

Public stakeholder consultation in the context of the interim evaluation of the Joint Technology Initiatives and Joint Undertakings

This consultation aims to collect the views of the public about the implementation of the Joint Undertakings (JUs) under Horizon 2020 for the period 2014 to 2016. The outcome of this public consultation will provide input to the currently ongoing interim evaluation of the JUs, covering the same period. The results of the interim evaluation will be used as a basis to improve the performance of the JUs and will be communicated to the European Parliament and the Council, national authorities, the research community and other stakeholders.

This questionnaire consists of six parts and it will take around 20 minutes to respond.

A short introduction to Joint Technology Initiatives and Joint Undertakings

The Joint Undertakings (JUs) are formalised public-private partnerships involving companies at the European level. The JUs were first set up in 2007 under the Seventh Framework Programme (referred to as 'FP7') in five strategic areas: aeronautics and air transport, health, fuel cell and hydrogen technologies, embedded computing systems and nanoelectronics. The JUs bring together industry, the research community, in some cases Member States, regulators and the EU to define and implement common research agendas and invest in large-scale multinational research activities. They are practical examples of the European Union's efforts towards strengthening its competitiveness through scientific excellence, industry led research, openness and innovation.

The European Commission, as a co-founding member, was responsible for setting up the JUs. Once they had built up their legal and financial framework and demonstrated their capacity to manage their own budgets, the JUs were granted autonomy. The control over JUs is shared and the Commission has its own members in the Governing Board of each JU.

Based on the experience acquired under FP7, a second generation of public and private partnerships was set up¹ by the European Commission under Horizon 2020, aiming to collectively pool more than €22 billion² of research and innovation investments. This includes seven JUs, namely: Bio-based Industries (BBI), Clean Sky 2 (CS 2), Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership (ECSEL), Fuel Cells and Hydrogen 2 (FCH 2), Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 (IMI 2), Single European Sky ATM Research (SESAR) and Shift2Rail, that organise their own research and innovation agenda³ and award funding for projects on the basis of competitive calls⁴.

¹ With the exception of SESAR JU for which the existing JU Regulation was extended.

² This amount represents the total investments under Art. 185 and Art. 187 initiatives under Horizon 2020.

³ Exception is the SESAR JU the agenda of which is set by the Member States, various Air Traffic Management (ATM) stakeholders and the members of the PPP in the framework of the European ATM Master Plan.

⁴ For more information about the Joint Undertakings operating under Horizon 2020, please visit:

<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/area/partnerships-industry-and-member-states>

First part of questions common to all JUs

A. Information about you

In this section you are asked to provide information to help us understand about the respondents who have completed this questionnaire. Please be aware that in accordance with Regulation 45/2001, all personal data collected through this questionnaire will be stored securely and ultimately erased.

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

- As an individual in my personal capacity
 In my professional capacity or on behalf of an organisation

In case of individual: (note: depending on the response to A.1. one of the two options below will appear)

A.1.1 Please enter your personal details*:

First name:

Last name:

Email address:

If you do not have an email address, please write "Not available"

In case of organisation:

A.1.2. Please enter your professional details*:

First name:

Last name:

Professional email address:

Name of the organisation:

Postal address of the organisation:

A.1.3. Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?

If your organisation is not registered we invite you to register here, although it is not compulsory to be registered in order to participate in this consultation. Why a transparency register?

A.2. My contribution, *

Note that whatever option chosen, your answers may be subject to a request for public access to documents under Regulation (EC)No 1049/2001

- can be published with my personal information** (I consent to the publication of all 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 I 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 if unlawful or would infringe the rights of any third party in a manner that would prevent the publication)

A.3. Please enter your current country of residence/where your organisation is based*.

(note: depending on the response to A.1. one of the two options will appear)

Austria	Belgium	Bulgaria	Croatia
Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia
Finland	France	Germany	Greece
Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia
Lithuania	Luxembourg	Malta	Netherlands
Poland	Portugal	Romania	Slovak Republic
Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	United Kingdom
Albania	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Faroe Islands	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Georgia	Iceland	Israel	Moldova
Montenegro	Norway	Serbia	Switzerland
Tunisia	Turkey	Ukraine	Other (if Other, please specify)

A.4. For which Joint Undertaking would you like to provide your views:

(you may provide your views for more than one JU)

- BBI CS 2 ECSEL FCH2 IMI 2 SESAR Shift2Rail

The Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking (BBI JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to BBI JU

The Commission Communication "Innovating for sustainable growth: A Bioeconomy for Europe"⁵ and the Europe 2020 Strategy⁶ calls for bioeconomy as a key element for smart and green growth in Europe. Both propose that the advancements in bioeconomy research and innovation uptake will allow Europe to improve the management of its renewable biological resources and to open new and diversified markets in food and bio-based products.

The Bio-Based Industries Joint Undertaking is a new €3.7 billion Public-Private Partnership between the EU and the Bio-based Industries Consortium. It funds research and innovation projects under Horizon 2020 and it is driven by the Strategic Innovation and Research Agenda (SIRA) developed by the industry.

One of the main objectives of the Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking (BBI JU)⁷ is to contribute to the objectives of the BBI Initiative for a more resource efficient and sustainable low-carbon economy and to increasing economic growth and employment, in particular in rural areas, by developing sustainable and competitive bio-based industries in Europe based on advanced biorefineries that source their biomass sustainably, and in particular to:

- (i) demonstrate technologies that enable new chemical building blocks, new materials, and new consumer products from European biomass which replace the need for fossil-based inputs;
- (ii) develop business models that integrate economic actors along the whole value chain from supply of biomass to biorefinery plants to consumers of bio-based materials, chemicals and fuels, including by means of creating new cross-sector interconnections and supporting cross-industry clusters; and
- (iii) set up flagship biorefinery plants that deploy the technologies and business models for bio-based materials, chemicals and fuels and demonstrate cost and performance improvements to levels that are competitive with fossil-based alternatives.

According to the BBI JU legal framework⁸, the contributions of the Union on one hand and the members other than the Union (private partner – Biobased Industries Consortium, BIC), on the other hand, are the following:

- (i) The contribution of the Union to the administrative and operational costs of the BBI JU should be up to € 975 million;
- (ii) The contribution of BIC or of its constituent entities to the administrative and operational costs of the BBI Initiative should be at least € 2,730 million.

⁵ COM(2012)60 of 13/2/2012

⁶ COM(2010)2020 of 3/3/2010

⁷ <http://www.bbi-europe.eu>

⁸ Council Regulation (EU) No 560/2014 of 6 May 2014 establishing the Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia
- Other (if "Other", please specify)

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Agriculture
- Agro-food sector
- Forestry
- Forest-based sector
- Fisheries and aquaculture
- Industrial Biotechnology
- Chemicals
- Materials, e.g. polymers, plastics
- Other (non-pharmaceutical) biotechnologies
- Energy and bio-fuels
- Bio-waste processing
- Technology providers
- Other (if "Other", please specify)

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)⁹

- YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking (BBI JU)? *

- Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied for funding from the BBI JU? *

- YES NO

A.9. Are you directly involved with the BBI JU, as*:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| BIC member | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Beneficiary of BBI JU | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Evaluator | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Advisory board member | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Other (if, "Other", please specify:) | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could the industry along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, be able to overcome the barriers which hinder innovation and drive up costs in the bio-based sector?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

⁹ SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises as defined in the Recommendation 2003/361/EC of 6 May 2003. The category of SMEs is made up of enterprises which employ fewer than 250 persons and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million. Within the SME category, a small enterprise is defined as an enterprise which employs fewer than 50 persons and whose annual turnover and/or annual balance sheet total does not exceed EUR 10 million. Within the SME category, a microenterprise is defined as an enterprise which employs fewer than 10 persons and whose annual turnover and/or annual balance sheet total does not exceed EUR 2 million.

