

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

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

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

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

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

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

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

Section A - About you

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

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

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

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

Please select one of the following:

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

***2. You are from**

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

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

***3. Information about respondents**

First name:

* Last name:

* Email address:

* Organisation:

The Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs

* 3.1 Is your organisation included in the Transparency Register?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

*** 4. Your contribution**

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

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

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

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

If Yes, in which function?

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

Section B

7. EU Added value

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

between 8 and 8 answered rows































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

8. Relevance

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

between 15 and 15 answered rows

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

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

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

- ☒ High
- ☐ Low
- ☐ Don't know

9. Coherence

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



































between 4 and 4 answered rows

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

10. Effectiveness

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

between 7 and 7 answered rows

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
Contribute to scientific integration					
Contribute to managerial integration					
Contribute to financial integration					
Allow for easier cross-country cooperation than national programmes					
Allow for easier cross-country cooperation than Horizon 2020 programmes					
Allow for projects that could not be realised within national programmes					
Allow for projects that could not be realised under Horizon 2020					

11. Efficiency

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









































between 5 and 5 answered rows

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

12. Future recommendations

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

between 8 and 8 answered rows

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

13. Overall comments

Please provide any further comments you might have:

600 character(s) maximum

Art. 185-initiatives differ strongly w/r to thematic focus, objectives, governance, which makes it very difficult (and not necessarily desirable) to draw general conclusions. Added value of Art. 185 also includes alignment of national policies, stability and the development of networks. Initiatives rely heavily on MS-contributions for their success, therefore MS should remain in driver's seat. There is a need for better streamlining of existing instruments for joined programming (Art. 185, JPI, ERA-nets, etc.), thereby also looking for synergy with other initiatives (e.g. KIC's, JTI's, ESIF).

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

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

Section C - AAL2

Introduction to AAL2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Involvement through national funding agency.

Objectives

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

between 7 and 7 answered rows

	Fully	To a large extent	To a small extent	Not	No opinion
Accelerate the emergence and take-up of relevant, affordable and integrated innovative ICT-based solutions for active and healthy ageing at home, in the community, or at work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support the development of solutions that contribute to the independence and alleviation of a sense of social isolation of older adults, in such a way that the ICT component does not reduce human contact, but is complementary to it	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Maintain and further develop a critical mass of applied research, development and innovation at Union level in the areas of ICT-based products and services for active and healthy ageing					
Develop cost-effective, accessible and, where relevant, energy-efficient solutions, including establishing relevant interoperability standards and facilitating the localisation and adaptation of common solutions which are compatible with varying social preferences, socio-economic factors (including energy poverty, social inclusion), gender aspects, and regulatory aspects at national or regional level					
Establish a favourable environment for the participation of small and medium-sized enterprises					
Focus on market-oriented applied research and innovation and shall complement related longer-term research and large scale innovation activities envisaged under Horizon 2020, and other European and national initiatives such as joint programming initiatives and activities undertaken within the European Institute of Innovation and Technology and its relevant Knowledge and Innovation Communities					

Contribute to the implementation of the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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

600 character(s) maximum

The ageing society does not automatically provide for a market. AAL2 has shifted the approach to calls and projects to enhance the market orientation and the potential uptake by requesting thorough evaluations to create evidence of added value. Furthermore, AAL2 has implemented support actions and new instruments and engages in new collaborations to create impact (e.g. with EIT Health, COST, ECH Alliance).

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

There are very big differences in available budgets between countries (some are very low, only providing for one project). This complicates the ambition to create projects, having to be selective in funding.

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

1200 character(s) maximum

Very high added value compared to using only Member State contributions. AAL2 supports a common approach to a European challenge. Several Member States would probably not participate without the EU contribution. In H2020, at least in the social domain, projects are more isolated and follow-up is less evident, as there is little connection to national policy.

