

Public Stakeholder Consultation – Evaluation of Public-Public Partnerships (Art.185 initiatives) in the context of the Horizon 2020 Interim Evaluation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Horizon 2020, with a budget of €77bn from 2014 – 2020, is the biggest European Union research and innovation framework programme ever and one of the largest worldwide. Horizon 2020 promotes Europe's scientific and technological excellence to extend the frontiers of human knowledge, boosts the European Union's economic competitiveness and addresses societal challenges.

Horizon 2020 supports a number of Public-Public Partnerships on the basis of Art.185 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). It allows the EU to participate in research programmes undertaken jointly by several Member States.

This consultation aims to collect the views of the public about the implementation of Public-Public Partnerships (**Sections A and B**) in the context of the interim evaluation of Horizon 2020. In addition, it allows you to provide specific views on three of the initiatives:

- AAL 2 - Active and Assisted Living R&D Programme (Horizon 2020) – **Section C**
- Eurostars2 - Joint research programme for R&D performing SMEs (Horizon 2020) – **Section D**
- BONUS - Joint Baltic Sea research and development programme (Framework Programme 7) – **Section E**

The results of this consultation will feed into the report on the interim evaluation of Horizon 2020, will help us to improve the implementation and future design of Art.185 initiatives and will contribute to setting the scene for the future of Public-Public Partnerships in the context of the EU research and innovation funding post-2020.

Section A - About you

Section A consists of questions about the respondent. We would like to know who our respondents are in order to better understand their perspective, expectations and needs in terms of research and innovation. It will also help us to tailor this survey to respondents' experiences with Horizon 2020 and Art.185 initiatives. Please be aware that in accordance with Regulation 45/2001, all personal data collected through this survey will be stored securely and ultimately erased.

***1. In which capacity are you responding to this consultation?**

- ☐ As an individual
- ☐ On behalf of a single institution/company
- ☐ On behalf of an “umbrella” organisation of EU interest

*** 1.1 What type of organisation do you represent?**

Please select one of the following:

- ☐ Academia
- ☐ Research organisation
- ☐ Business
- ☐ Public Authority
- ☐ Non-governmental organization
- ☐ Other

*** If "Other", please specify:**

1.2 Are you an SME (Small and Medium Sized Enterprise)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

***2. You are from**

or if you answer on behalf of an organisation: country where it is established

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Belgium | <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria | <input type="radio"/> Croatia |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Czech Republic | <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Estonia |
| <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Greece |
| <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Latvia |
| <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands |
| <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Slovak Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Slovenia | <input type="radio"/> Spain | <input type="radio"/> Sweden | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Bosnia and Herzegovina | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia |
| <input type="radio"/> Georgia | <input type="radio"/> Iceland | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Moldova |
| <input type="radio"/> Montenegro | <input type="radio"/> Norway | <input type="radio"/> Serbia | <input type="radio"/> Switzerland |
| <input type="radio"/> Tunisia | <input type="radio"/> Turkey | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine | <input type="radio"/> Other |

* If "Other", please specify:

***3. Information about respondents**

First name:

* Last name:

* Email address:

* Organisation:

*** 3.1 Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?**

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

***4. Your contribution**

Note that, whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC) N° 1049/2001

- ☐ can be published with your personal information (I consent to the publication of all the information in my contribution in whole or in part including my name or my organisation's name, and I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent publication)
- ☐ can be published provided that you remain anonymous (I consent to the publication of any information in my contribution in whole or in part (which may include quotes or opinions I express) provided that it is done anonymously. I declare that nothing within my response is unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent the publication.

***5. Have you received/are you receiving support from Horizon 2020?**

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

***6. Are directly or indirectly involved in one or more of the Art.185 initiatives?**

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, in which function?

| | AAL | BONUS | EDCTP | EMRP / EMPIR | Eurostars |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Evaluator | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Applied for funding | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Received funding | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stakeholder involved in preparation and management | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Scientific advisor to a programme | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| User of project results | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Section B

7. EU Added value











How would you assess the following statements about Art.185 initiatives?