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that the bio-based research brings better results to the society and the market in Europe?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

a: Not important at all b: Not important c: Important d: Very important e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. Integration of European research	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. More cross border collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross-sector/interdisciplinary collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. Quicker adoption of standards	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.6. Allowing leverage of external pools of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.7. Better availability of research results	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.8. Encouragement of companies to share expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant
(maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU other than the EU and the EU contribution. The Council Regulation establishing BBI JU sets out the minimum leverage effect throughout its lifespan to 2.8 (i.e. for each euro of public money the EU contributes, the industrial partners have to contribute at least with €2.8). Please note that, with the exception of innovation actions, large industry, does not receive any EU funding for participating in BBI JU projects.

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 2.8 is:

Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why?
(maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that BBI JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion *(maximum 600 characters)*

B.7. Do you consider that the BBI JU contributes to the transition from a fossil- based to a bio-based economy?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.8. Do you think that the BBI JU contributes to the climate change mitigation by reducing the CO2 derived from the use of fossil-based products?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.9. Do you think that the BBI JU contributes to a more sustainable and efficient use of resources, including the recycling, reuse and valorization of organic residues?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.10. Do you think that the BBI JU contributes to the strengthening of a circular economy in Europe
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the BBI JU website provides the general public and potential participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

	a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion
	a	b	c	d	e
C.1.1. The BBI JU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The BBI JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The BBI JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				

C2. Do you consider that the BBI JU encourages the participation of SMEs?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.3. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive?¹⁰

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.3.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.4. If you have applied for funding from BBI JU, do you consider that BBI JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance? (this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4.1. If you have applied for funding from BBI JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results (maximum 600 characters)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The scientific priorities addressed by the BBI JU are set in the Strategic Innovation and Research Agenda (SIRA)¹¹. Is this document optimal for defining the scope of research and innovation followed by the BBI JU?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. Do you consider other research and innovation areas not mentioned in SIRA as important to be addressed?

YES NO

¹⁰ http://www.bbi-europe.eu/sites/default/files/bbi_ju_call_2016.pdf

¹¹ http://bbi-europe.eu/sites/default/files/documents/BBI_SIRA_web_0.pdf

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other research and innovation areas not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.3. In your view how effective has BBI JU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective	b: Somewhat effective	c: Very effective	d: No opinion			
			a	b	c	d
D.3.1. Supporting the development and implementation of pre-competitive research and of innovation activities of strategic importance to the Unions in the bioeconomy sector	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.2. Increasing the number of new cross-sector interconnections in BBI projects	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.3. Developing new bio-based value chains	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.4. Developing new bio-based building blocks	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.5. Developing the bio-based materials	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.6. Developing new bio-based consumer products	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.7. Increasing the numbers of flagship biorefinery plants started based on BBI demonstration projects	<input type="checkbox"/>					
D.3.8. Developing necessary technologies to fill in the gap in the bio-based value chains	<input type="checkbox"/>					

D.4. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES NO

D.4.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.5. Do you think that the BBI JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe in the bio-based industries sector?

In the short term: over the next five years In the medium term: over the next ten years In the long term: over the next twenty years No opinion

D.5.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.6. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in a BBI JU project?

a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion				
				a	b	c	d	e
D.6.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>							
D.6.2. Greater visibility across Europe/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>							
D.6.3. Greater understanding of the bio-based products development process	<input type="checkbox"/>							
D.6.4. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>							
D.6.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and the industry	<input type="checkbox"/>							

D.7. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.8. Do you consider that BBI JU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?

YES NO

D.8.1. If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.9. To what extent are the activities of the BBI JU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.10. What is the relation of the BBI JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (*maximum 600 characters*)

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the BBI JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.2. If you have applied for funding from the BBI JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (*maximum 600 characters*)

E.4. You consider that the BBI JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

'Clean Sky' Joint Undertaking (CS 2 JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to Clean Sky JU

The Clean Sky JTI (Joint Technology Initiative) was created in 2008 as a public-private partnership between the European Commission and the aeronautics industry. The programme is managed by the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking.

The first research programme, named "Clean Sky", was launched under FP7 with a value of €1.6 billion. The European Commission and industry each contribute 50% of this budget. The FP7 Clean Sky programme aimed at demonstrating and validating the technology breakthroughs that are necessary to make major steps towards the environmental goals sets by the Vision 2020 for European Aeronautics to be reached by 2020, compared to a baseline of a typically new aircraft as available in 2000:

- 50% reduction of CO₂ emissions through drastic reduction of fuel consumption
- 80% reduction of NO_x (nitrogen oxide) emissions
- 50% reduction of external noise
- A green product life cycle: design, manufacturing, maintenance and disposal/ recycling

The second research programme under Horizon 2020, "Clean Sky 2", was established in the view of Flightpath 2050, Europe' Vision for Aviation and its ambitious goals for 2050:

- 75% reduction of CO₂ emissions per passenger kilometre to support the ATAG target
- 90% reduction of NO_x (nitrogen oxide) emissions
- 65% reduction of external noise
- Aircraft movements are emission-free when taxiing
- Aircraft are designed and manufactured to be recyclable

The new Clean Sky 2 programme is of total value of approximately €4 billion. The European Commission contributes €1.755 billion and industry 2.2 billion. The private in-kind contributions include a minimum of €965 million through additional activities.

The aim of Clean Sky 2 is to integrate, demonstrate and validate the most promising technologies capable of:

- Increasing aircraft fuel efficiency and reducing CO₂ emissions by 20 to 30% compared to 'state-of-the-art' aircraft entering into service as from 2014;
- Reducing aircraft NO_x emissions by 20 to 30% compared to 'state-of-the-art' aircraft entering into service as from 2014;
- Reducing aircraft noise emissions levels by up to 5dB – using the recognised effective perceived noise levels decibel (EPNdB) standard – per operation compared to 'state-of-the-art' aircraft entering into service as from 2014.

