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Small networks of actors support novelties on the basis of expectations and visions.

Learning processes take place in niches, based on Geels & Schot (2007).

Introduction to transition governance

Landscape developments put pressure on existing regime based on Geels & Schot (2007). New configuration breaks through, taking advantage of ‘windows of opportunity’. Adjustments occur in regime.
Long term transitions and evaluation

• Transition governance aims at long-term results: 25 – 50 years in complex circumstances

• So only evaluation after 50 years?

  → No, focus on process evaluation in the transition literature

• But a good process does not guarantee good results!

  → Focus on nurturing niches
Inspiration for an evaluation tool

- Process evaluation and reflexive learning
  (e.g. Bussels et al, 2013)

- Focus on nurturing niches
  (Ros et al, 2006)

- Programme theory evaluation: Theories of Change; Modus Narrandi
  (Blamey & Mackenzie, 2007; Gysen et al, 2006)
# The transition governance evaluation tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Process/Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Description of the niches</td>
<td>No evaluation</td>
<td>Purely descriptive</td>
<td>Desktopresearch Interviews</td>
<td>Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Evaluation of the niches potential for system change</td>
<td>The potential of the pathway in increasing the system sustainability</td>
<td>PPP &amp; here vs. elsewhere dimensions (Ros et al, 2006) System change</td>
<td>Desktopresearch Interviews</td>
<td>Product - Impact (potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluation of transition governance process</td>
<td>The institutional framework of the transition process is tested against process prescriptions in the literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The transition governance evaluation tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Process/Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Evaluation of the predevelopment phase</td>
<td>Whether or not certain crucial government activities took place during the predevelopment</td>
<td>Description of policy outputs</td>
<td>Interviews Workshops</td>
<td>Product - Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Evaluation of the possibility of take-off</td>
<td>Decrease of the regime resistance thanks to the transition process</td>
<td>Programme theory failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The transition governance evaluation tool

**LANDSCAPE**
- DEMOGRAPHY
- ECONOMY
- NATURE

**REGIME**
- Input
  - Transition arena
- Evaluation phase 1
  - Take off
  - Breakthrough
  - Stabilization
- Evaluation phase 2
- Impact
  - Less CO₂
  - Less air pollution
- Evaluation phase 3
- Evaluation phase 4
- Evaluation phase 5

**NICHES**
- Electrical Car
- Predevelopment

**Outcomes**
- Decreasing complexity
- Increasing public support

**Output**
- Subsidies
- Experiments
- R&D
- Learning activities
Flemish SD policy is very much LT oriented thanks to transition governance approach.

Evaluation has to encourage the LT horizon.

Exclusive focus on process evaluation only is however not sufficient.

Better is a focus on causal links between policy process and decreasing regime resistance (program theory evaluation).
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