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Fund high quality R&I projects which cannot be realized at national level alone | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provide knowledge gains with respect to programme development and implementation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increase competitiveness and contribute to economic growth | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Produce higher impact from national R&I investments when embedded in transnational programme | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow national R&I capacity building as well as access to foreign knowledge | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Raise the attractiveness for foreign researchers to work in your country | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Provide additional financial resources for national R&I from EU cofunding | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Raise political visibility for joint programmes at national and European level | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

8. Relevance

8.1. Do you think that Art.185 initiatives are relevant for the following EU policy objectives:

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Build a society and an economy based on knowledge and innovation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Implement the "Europe 2020" strategy, the EU's strategy for jobs and smart, sustainable and inclusive growth | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Develop and implementing EU policies | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Support the development of the European Research Area, a unified area open to the world, in which scientific knowledge, technology and researchers circulate freely | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Foster excellent science | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Boost industrial leadership | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Improve the lifelong health and well-being of all | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Secure sufficient supplies of safe, healthy and high quality food and other bio-based products | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Make the transition to a reliable, affordable, publicly accepted, sustainable and competitive energy system | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Achieve a European transport system that is resource-efficient, climate- and environmentally-friendly, safe and seamless for the benefit of all citizens, the economy and society |  |  |  |  |  |
| Achieve a resource- and water-efficient and climate change resilient economy and society, protection and sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems and a sustainable supply and use of raw materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| Foster a greater understanding of Europe, providing solutions and supporting inclusive, innovative and reflective European societies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Foster secure European societies in a context of Unprecedented transformations and growing global interdependencies and threats, while strengthening the European culture of freedom and justice |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spread excellence and widening participation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support science with and for society |  |  |  |  |  |

* 8.2. How do you assess the relevance of Art.185 initiatives in their specific thematic context for the country you are based in?

- ☐ High
- ☐ Low
- ☐ Don't know

9. Coherence

How would you assess the following statements about Art.185 initiatives?

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Are complementary to / and well coherent with other Horizon 2020 Public to Public Partnership initiatives with similar objectives (i. e. ERA-NET Cofund, Joint Programming Initiatives, EJP Cofund, etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are in line with Horizon 2020 policy objectives | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are in line with broader EU policy objectives, beyond Horizon 2020 policy objectives | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are mainly oriented towards national policy objectives | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

10. Effectiveness

How would you assess the following statements about Art.185 initiatives and projects stemming from them?

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Contribute to scientific integration | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contribute to managerial integration | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contribute to financial integration | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow for easier cross-country cooperation than national programmes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow for easier cross-country cooperation than Horizon 2020 programmes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow for projects that could not be realised within national programmes | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Allow for projects that could not be realised under Horizon 2020 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

11. Efficiency

How would you assess the following statements about Art.185 initiatives?

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Provide an appropriate level of administrative burden for Participating States | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are straightforward and simple in their preparation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are straightforward and simple in their implementation | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are less burdensome for applicants than national projects | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are less burdensome for applicants than Horizon 2020 projects | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

12. Future recommendations

Do you think that Art.185 initiatives performance can be improved in the future?

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Legal and administrative burdens at national level are removed | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More human resources are available for the set-up of an Art.185 framework | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More national budgets for Art.185 initiatives are available | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More human resources are available for efficient / effective implementation of Art.185 initiatives | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A better coordination between national stakeholders is ensured | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Are better embedded in the EU Framework Programme | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The multiplicity of instruments is reduced | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| More harmonisation of funding rules including reporting is achieved | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

13. Overall comments

Please provide any further comments you might have:

600 character(s) maximum

* For which evaluation would you like to provide further views:

- ☐ AAL2 (Horizon 2020) - **Section C**
- ☐ Eurostars2 (Horizon 2020) - **Section D**
- ☐ BONUS (FP7) - **Section E**
- ☐ None of the previously mentioned initiatives

Section C - AAL2

Introduction to AAL2

The Active and Assistive Living (AAL) programme funds projects in public-private partnership in the field of information and communication technology (ICT) for active and healthy ageing since 2008. The programme was renamed in 2014 after being renewed for a second phase (the first was from 2008 until 2013 and was named Ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme) and it is co-financed by the European Commission – under the Horizon 2020 umbrella – and 19 countries.