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia

Other (If "Other", please specify)

A.5.1. If PRC, in the area of*:

- Large passenger aircraft
- Regional aircraft
- Small aircraft
- Rotorcraft
- Airframes
- Engines
- Systems and equipment
- Avionics
- Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)

YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking (CS2 JU)? *

Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied to become a Core Partner of the CS2 JU? *

YES NO

A.9. Have you applied for funding from the CS2 JU? *

YES NO

A.10. Are you directly involved with the CS2 JU, as: *

	YES	NO
Leader of CS2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Core Partner in CS2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beneficiary of CS2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisory board member	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (if "Other", please specify:)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could the industry along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, maintain its worldwide competitiveness, by maintaining or expanding its research effort in order to overcome the barriers to innovation and create more environmentally-friendly aircraft?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that aeronautics research accelerates the greening of aviation and increases the worldwide competitiveness of the European aeronautics Industry?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the European added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

	a: Not important at all	b: Not important	c: Important	d: Very important	e: No opinion
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. More secure budget for the aviation research sector	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. Integration of European research	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross-border collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. More cross-sector/ inter-disciplinary collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| B.3.6. Quicker adoption of standards | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.7. Allowing leverage of external pools of knowledge | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.8. Better availability of research results | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.9. Encourage companies to share expertise | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.10. Enable companies to exploit technologies faster in products | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.11. Enable truly disruptive innovation in aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B.3.12. Enable new European companies in aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> |

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant
(maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU, other than the EU, and the EU contribution. The Council Regulation establishing CS2 JU sets out the minimum leverage effect throughout its lifespan to 1.25 (i.e. for every €1 of public money the EU contributes, the industrial partners have to contribute at least €1.25).

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 1.25 is:

- Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why?
(maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that CS2 JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the CS2 JU website provides the general public and potential new members and participants with easy access to relevant information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a: Strongly disagree | b: Disagree | c: Agree | d: Strongly agree | e: No opinion | |
| | a | b | c | d | e |
| C.1.1. The CS2 JU website provides easy and effective access to relevant information to the public | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C.1.2. The CS2 JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C.1.3. The CS2 JU website provides effective access to relevant information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C.1.4. The CS2 JU website provides effective access to relevant information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations in order to facilitate them in becoming Core Partners in CS2 JU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C.1.5. The CS2 JU website provides easy and effective access to knowledge generated by the projects funded under this JU | <input type="checkbox"/> |

C.2. Do you consider that the CS2 JU encourages the participation of SMEs?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.3. Do you consider that the process of selecting the CS2 Core Partners is sufficiently open, non-discriminatory and competitive?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive¹²?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5. Do you consider that the budget split between members' activities (max. 70% of EU funding to the CS2 JU) and non-members (min. 30% of EU funding to the CS2 JU) is appropriate to ensure a wide participation of the sector at large?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6. If you have applied for funding from CS2 JU, do you consider that CS2 JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6.1. If you have applied for funding from CS2 JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.7. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results (*maximum 600 characters*)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The aim of CS2 JU is to integrate, demonstrate and validate the most promising technologies capable of:

- Increasing aircraft fuel efficiency and reducing CO₂ emissions by 20 to 30%
- Reducing aircraft NOx emissions by 20 to 30%
- Reducing aircraft noise emissions levels by up to 5dB – using the recognised effective perceived noise levels decibel (EPNdB) standard – per operation

All this compared to 'state-of-the-art' aircraft entering into service as from 2014.

Are the objectives set sufficient for defining the Clean Sky research agenda?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. Do you consider that other important fields of aeronautics research, not mentioned as Clean Sky goals, should also be addressed?

YES NO

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other important fields not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

¹² <http://www.cleansky.eu/calls>

D.3. In your view how effective has CS2 JU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective

b: Somewhat effective

c: Very effective

d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.3.1. Providing financial support to research and innovation indirect actions mainly in the form of grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Bringing together a range of Integrated Technology Demonstrators (ITD) and Innovative Aircraft Demonstration Platforms (IADP)supported by Transvers Activities (TA), with the emphasis on innovative technologies and development of full-scale demonstrators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3 Focusing efforts within ITDs, IADPs and TAs on key deliverables that can help the EU meeting its environmental and competitiveness goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4 Enhancing the technology verification process in order to identify and remove obstacles to future market penetration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.5 Pooling user requirements to guide investment in research and development towards operational and marketable solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.6 Ensuring the provision of procurement contracts, where appropriate, through Calls for Tender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.7 Mobilising the public and private-sector funds needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.8 Liaising with national and international activities in the CS2 JU technical domain, in particular with the SESAR JU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.9 Stimulating the involvement of SMEs in its activities, in line with the objectives of the Seventh Framework Programme and of Horizon 2020;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.10. Developing close cooperation and ensuring coordination with related European (in particular under the framework programmes), national and transnational activities;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.11. Engaging in information, communication, exploitation and dissemination activities , including making the detailed information on results from calls for proposals available and accessible in a common Horizon 2020 e-database;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.12. Liaising with a broad range of stakeholders including research organisations and universities;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.13. Enabling synergy and cross fertilisation between the ITDs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D.4.Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES

NO

D.4.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake
(maximum 600 characters)

D.5. Do you think that the CS2 JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe in the aeronautics sector?

In the short term: over the next five years

In the medium term: over the next ten years

In the long term: over the next twenty years

No opinion

D.5.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer (maximum 600 characters)

D.6. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in a CS2 JU project?*

a: Strongly disagree

b: Disagree

c: Agree

d: Strongly agree

e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.6.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.2. Greater visibility across Europe/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.3. Greater understanding of the product development process	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.4. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				

- D.6.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and the industry
- D.6.6. Freedom to propose innovative approaches

D.7. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above
(maximum 600 characters)

- D.8. Do you consider that CS/ CS2 JU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?
 YES NO

D.8.1 If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind (maximum 600 characters)

- D.9. To what extent are the activities of the CS2 JU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?
 Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

- D.10. What is the relation of the CS2 JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes
 Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

- D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?
 YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (maximum 600 characters)

E. Efficiency

- E.1. If you have applied for funding from CS2 JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

- E. 2. If you have applied for funding from CS2 JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

- E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (maximum 600 characters)

- E.4. You consider that the CS2 JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

- Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other No opinion

types of research and
innovation actions in this area

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments? (*maximum 600 characters*)

'Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership' Joint Undertaking (ECSEL JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to ECSEL JU

The 'Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership' (ECSEL JU¹³), set up under Horizon 2020, is the merger of two pre-existing JUs under FP7, ENIAC and ARTEMIS, encompassing areas of embedded/cyber physical systems, nanoelectronics as well as smart systems. It is a **tri-partite Joint Undertaking** between the European Union, the ECSEL Participating States and the industrial associations AENEAS, ARTEMISIA and EPoSS. It is the only JU in which Member States financially contribute. It brings together various stakeholders in order to boost the development of a strong and globally competitive electronics components and systems industry in Europe and supporting electronics applications, from healthcare and personal safety to entertainment and safer transport. ECSEL JU has the objective of ensuring the availability of electronic components and systems for key markets and for addressing societal challenges.

ECSEL JU supports a collaborative, industrially-relevant Research, Development and Innovation programme, as is identified in the multi-annual strategic plan, which develops the essential capabilities and provides the “Smarts” behind the applications that can help address societal challenges (mobility, energy, health, society & production). Ultimately the ECSEL JU will strengthen European global competitiveness, both of its electronics industries and of industries that rely upon electronics, to further their innovation potential.