The overall objective of AAL is to enhance the quality of life of older adults while strengthening the industrial base in Europe through the use of ICT. Since 2008, AAL has issued 7 calls for proposals each focusing on different issues and has funded 154 trans-national innovations projects with over 1000 partners. Almost half of these project partners are small and medium enterprises (SMEs), which are collaborating with user organisations, large enterprises, universities and research organisations in the development of innovative solutions. The topics covered by the programme include management of chronic conditions, social inclusion, access to the self-serve society, mobility of older adults, management of daily activities, support from informal carers (e.g. family and friends) and occupation in life.

The AAL projects aim at introducing their solution to the market within 2 to 3 years after the end of the project. For this reason, as part of their funded work, the projects perform pilot tests in realistic settings and develop their business model together with the most relevant players of the value network. In the first phase of AAL, some projects already accomplished their way to market (see selected success stories).

Additional information can be found at: www.aal-europe.eu

* C.1: What is your level of familiarity with the AAL2 Joint Programme?

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Low

* C.2: Have you participated in an action under AAL1 and/or AAL2 (several answers are possible)?

- ☐ Yes, in funded project of AAL1
- ☐ Yes, in non-selected project of AAL 1
- ☐ Yes, in funded project of AAL 2
- ☐ Yes, in non-selected project of AAL 2
- ☐ No

* C.3: If you are not involved in an AAL project, how you did find out information about the Joint Programme?

- ☐ In a conference
- ☐ At a scientific workshop or training event
- ☐ Through media (Internet, national information channels, newspapers, specialised press, etc.)
- ☐ Through national networks (NPS, NCPs, EEN, KAM, Regional authorities, national or regional Innovation Agencies, national or regional Chambers of Commerce, etc.)
- ☐ Other





















Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Objectives

C.4: To which extent is the AAL2 programme likely to achieve the following objectives?

| | Fully | To a large extent | To a small extent | Not | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Accelerate the emergence and take-up of relevant, affordable and integrated innovative ICT-based solutions for active and healthy ageing at home, in the community, or at work | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Support the development of solutions that contribute to the independence and alleviation of a sense of social isolation of older adults, in such a way that the ICT component does not reduce human contact, but is complementary to it |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintain and further develop a critical mass of applied research, development and innovation at Union level in the areas of ICT-based products and services for active and healthy ageing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Develop cost-effective, accessible and, where relevant, energy-efficient solutions, including establishing relevant interoperability standards and facilitating the localisation and adaptation of common solutions which are compatible with varying social preferences, socio-economic factors (including energy poverty, social inclusion), gender aspects, and regulatory aspects at national or regional level |  |  |  |  |  |
| Establish a favourable environment for the participation of small and medium-sized enterprises |  |  |  |  |  |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Focus on market-oriented applied research and innovation and shall complement related longer-term research and large scale innovation activities envisaged under Horizon 2020, and other European and national initiatives such as joint programming initiatives and activities undertaken within the European Institute of Innovation and Technology and its relevant Knowledge and Innovation Communities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contribute to the implementation of the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

C.5: What concrete contributions of the AAL2 programme have you observed with regard to achieving the objectives?

600 character(s) maximum

*C.6: Is there sufficient budget contributions from Participating States to achieve the objectives of the AAL2 Programme?

- ☐ Sufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ Sufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

C.7: What has been the additional value of the EU financial contribution to the AAL2 programme compared to what could be achieved by using the funding under Horizon 2020, or by using only the contributions from the Member States?

1200 character(s) maximum

Relevance

C.8: What are your views about the relevance and usefulness of the AAL2 programme?

1200 character(s) maximum

* Coherence

C.9: To what extent is the AAL2 programme coherent with other EU initiatives which have similar objectives Horizon 2020, Joint programming initiative More years, Better lives or European Institute of Innovation & Technology - Health

- ☐ Fully coherent
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not coherent
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

*** Effectiveness**

C.10: Given the effects that can be attributed to the AAL2 programme, how cost-effective has been the AAL2 programme so far?

- ☐ Very cost-effective
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not cost-effective
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

*** C.11: In your opinion is the AAL2 Programme sufficiently accessible to its target group, in particular SMEs?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

C.12: What are the benefits of participating in AAL2 projects?

600 character(s) maximum

*** European Added Value**

C.13: Do you think that the total amount of EU financial contribution (i.e. max 175 million EUR) is appropriate in order to achieve the objectives of the AAL2 Programme?

- ☐ Too high
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Too small
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

C.14: What is in your opinion the additional value resulting from the EU intervention in the Programme compared to what could be achieved at national or regional level?

600 character(s) maximum

*** C.15: Is the design and performance of AAL2 in line with the spirit of Art.185 TFEU and with the requirements of Art.26 of Horizon 2020, in particular concerning financial, managerial and scientific integration?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Strengths, weaknesses and the future

C.16: In your opinion, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the AAL2 programme? What could be the lessons learnt for the future?

1200 character(s) maximum

* C.17: In order to maximise the future impact in the field of active and healthy ageing, you would recommend to:

- ☐ Keep existing scope of the AAL Joint Programme
- ☐ Widen of the scope of the AAL Joint Programme (e.g. address also non-ICT topics, also assistive technology for the disabled, also roll-out of actual solutions, etc.)
- ☐ Narrow of the scope AAL Joint Programme (e.g. not to address health-related questions, focus on the oldest part of the population, focus on affordability of independent living solutions, etc.)
- ☐ Use other form of public financing of research and innovation in the field of active and health ageing

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* C.18 Which form of public financing at European level should be used for funding of innovation and research in the area of the active and healthy ageing?

- ☐ Public-Public Partnership without Union participation (Member States only)
- ☐ Public-Private Partnership with Union participation (European Commission & industry)
- ☐ Public-Public Partnerships with Union participation (European Commission and Member States, current AAL2)
- ☐ Pre-commercial procurement with Union participation (European Commission & industry)
- ☐ None

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* C.19: Would you be in favour of a future AAL initiative?

- ☐ Yes, as a joint programme with the participation of both Participating States and the EU
- ☐ Yes, as a joint programme, but only with the Participating States
- ☐ No, I would prefer community support in the context of a future Framework Programme
- ☐ No, only national programmes are relevant in this domain
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

C.20: Do you have any further comments?

1200 character(s) maximum

Section D - EUROSTARS2

Introduction to Eurostars2

Eurostars supports international innovative projects led by research and development- performing small- and medium-sized enterprises (R&D-performing SMEs). With its bottom-up approach, Eurostars supports the development of rapidly marketable innovative products, processes and services that help improve the daily lives of people around the world. Eurostars has been carefully developed to meet the specific needs of SMEs. It is an ideal first step in international cooperation, enabling small businesses to combine and share expertise and benefit from working beyond national borders.

Eurostars is a joint programme between EUREKA and the European Union, co-funded from the national budgets of 36 Eurostars Participating States and Partner Countries and by the European Union through Horizon 2020. In the 2014-2020 period it has a total public budget of €1.14 billion.

Additional information can be found at www.eurostars-eureka.eu/about-eurostars

* D.1: What is your level of familiarity with the Eurostars2 Joint Programme?

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Low

D.2: Have you participated in an action under Eurostars-1 and/or Eurostars-2?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

* D.2.1: Please specify which (several answers are possible)?

- ☐ In funded project of Eurostars1
- ☐ In non-selected project of Eurostars1
- ☐ In funded project of Eurostars2
- ☐ In non-selected project of Eurostars2

* D.3: If you are not involved in a Eurostars project, how did you find out information about the Joint Programme?

- ☐ In a conference
- ☐ At a scientific workshop or training event
- ☐ Through media (Internet, national information channels, newspapers, specialised press, etc.)
- ☐ Through national networks (NPS, NCPs, EEN, KAM, Regional authorities, national or regional Innovation Agencies, national or regional Chambers of Commerce, etc.)
- ☐ Other

Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Objectives

D.4: To which extent is the Eurostars programme likely to achieve the following objectives?

| | Fully | To a large extent | To a small extent | Not | No opinion |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Promote research activities that are carried out by transnational collaboration of research- and development performing SMEs among themselves or including other actors of the innovation chain (e.g. universities, research organisations) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Promote research activities where results are to be introduced into the market within two years of the completion of an activity | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Increase the accessibility, efficiency and efficacy of public funding for SMEs in Europe by aligning, harmonising and synchronising the national funding mechanisms of Participating States | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Promote and increase the participation of SMEs without previous experience in transnational research | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

- * D.5: A major objective of the Joint Programme is to introduce the results of projects into the market within 2 years of the completion of the project. Does the present design of the Eurostars Joint Programme sufficiently support such a target, do you see any possibilities to improve this?