ECSEL JU¹⁴ will run from June 2014 for 10 years and it will have a total budget of some €5 billion, split as follows:

- Up to € 1.184 billion from the EU’s Horizon 2020 programme, to cover administrative and operational costs
- At least €1.170 billion from Participating States that is commensurate with the Union’s financial contribution
- And the remainder from the beneficiaries

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia
- Other (if "Other", please specify)

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Automotive
- Electronics
- Semiconductors
- Systems
- Energy

¹³ Council Regulation (EU) No 561/2014 of 6 May 2014 establishing the ECSEL Joint Undertaking.

¹⁴ For more information about ECSEL, please visit: <http://www.ecsel-ju.eu>

sets out a minimum 'high' leverage effect throughout its lifespan – for every 1€ the EU spends, the ECSEL Participating States collectively spend at least 1€ as well and the industrial partners are contributing at least €1.4, resulting in a leverage effect of at least 2.4 (tri-partite funding model). Please note that AENEAS, ARTEMISIA and EPOSS industrial associations do not directly receive any EU funding and do not participate in ECSEL JU projects.

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 2.4¹⁵ is:

Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why? (*maximum 600 characters*)

B.6. Do you consider that ECSEL JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the ECSEL JU website provides the general public and potential participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
C.1.1. The ECSEL JU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The ECSEL JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The ECSEL JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				

C2. Do you consider that the ECSEL JU encourages the participation of SMEs?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.3. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive¹⁶?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.3.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.4. If you have applied for funding from ECSEL JU, do you believe that ECSEL JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial impact? (*this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES"*)

¹⁵ In assessing the overall impact of ECSEL, investments from all legal entities other than the Union and the states participating in ECSEL are expected to amount to at least EUR 2 340 000 000 – this results in a leverage effect of 3.

¹⁶ <http://www.ecsel-ju.eu/web/events/ESF2016.php>

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4.1. If you have applied for funding from ECSEL JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results (*maximum 600 characters*)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The scientific priorities addressed by the ECSEL JU are set in the Multi Annual Strategic Plan (MASP)¹⁷ and are aligned with the "Digitisation of European Industry"¹⁸. Is this framework optimal for defining the Scientific Research and Innovation Agenda followed by the ECSEL JU?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. Do you consider other scientific areas not mentioned in MASP as important to be addressed?

YES NO

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other research and innovation areas not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.3. In your view how effective has ECSEL JU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective b: Somewhat effective c: Very effective d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.3.1. Contributing to the development of a strong and globally competitive electronic components and systems industry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Strengthening innovation capabilities and creating economic and employment growth in the Union	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Aligning strategies with Member States to attract private investment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4. Maintaining and growing semiconductor and smart system manufacturing capability in Europe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.5. Securing and strengthening a commanding position in design and systems engineering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.6. Providing access for all stakeholders to a world-class infrastructure for design and manufacturing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.7. Building a dynamic ecosystem involving Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs), strengthening existing clusters and creating new clusters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D.4. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES NO

D.4.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.5. Do you think that the ECSEL JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness, industrial leadership, economic growth and job creation of Europe in the electronic components and systems sector?*

In the short term: over the In the medium term: over In the long term: over the next No opinion

¹⁷ http://www.ecsel-ju.eu/web/downloads/documents/ecsel_gb_2015_46_-_masp_2016.pdf

¹⁸ <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/digitising-european-industry>

next five years

the next ten years

twenty years

D.5.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.6. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in an ECSEL JU project?

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.6.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.2. Greater visibility across Europe /Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.3. Stronger involvement in existing or new clusters in promising new areas	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.4. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and industry	<input type="checkbox"/>				

D.7. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.8. Do you consider that ECSEL JU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?

YES NO

D.8.1. If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.9. To what extent are the activities of the ECSEL JU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.10. What is the relation of the ECSEL JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (*maximum 600 characters*)

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the ECSEL JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.2. If you have applied for funding from the ECSEL JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (*maximum 600 characters*)

E.4. You consider that the ECSEL JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

Public stakeholder consultation in the context of the interim evaluation of the 'Fuel Cells and Hydrogen' Joint Undertaking (FCH 2 JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to FCH JU and FCH 2 JU

The Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCH JU) under FP7, and its successor FCH 2 JU under Horizon 2020, is Europe's leading public-private partnership in the field of fuel cell and hydrogen technologies. It is a Joint Undertaking between the European Union, the Industry Grouping Hydrogen Europe, and the Research Grouping N.ERGHY¹⁹. As such, it brings together industrial partners from both transport and energy sectors, innovative SME's, universities and research establishments. It was initially set up with the intention of accelerating the development and deployment of fuel cell and hydrogen technologies, and has in its second phase put more emphasis on demonstration, innovation and activities to support to activities on market introduction.

The FCH 2 JU covers activities in transport (mainly fuel cell electric vehicles and refuelling infrastructure) and the energy sector (production of hydrogen from renewable energy sources, highly efficient generation of electricity and heat through fuel cells, and storage of hydrogen as energy carrier), as well as cross-cutting topics focusing on education, regulations, codes and standards, and safety.

The FCH 2 JU will run from 2014 to the end of 2024, and will have an EU contribution of € 665 Million, out of which € 95 Million conditional on contributions of Members other than the EU reaching at least €380 Million.

The contributions from Members other than the EU consist of the following:

- A cash contribution of up to € 19 Million to cover 50% of the JU's administrative expenditure
- In-kind contributions via participation in projects funded by the FCH2 JU
- In-kind contributions via additional activities for at least € 285 Million

The additional activities referred to in the last point consist of costs incurred by the Members outside of the FCH 2 JU, but contributing to the objectives of the FCH 2 Joint Technology Initiative.

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia

Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Vehicles and related components
- Hydrogen refueling infrastructure
- Fuel cells and components
- Hydrogen production
- Energy production and distribution
- Energy storage

¹⁹ N. ERGHY is an association representing the interests of European universities and research institutes in the FCH2 JU.

Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)

YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCH 2 JU)? *

Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied for funding from the FCH 2 JU? *

YES NO

A.9. Are you directly involved with the FCH 2JU, as*:

Member of Hydrogen Europe/N. ERGHY YES NO

Beneficiary of FCH 2 JU YES NO

Evaluator YES NO

Advisory board member YES NO

Other (e.g. evaluator, advisory board member) YES NO

If, "Other", please specify:

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could industry along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, be able to overcome the barriers which hinder the market introduction and deployment of fuel cells and hydrogen technologies?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that fuel cells and hydrogen technologies can be introduced into the market and deployed?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

a: Not important at all b: Not important c: Important d: Very important e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. Attraction of best players in the sector	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. Better coordination of European research efforts, overcoming fragmentation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross border collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. More cross-sector/interdisciplinary/multi-stakeholder collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.6. Quicker adoption of standards	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.7. Increased synergy with sources of funding outside FCH 2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.8. Better availability of research results and cross-fertilisation of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.9. Help in overcoming first mover risk	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.10. Greater scale of collaborations and activities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.11. Faster introduction on the market	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant
(maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU other than the EU and the EU contribution. The Council Regulation establishing FCH 2 JU sets out the minimum leverage effect throughout its lifespan to 0.57 (i.e. for each euro of public money the EU contributes, the other members have to contribute at least with €0.57). This leverage is achieved through participation in projects, as well as through investments in Additional Activities that contribute to the goals of the FCH 2 JU but take place outside its work plan.