- ☐ Fully
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

- * D.6: In the absence of a Eurostars-2 grant, would R&D performing SMEs have undertaken their projects by their proper or other means?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.7: Is there sufficient budget from Participating States to achieve the objectives of the Eurostars2 Programme?

- ☐ Sufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ Sufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* **Relevance**

D.8: Does the Eurostars-2 Joint Programme in its design and implementation contribute to the general objectives of making Horizon 2020 more oriented towards innovation and economic impact and support the holistic approach to innovation taken by Horizon 2020?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.9: Is the design of the Eurostars-2 Joint Programme (minimum 2 participants from 2 different Eurostars-2 participating States, R&D performing SME as leading partner in the consortia, 3 years project duration, project results to be introduced into the market after to 2 years of the project completion, etc.) an adequate response to the observations on SME innovation support in FP7 and H2020?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* **Coherence**

D.10: Does the Eurostars-2 Joint Programme complement other interventions / instruments from Horizon 2020 (SME Instrument, 'Fast Track to Innovation', Collaborative projects, Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions) or from other EU programmes (COSME) and realise synergies where possible?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.11: Are the resources mobilized by the Participating States and the European Union justified by the scale and scope of the initiative?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.12: How do you assess the efficiency of the mechanisms and tools ensuring the entry-into-the-market of results/achievements of Eurostars-2 ended projects?

- ☐ Very efficient
- ☐ Efficient
- ☐ Partially efficient
- ☐ Not efficient
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* **Effectiveness**

D.13: In your opinion is the Programme sufficiently accessible in particular for R&D performing SMEs?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.14: What is the benefit for an R&D-performing SME to participate in Eurostars2 projects?

600 character(s) maximum

* European Added Value

D.15: Do you think that the total amount of EU financial contribution (i.e. max 287 million EUR) is appropriate in order to achieve the objectives of the Eurostars2 Programme?

- ☐ Too high
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Too small
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* D.16: What is in your opinion the additional value resulting from the EU intervention in the Programme compared to what could be achieved at national or regional level?

600 character(s) maximum

* D.17: Is the design and performance of Eurostars2 in line with the spirit of Art.185 TFEU and with the requirements of Art.26 of Horizon 2020, in particular concerning financial, managerial and scientific integration?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

* **Strengths, weaknesses and the future**

D.18: In your opinion what are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats regarding the management of Eurostars2 Joint Programme?

600 character(s) maximum

* D.19: What are the lessons learnt for the future?

600 character(s) maximum

* D.20: Would you be in favour of a future Eurostars initiative?

- ☐ Yes, as a joint programmes with the participation of both Participating States and the EU
- ☐ Yes, as a joint programmes, but only with the Participating States
- ☐ No, I would prefer community support in the context of a future Framework Programme
- ☐ No, only national programmes are relevant in this domain
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

D.21: Do you have any further comments?

1200 character(s) maximum

Section E - BONUS

Introduction to BONUS

BONUS, the joint Baltic Sea research and development programme for years 2010-2017, was started by the BONUS member states together with the EU and officially launched in September 2010 by a co-decision of the European Parliament and the European Council as a Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) Art.185 initiative.

In support of sustainable development and ecosystem based management of the Baltic Sea region, the HELCOM Baltic Sea Action Plan and the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive and other European, regional and national coastal and marine environmental policies and plans, BONUS issues calls on ecosystem research and innovation for scientific community and SMEs funds projects of high excellence and relevance 1) to produce knowledge, scientific evidence and innovation solutions needed by policymakers and 2) to engage end-users and the society in the knowledge based governance of the fragile Baltic Sea.