It should be noted that only contributions by the members (and their constituent entities) can be counted as leverage, which represents around 25% of the participation in projects.

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 0.57 is:

Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why? (maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that the FCH 2 JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the FCH 2 JU website provides the general public and potential participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

	a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion
	a	B	c	d	e
C.1.1. The FCH 2 JU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The FCH 2 JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The FCH 2 JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.4. The FCH 2 JU website provides easy and effective access to knowledge generated by the projects funded under this JU	<input type="checkbox"/>				

C2. Do you consider that the FCH 2 JU encourages the participation of SMEs?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.3. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive²⁰?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.3.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.4. If you have applied for funding from the FCH 2 JU, do you consider that the FCH 2 JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4.1. If you have applied for funding from the FCH 2 JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results of the FCH2 JU? (*maximum 600 characters*)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The priorities addressed by the FCH 2 JU are set in the Multi-Annual Work Plan (MAWP)²¹. Do you think this document is relevant and coherent with European transport and energy policies and priorities?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. Do you consider are other scientific areas not mentioned in the MAWP as important to be addressed by the FCH2 JU?

YES NO

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other research and innovation areas not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.3. In your view how effective has the FCH 2 JU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective b: Somewhat effective c: Very effective d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.3.1. Developing a strong, sustainable and globally competitive fuel cells and hydrogen sector in the EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Reducing the production cost of FC systems to be used in transport applications, while increasing their lifetime to levels which can compete with conventional technologies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Increasing the electrical efficiency and durability of FC for power production to levels competitive with conventional technologies, while reducing costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4. Increasing the energy efficiency of production of hydrogen mainly from water electrolysis and renewable sources while reducing operating and capital costs, so that the combined system of the hydrogen production and the conversion using the fuel cell system can compete with the alternatives for electricity production available on the market	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.5. Demonstrating on a large scale the feasibility of using hydrogen to support integration of renewable energy sources into the energy systems, including through its use as a competitive energy storage medium for electricity produced from renewable energy sources;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.6. Reducing the use of Critical raw materials, for instance through low-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

²¹ <http://www.fch.europa.eu/page/multi-annual-work-plan>

platinum or platinum-free resources and through recycling or reducing or avoiding the use of rare earth elements

D.4. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES NO

D.4.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake (maximum 600 characters)

D.5. Do you think that the FCH 2 JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe in the transport and energy sector?*

In the short term: over the next five years In the medium term: over the next ten years In the long term: over the next twenty years No opinion

D.5.1. Please, provide a reason for your answer (maximum 600 characters)

D.6. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in a FCH 2 JU project?

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.6.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.2. Greater visibility across Europe for your entity/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.3. Enhanced access to knowledge and technologies	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.4. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and the industry	<input type="checkbox"/>				

D.7. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above? (maximum 600 characters)

D.8. Do you consider that FCH 2 JU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?

YES NO

D.8.1. If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind (maximum 600 characters)

D.9. To what extent are the activities of the FCH 2 JU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

D.10. What is the relation of the FCH 2 JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (*maximum 600 characters*)

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the FCH 2 JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E. 2. If you have applied for funding from the FCH 2 JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (*maximum 600 characters*)

E.4. You consider that the FCH 2 JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments? (*maximum 600 characters*)

'Innovative Medicines Initiative' Joint Undertaking (IMI 2 JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to IMI JU and IMI 2 JU

The Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI JU) under FP7 and its successor under Horizon 2020, IMI 2 JU²², is Europe's largest public-private initiative aiming to speed up the development of better and safer medicines for patients. It is a Joint Undertaking between the European Union and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA). It brings together companies, universities, public laboratories, innovative SMEs, patient groups and regulators in order to boost pharmaceutical innovation in Europe. IMI 2 JU has specifically the objective of significantly improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the drug development process with the long-term aim that the pharmaceutical sector produces more effective and safer innovative medicines.

IMI2 JU covers all areas of life science research and innovation of public health interest, as identified by the World Health Organisation report on "Priority Medicines for Europe and the World"²³, which has been updated in 2013. The initiative should constantly seek to involve a broader range of partners from pharmaceuticals to sectors such as biomedical imaging, medical information technology, diagnostics and animal health industries.

IMI 2 JU²⁴ will run from 2014 to the end of 2024 and it will have a total budget of up to €3.276 billion, split as follows:

- Up to € 1.425 billion from the EU's Horizon 2020 programme, to match at least 1.425 billion from EFPIA and its constituent or affiliated entities
- Up to €213 million from the EU's Horizon 2020 programme, to match up to €213 million from other organisations that decide to join IMI2 as Associated Partners

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia
- Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Pharmaceuticals
- Vaccines
- Biotechnology
- Diagnostics
- Biomedical imaging
- Medical information technologies
- Animal health
- Other (if "Other", please specify):

²² Council Regulation (EU) No 557/2014 of 6 May 2014 establishing the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking.

²³ www.who.int/medicines/areas/priority_medicines/MasterDocJune28_FINAL_Web.pdf

²⁴ For more information about IMI2JU, please visit: <https://www.imi.europa.eu/>

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)

YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking (IMI2 JU)? *

Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied for funding from IMI2 JU? *

YES NO

A.9. Are you directly involved with the IMI2 JU, as*:

Member of EFPIA	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Associated partner of IMI2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Beneficiary of IMI2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Evaluator	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Advisory board member	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

If, "Other", please specify:

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could the pharmaceutical industries along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, be able to overcome the barriers which hinder innovation and drive up costs in the life science sector?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that the life science research brings better results to the patients and the market in Europe?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

a: Not important at all b: Not important c: important d: Very important e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. Integration of European research	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. Greater scale of collaborations and activities	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross border collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. More cross-sector/interdisciplinary collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.6. Quicker adoption of standards	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.7. Faster delivery of benefits for the patients	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.8. Allowing leverage of external pools of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.9. Better availability of research results	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.10. Encouragement of companies to share expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant (maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU other than the EU and the EU contribution. The Council Regulation establishing IMI2 JU sets out the minimum leverage effect throughout its lifespan to 1 (i.e. for each euro of public money the EU contributes, the industrial partners have to contribute at least with €1). Please note that EFPIA itself, EFPIA companies and IMI2 JU Associated Partners do not receive any EU funding for participating in IMI2 JU projects. EU funding goes to Universities, SMEs, mid-sized companies, patient groups, etc.

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 1 is:

Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why?
(maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that IMI2 JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the IMI2 JU website provides the general public and potential new members and participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
C.1.1. The IMI2 JU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The IMI2 JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The IMI2 JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.4. The IMI2 JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations in order to facilitate them in becoming Associated Partners in IMI2 JU	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.5. The IMI2 JU website provides easy and effective access to knowledge generated by the projects funded under this JU	<input type="checkbox"/>				

C2. Do you consider that the IMI2 JU encourages the participation of SMEs?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.3. Do you consider that the process for engaging with Associated Partners of IMI2 JU is sufficiently open, non-discriminatory and competitive?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive²⁵?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.5. If you have applied for funding from IMI2 JU, do you consider that IMI2 JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5.1. If you have applied for funding from IMI2 JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results of IMI2 JU? (*maximum 600 characters*)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The scientific priorities addressed by the IMI2 JU are set in the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA)²⁶ and are aligned with the 2013 update of the World Health Organisation's "Priority Medicines for Europe and the World" report³⁹.

Do you think that this framework is the most appropriate for defining the Scientific Research Agenda followed by the IMI2 JU?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. Do you consider other research and innovation areas not mentioned in the SRA as important to be addressed?

YES NO

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other research and innovation areas not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.3. In your view how effective has IMI2 JU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective b: Somewhat effective c: Very effective d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.3.1. Supporting the development and implementation of pre-competitive research and of innovation activities of strategic importance to the Unions in the life science sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.2. Increasing the success rate in clinical trials of priority medicines identified by the World Health Organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.3. Reducing the time to reach clinical proof of concept in medicine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.4. Developing new therapies for diseases for which there is a high unmet need and limited incentives to bring to market ²⁷	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.5. Developing diagnostic and treatment biomarkers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.3.6. Reducing the failure rate of potential new vaccines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

²⁵ <http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/how-imi-works>

²⁶ <http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/research-agenda>

²⁷ Such as Alzheimer's disease and antimicrobial resistance.

D.3.7. Improving the drug development process

D.3.8. Contributing to personalised medicine

D.4. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?
 YES NO

D.4.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake
(maximum 600 characters)

D.5. Do you think that the IMI 2 JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe in the life science sector?

In the short term: over the next five years In the medium term: over the next ten years In the long term: over the next twenty years No opinion

D.5.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.6. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in an IMI2 JU project?

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.6.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.2. Greater visibility across Europe/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.3. Greater understanding of the drug development process	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.4. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.6.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and the industry	<input type="checkbox"/>				

D.7. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.8. Do you consider that IMI2 JU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?

YES NO

D.8.1. If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.9. To what extent are the activities of the IMI2 JU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.10. What is the relation of the IMI2 JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (*maximum 600 characters*)

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the IMI2 JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.2. If you have applied for funding from the IMI2 JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (*maximum 600 characters*)

E.4. You consider that the IMI2 JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments? (*maximum 600 characters*)

'SESAR' Joint Undertaking (SJU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to the SESAR Joint Undertaking

The SESAR project is an initiative of the EU to modernise and harmonise Air Traffic Management (ATM) in Europe. It is the technological pillar of the EU's broader Single European Sky initiative aiming to reform and improve the performance of ATM in Europe through a holistic approach affecting all aspects and actors of ATM.

Established in 2007 as a Public Private Partnership²⁸, the SESAR Joint Undertaking (SJU) is responsible for managing the activities of the research and development phase of the SESAR project. Its main objective is to coordinate and concentrate all ATM related research and innovation efforts in the EU.

Founded by the EU and Eurocontrol (European organisation for the safety of air navigation), the SJU is composed of industry members who together with their partners and affiliate associations represent over 100 organisations from across the aviation community, from civil and military air navigation service providers, to airports, civil and military airspace users, staff associations, academia and research centres.

The SJU has been entrusted with the management of EU funds allocated to the SESAR development phase since 2007. The SJU was initially established for eight years, in the FP7 and TEN-T frameworks, from 2007 to the end of 2016 under the EU's 2007-2013 multi-annual financial perspectives. In 2014, the Council amended the SJU's founding Regulation to extend its duration to 31 December 2024 in the framework of Horizon 2020.

The total budget of the SJU is composed of:

- EUR 2.1 billion for the SJU's 2007-2016 work programme (SESAR 1), which includes an EU contribution of EUR 350 million from FP7 and EUR 350 million from TEN-T under the 2007-2013 financial perspectives;
- EUR 1.6 billion for the 2014-2024 work programme (SESAR 2020), which includes an EU contribution of EUR 585 million from Horizon 2020 under the EU's 2014-2020 multi-annual financial framework.

The SJU has established a research 'pipeline to innovation' in SESAR 2020, comprising three distinct threads of activities aiming to develop and validate innovative ATM concepts: Exploratory research; Industrial research; and Very Large Scale Demonstrations.

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia
- Other (If "Other", please specify)

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Air Navigation Service Provider
- Airport
- Civil Airspace User

²⁸ Council Regulation (EC) No 219/2007 of 27 February 2007

- Manufacturing industry
- Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)

- YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the SJU? *

- Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied for funding from SJU? *

- YES NO

A.9. Are you directly involved with the SJU, as*:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Industry member | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Beneficiary of SJU | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Evaluator | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Advisory board member | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
| Other (if, "Other", please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> YES | <input type="checkbox"/> NO |

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could the ATM industry along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, develop innovative and interoperable solutions in order to modernise and harmonise the European ATM system?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that the ATM research brings better results to all ATM stakeholders in Europe?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

	a: Not important at all	b: Not important	c: Important	d: Very important	e: No opinion
	a	b	c	d	e
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. Integration of European research	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. More cross border cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross-sector/interdisciplinary/multi-stakeholder cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. Quicker adoption of standards	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.6. Knowledge pooling and sharing	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.7. Better access to research results	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.8. Incentives for companies to share expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.9. Better support of the Union policies	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.10. Facilitation of industrialization and deployment process	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.11. Research risk sharing and mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.12. Improved cooperation with 3rd countries	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.13. Better market access	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant
(maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU other than the EU and the EU contribution. For the SJU there are no specific minimum expected leverage, but currently, for the activities foreseen under Horizon 2020, the ratio stands at 1.41 (825M EUR invested by Members against a 500M EUR EU contribution).

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 1.41 is:

- Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect, and why? (maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that SJU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the SJU website provides the general public and potential participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

	a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion
	a	B	c	d	e
C.1.1. The SJU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The SJU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The SJU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.4. The CS2 JU website provides easy and effective access to knowledge generated by the projects funded under this JU	<input type="checkbox"/>				

C2. Do you consider that the SJU encourages the participation of SMEs?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.3. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive?²⁹

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.3.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C.4. Do you consider that the budget split between members' activities (max. 70% of EU funding to the SJU) and non-members activities (min. 30% of EU funding to the SJU) is appropriate to ensure a wide participation of the sector at large?

²⁹ <http://www.sesarju.eu/discover-sesar/roadmap-towards-atm-modernisation>

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5. If you have applied for funding from SJU, do you consider that SJU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.5.1. If you have applied for funding from SJU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results *(maximum 600 characters)*

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The research and development agenda of the SJU is set out in the European ATM Master Plan following a comprehensive planning exercise carried out in cooperation with the European Commission, Member States, various aviation stakeholders and SJU Members.