BONUS responds to the EU's growth and jobs strategy by implementing many principles of the EU Horizon 2020 (2014-2020) by e.g. pursuing challenge-oriented interdisciplinary research, bringing closer science and innovation and involving stakeholders across multitude of sectors in all phases of the programme.

BONUS members are the national research funding institutions in the eight EU member states around the Baltic Sea who fund jointly with the EU's Seventh Programme for research, technological development and demonstration by a total of EUR 100 million for years 2011-2017. Russia participates in BONUS through bilateral agreements.

Additional information can be found at: <http://www.bonusportal.org/>

* E.1: What is your level of familiarity with the BONUS Joint Programme?

- ☐ Very good
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Low

* E.2: Have you participated in an action under BONUS (several answers are possible)?

- ☐ Yes, in funded project of BONUS
- ☐ Yes, in non-selected project of BONUS
- ☐ No

E.3: If you are not involved in a BONUS project, how did you find out information about the Joint Programme?

- ☐ In a conference
- ☐ At a scientific workshop or training event
- ☐ Through media (Internet, national information channels, newspapers, specialised press, etc.)
- ☐ Through national networks (NPS, NCPs, EEN, KAM, Regional authorities, national or regional Innovation Agencies, national or regional Chambers of Commerce, etc.)
- ☐ Other

Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Objectives

E.4: To which extent is the BONUS programme likely to achieve the following objectives?

| | Fully relevant | To a large extent | To a small extent | Not | No opinion |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Enhance the Baltic Sea Region's research capacity to underpin the development and implementation of 'fit-for-purpose' regulations, policies and management practices | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Respond effectively to the major environmental and key societal challenges which the region faces and will face in the coming years | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Baltic Sea Region's fragmented environmental research programming and approach by integrating the research activities in the Baltic Sea System into a durable, cooperative, interdisciplinary well-integrated and focused multi-national programme | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Contribute to the establishment and structuring of the ERA in the Baltic Sea Region | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

E.5: In your opinion, what are the major achievements / strengths of the BONUS programme? Which of the strengths should be reinforced?

1200 character(s) maximum

* E.6: Is there sufficient budget from Participating States to achieve the different objectives of the BONUS Programme?

- ☐ Sufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ Sufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from some Participating States
- ☐ Insufficient budgets from all Participating States
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Relevance

E.7: What are your views about the relevance and usefulness of the BONUS joint programme?

1200 character(s) maximum

E.8: How do you assess the efficiency of BONUS in funding transnational research and innovation activities among the states around the Baltic Sea?

1200 character(s) maximum

E.9: In your opinion, what are the positive impacts on the state of the Baltic Sea that the BONUS programme is likely to achieve?

1200 character(s) maximum

*** Coherence**

E.10: To what extent is the BONUS programme coherent with other initiatives with similar objectives (Horizon 2020 thematic calls, Joint programming Initiative Oceans, etc.)?

- ☐ Fully coherent
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

*** Effectiveness**

E.11: In your opinion is the BONUS Programme sufficiently accessible to its target group?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

E.12: What is the added value to participate in BONUS projects?

600 character(s) maximum

*** European Added Value**

E.13: Do you think that the total amount of EU financial contribution (i.e. max 50 million EUR) is appropriate in order to achieve the objectives of the BONUS Programme?

- ☐ Too high
- ☐ Adequate
- ☐ Too small
- ☐ No opinion

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

E.14: What is in your opinion the additional value resulting from the EU intervention in the Programme compared to what could be achieved at national or regional level?

600 character(s) maximum

Strengths, weaknesses and the future

E.15: In your opinion, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the BONUS programme? What could be the lessons learnt for the future?

1200 character(s) maximum

* E.16: Would you be in favour of a future Bonus initiative?

- ☐ Yes, as a joint programmes with the participation of both Participating States and the EU
- ☐ Yes, as a joint programmes, but only with the Participating States
- ☐ No, I would prefer community support in the context of a future Framework Programme
- ☐ No, only national programmes are relevant in this domain
- ☐ No opinion
- ☐ Other

Please specify:

600 character(s) maximum

E.17: Do you have any further comments?

1200 character(s) maximum