Do you think that this framework is the most appropriate for defining the European Research & Innovation agenda for ATM?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

D.2. In your view how effective has SJU been in terms of:

a: Not at all effective b: Somewhat effective c: Very effective d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.2.1. Supporting the development of ATM solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.2. Accelerating ATM research	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.3. Validating SESAR solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.4. Supporting the transition to standardisation and industrialisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.5. Resolving existing technical limitations (e.g. inter-operability problems)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.6. Mitigating risks linked to innovation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.7. Aligning ATM Research to the Single European Sky policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.2.8. Transitioning from FP7 to Horizon 2020 environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D.3. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES NO

D.3.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.4. Do you think that the SJU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe in the ATM sector?

In the short term: over the next five years In the medium term: over the next ten years In the long term: over the next twenty years No opinion

D.4.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.5. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in a SESAR JU project?

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.5.1. Financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.5.2. Greater visibility across Europe/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				

- D.5.3. Enhanced access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources
- D.5.4. Inclusion in open innovation networks, with direct contact to leading researchers in universities and the industry

D.6. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above? *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.7. Do you consider that SJU projects have resulted in specific scientific and/or technological successes?
 YES NO

D.8.1. If yes, please use this space to write which ones you have specifically in mind *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.9. To what extent are the activities of the SJU coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.9.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.10. What is the relation of the SJU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion *(maximum 600 characters)*

D.11. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

YES NO

D.11.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems *(maximum 600 characters)*

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the SJU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.2. If yes, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure *(maximum 600 characters)*

E.4. You consider that the SJU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

- Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

'Shift2Rail' Joint Undertaking (S2R JU)

JU-specific questions

Introduction to the Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking

The Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking (S2R JU) is a new public private partnership in the rail sector, providing a platform for cooperation that will drive rail innovation as part of the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme³⁰. The S2R JU pursues research and innovation activities in support of the achievement of the Single European Railway Area and with a view to improve the attractiveness and competitiveness of the European rail system. In particular, it is expected to contribute to cutting the life-cycle cost of railway transport (i.e. costs of building, operating, maintaining and renewing infrastructure and rolling stock) by as much as 50%, doubling railway capacity and increasing reliability and punctuality by as much as 50%.

The Shift2Rail activities are organised around five key "Innovation Programmes": cost-efficient and reliable trains, including high speed trains and high-capacity trains; advanced traffic management & control systems; cost-efficient and reliable high capacity infrastructure; IT solutions for attractive railway services; technologies for sustainable & attractive European freight. Some key trends (e.g. socio-economics, energy and sustainability, human capital, etc.) are addressed horizontally through the Cross Cutting Activities. The Joint Undertaking's strategic priorities are summarised in the Shift2Rail Master Plan³¹ adopted by the Governing Board of the S2R JU following endorsement by the Council. These objectives are further detailed in the Shift2Rail Multi-Annual Action Plan³².

The S2R JU³³ will run from 2014 to the end of 2024 and it will have a total budget of €970 million, split as follows:

- Up to €450 million from the EU's Horizon 2020 programme, allocated as follows: up to €315 million to match the contribution of the JU industrial partners and a minimum of €135 million dedicated to fully open calls, in which the JU members do not participate
- A minimum of €470 million from the Shift2Rail private members (Founding Members other than the Union and Associated Members)

A.5. What type of organisation do you represent? *

Please select one of the following:

- Private for profit organisation, excluding education (PRC)
- Member State administration
- Regional/local administration
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Research organisation
- Academia
- Other (if "Other", please specify)

A.5.1. If PRC, in the sector of*:

- Railway Undertaking
- Infrastructure Manager
- Supply Industry
- Research

³⁰ Council Regulation (EU) No 642/2014 of 16 June 2014 establishing the Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking

³¹ <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/sites/transport/files/modes/rail/doc/2015-03-31-decisionn4-2015-adoption-s2r-masterplan.pdf>

³² http://shift2rail.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/S2R-JU-GB_Decision-N-15-2015-MAAP.pdf

³³ For more information about the S2R JU, please visit: <http://shift2rail.org/>

Other (if "Other", please specify):

A.6. Are you a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME)

YES NO

A.7. Are you familiar with the objectives and activities of the Shift2Rail Joint Undertaking (S2R JU)? *

Not at all familiar Slightly familiar Moderately familiar Very familiar

A.8. Have you applied for associated membership (call for associated members) in the S2R JU?

YES NO

A.9. Have you applied for funding from the S2R JU? *

YES NO

A.10. Are you directly involved with the S2R JU, as*:

Founding Member of S2R JU	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Associated Member of S2R JU	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Beneficiary of S2R JU	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Evaluator	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Advisory board member	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Other (f, "Other", please specify:)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO

B. European added value

B.1. In your view, could the industry along with other possible actors at national level but without the involvement of the EU, be able to overcome the barriers which hinder innovation in the rail sector?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.2. Do you agree with the EU cooperating with industry in the context of a public-private partnership so that rail-related research brings better results to overcome the challenges of the rail sector in Europe and to develop the Single European Railway Area?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.3. If you agree with the EU cooperating with industry, what is the added value of this public-private partnership?

Please rate element(s) of European added value that you consider relevant.

a: Not important at all b: Not important c: Important d: Very important e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
B.3.1. Better use of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.2. Integration of European research	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.3. More cross border collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.4. More cross-sector/interdisciplinary collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.5. Quicker adoption of standards and enhanced market-uptake	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.6. Allowing leverage of external pools of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.7. Better availability of research results	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.3.8. Encouragement of companies to collaborate and share expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.4. Please provide here any other elements of European added value you consider to be relevant
(maximum 600 characters)

B.5. "Leverage effect" is defined as the ratio between the total contributions provided by the members of the JU other than the EU and the EU contribution. The Council Regulation establishing S2R JU sets

out the minimum leverage effect throughout its lifespan to 1.04 (i.e. for each euro of public money the EU contributes, the industrial partners have to contribute at least with €1.04). Please note that this leverage ratio is limited to the calls organized by the S2R JU to its private members (CFM).

The current minimum leverage effect foreseen of 1.04³⁴ is:

- Too low Realistic Too high No opinion

B.5.1. In your opinion what would be the satisfactory leverage effect , and why? (maximum 600 characters)

B.6. Do you consider that the S2R JU contributes to economic growth and job creation in the EU?

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

B.6.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

B.7. Do you consider that the S2R JU contributes to the following priorities:

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

	a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion
	a	b	c	d	e
B.7.1. Achieve the Single European Railway Area and increase interoperability	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.7.2. Enhance the attractiveness and competitiveness of the European railway system to ensure a modal shift towards rail as a low-emission mode of transport	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.7.3. Help the European rail industry to retain and consolidate its leadership on the global market for rail products and services	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.7.4. Boost economic growth and jobs in the rail sector at large	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.7.5. Support the rail sector in meeting the key challenges it faces (quality of service, cost reductions, emerging trends such as digitalization, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
B.7.6. Support the rail sector in meeting the key challenges it faces (quality of service, cost reductions, emerging trends such as digitalization, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>				

B.8. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (maximum 600 characters)

C. Openness - Transparency

C.1. Do you consider that the S2R JU website provides the general public and potential participants with easy access to information?

Please provide your view to the following aspects:

	a: Strongly disagree	b: Disagree	c: Agree	d: Strongly agree	e: No opinion
	a	b	c	d	e
C.1.1. The S2R JU website provides easy and effective access to information to the public	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.2. The S2R JU website provides easily accessible and sufficient information about its funded projects	<input type="checkbox"/>				
C.1.3. The S2R JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations facilitating their participation in proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>				

³⁴ This figure is based on the ratio between the entire EU contribution to the S2R JU and the contribution of the JU private members. However, only a maximum of 70% of the EU contribution is to be targeted to the JU private members in accordance with the S2R Regulation. This mean that in practice, the effective leverage effect of the EU budget spent with the JU members reaches 1.49.

C.1.4. The S2R JU website provides effective access to information and sufficient guidance to interested organisations in order to facilitate them in becoming Associated Partners in S2R JU

C2. Do you consider that the S2R JU encourages the participation of SMEs?
 Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.2.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.3. Do you consider that the process for selecting the S2R Associated Members is sufficiently open, non-discriminatory and competitive?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4. Do you consider that the current way of defining topics for the calls of proposals is open and inclusive³⁵?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.4.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

C.5. Do you consider that the budget split between members' activities (max. 70% of EU funding to the S2R JU) and non-members activities (min. 30% of EU funding to the S2R JU) is appropriate to ensure a wide participation of the sector at large?

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6. If you have applied for funding from the S2R JU, do you consider that the S2R JU organises a sound and fair proposal evaluation system based on both scientific and technological excellence and industrial relevance?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.6.1. If you have applied for funding from Shift2Rail JU, do you consider that the communication of the evaluation results and the feedback provided to the applicants is effective and meaningful?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

C.7. Please use this space to write your comments on the evaluation of proposals and the communication of the evaluation results of the S2R JU? (*maximum 600 characters*)

D. Relevance – Coherence - Effectiveness

D.1. The scientific priorities addressed by the S2R JU are set in the S2R Master Plan³⁶ and the S2R Multi-Annual Action Plan³⁷ in order to answer to the challenges identified and contribute to meeting the S2R high level objectives. On an annual basis, these priorities are translated into more detailed and concrete calls for proposals (in the relevant Annual Work Plan). Is this framework optimal for defining the research & innovation activities undertaken by the S2R JU?*

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

³⁵ <http://shift2rail.org/participate/call-for-proposals/>

³⁶ <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/sites/transport/files/modes/rail/doc/2015-03-31-decisionn4-2015-adoption-s2r-masterplan.pdf>

³⁷ http://shift2rail.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/S2R-JU-GB_Decision-N-15-2015-MAAP.pdf

D.2. Do you consider other scientific areas not mentioned in the S2R Master Plan and the S2R Multi-Annual Action Plan as important to be addressed?

YES NO

D.2.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other research and innovation areas not currently addressed (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.3. Do you consider that the management of all EU funded rail-related research and innovation topics as part of the S2R JU is beneficial to increase the coherence of the activities and ensure higher delivery of results? (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.4. If necessary, how could the rail R&I framework be optimised to improve its effectiveness? (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.5. As the S2R JU is new, its activities are still in the early phase of development (first projects started in September 2016). Projecting on the level of ambitions and the possible progress of the JU, how effective could it be, in your view in terms of:

a: Not at all effective

b: Somewhat effective

c: Very effective

d: No opinion

	a	b	c	d
D.5.1. Supporting the development and implementation of pre-competitive research and of innovation activities of strategic importance to the Union in the rail sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.2. Increasing the success rate of demonstration projects through the direct cooperation of all actors of the supply chain (industry and operators) and facilitating the market uptake of technical solution.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.3. Improving the attractiveness of rail services through innovative solutions and adapt them to the constantly and rapidly evolving quality expectations of users (reliability and customer experience).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.4. Enhancing the capacity of the EU railway market, in particular through improved capacity management.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.5. Reducing the capital and investment costs of new rolling stock, infrastructure or technical solutions (including renewal and/or upgrade of existing assets)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.6. Reducing the operational costs of rail solutions (including long-term maintenance and energy consumption)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.7. Reducing the environmental impacts of rail transport (externalities such as noise, vibrations, emissions and other environmental impacts)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.8. Enhancing interoperability of the rail sector (removing technical obstacles, closing open points, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D.5.9. Simplifying business processes and reducing the development and productions costs of innovative technologies for rail (in particular in developing, certifying and authorising new systems).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D.6. Should the JU undertake any other tasks in order to achieve the objectives set out in the Regulation?

YES NO

D.6.1. If yes, please use this space to write your ideas about other tasks that the JU should undertake (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.7. Do you think that the S2R JU can contribute towards improving the competitiveness and industrial leadership of Europe for rail products and services?

- In the short term: over the next five years In the medium term: over the next ten years In the long term: over the next twenty years No opinion

D.7.1. Please use this space to provide a reason for your answer (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.8. Which would you consider as major benefits of participating in a S2R JU project?

a: Strongly disagree b: Disagree c: Agree d: Strongly agree e: No opinion

	a	b	c	d	e
D.8.1. Direct financial support for innovative research and development	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.8.2. Greater visibility across Europe/Reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.8.3. Greater understanding of the product development process	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.8.4. Enhanced cooperation with customers (RUs / IMs), access to new markets, business opportunities and funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
D.8.5. Inclusion in open innovation networks, and cooperation with leading universities and the main industry players	<input type="checkbox"/>				

D.9. Please use this space to write about other benefits not mentioned above (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.10. To what extent are the activities of the S2R coherent with other activities of the Horizon 2020 programme?

- Not at all coherent Somewhat coherent Very coherent No opinion

D.10.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.11. What is the relation of the BBI JU with other Union funding programmes and/or with similar international, national or intergovernmental programmes

- Complementarity Synergies Potential overlaps No opinion

D.11.1. Please use this space to justify your opinion (*maximum 600 characters*)

D.12. Do you have any experience in combining different sources of EU funds and/or with national funds for research and over the innovation value chain?

- YES NO

D.12.1. If yes, please use this space to share your experience in highlighting the advantages or explaining the encountered problems (*maximum 600 characters*)

E. Efficiency

E.1. If you have applied for funding from the S2R JU, do you think that the application procedure was straightforward and simple?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

- Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.2. If you have applied for funding from the S2R JU, was the administrative burden for preparing the proposal within acceptable limits?

(this question will appear only in case the response to question A.8. is "YES")

Strongly disagree Disagree Agree Strongly agree No opinion

E.3. Can you make any suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure?

YES NO

E.3.1. If yes, please use this space to provide your suggestions for improvements or simplifications to the application procedure (*maximum 600 characters*)

E.4. You consider that the S2R JU overall budget (public and private) in relation to its objectives and expected outcomes is:

Too low and therefore it should be increased Appropriate Too high and therefore it should be partly used for other types of research and innovation actions in this area No opinion

E.5. Please use this space to provide your comments (*maximum 600 characters*)

F. Overall

F.1. Please provide here any further comments (*maximum 600 characters*)