Relevance

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

1200 character(s) maximum

The relevance is very high because of the demographic change AAL2 is addressing. Very important in AAL2, compared to other programmes, is the involvement of end users (including secondary and tertiary). It is shifting to a more market oriented approach and more comprehensive evaluations of added value in real life over time, business cases for potential consumers, etc. This also provides for experiences and best practices for stimulating the uptake of AAL2 initiatives. The programme is constantly improving by using and evaluating new financial instruments to create better and faster impact. The commitment from the MS is important to stimulate follow up at national level, find solutions for barriers like national financing /reimbursement systems to stimulate uptake and create real impact.

* Coherence

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

MYBL has a broader agenda than ICT/technology as well as age range. It is very much research oriented.

EIT Health has a very strong focus on supporting startups and innovators. Some successful AAL results/spin-offs can be supported to go to market through accelerator programmes, etc. This is complementary to AAL, with the strong involvement of users to create useful solutions for primary, secondary and tertiary end users.

*** Effectiveness**

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

This depends very much on the perspective and indicators used. The budget leverage that is created in AAL is very high for countries (in AAL1 and AAL2). Successful outcomes in terms of AAL solutions on the market, will likely be higher in AAL2, because the shift in focus in the calls, the criteria and the support for projects (in NL leverage of 12x; € 15 mln leads to results (successes and failures) of €180 mln. in funded projects). This would not have been possible at national level. Management costs AAL relatively complicated and high, but worthwhile.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Although time-to-contract is too high, it reaches SMEs that want to understand the aspirations and needs of the 'silver market'. National entry and support is very important to them.

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

600 character(s) maximum

Cooperation with end users, insights in relation older adults - ICT, enriching network, international contacts, gaining knowledge about (differences in cultures, social/care systems etc.) and entrance to EU countries, international market opportunities, inspiration, support from different support actions etc.

*** European Added Value**

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Until now, in AAL2 it has been a bit high to adequate, to match national commitments plus benefits from support actions. AAL needs to (re)attract participating countries to match up to this budget.

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

600 character(s) maximum

The EU contribution to the AAL programme makes it attractive for countries to commit to AAL. Especially smaller countries would not have been able to create comparable impact with only national/regional funds and the markets are too small.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Strengths, weaknesses and the future

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

1200 character(s) maximum

Strengths: leverage of budgets, impact on national level (if actively pursued), collaboration with end users and other stakeholders, combination of expertises of NCP's/funding agencies from ICT/technology R&D, economic/market and user/social care perspective, support from NCP's for consortia to solve problems.

Weaknesses: different rules and criteria in different countries, very low financial commitments of some countries, very long time-to-contract in some countries, different levels of commitment to further develop the programme of NCP's in different countries.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

The scope on the contribution of ICT/technology based solutions should stay in the focus, but the target groups could be widened to include other groups with a relatively great distance to the use of ICT/technology based solutions (based on disabilities, socio-economic situation etc.); although AAL is already shifting to more market oriented solutions, validated by larger numbers of users, this could be further developed (including also secondary /tertiary users/payers as preparation for roll out).

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Including participating Member States. Without investment of private parties it is difficult to expect real commitment for commercialisation and uptake. The range of funding schemes should be limited to more market oriented like experimental development and further to market (100% funding for some partners creates incongruent motivation within consortia). EU participation is very important to create a a sense of 'common undertaking' as well as more budget. Links to EU pre-commercial procurement programmes could be enhanced.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

In the definitions of a future programme we should work on a more common objective and create more harmonisation in funding schemes, criteria etc. Some countries left AAL because they expected it to be a purely SME-oriented programme (e.g. Finland), while other countries participate with a research council perspective (with funding rates of 100%). With regard to criteria, liability-issues form a serious barrier for participation for some MS (e.g. Sweden).

C.20: Do you have any further comments?

1200 character(s) maximum

Section D - EUROSTARS2

Introduction to Eurostars2

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

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

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

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

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

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

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

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

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

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

Please specify:

100 character(s) maximum

Involvement through national enterprise agency.

Objectives

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

between 4 and 4 answered rows

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Supporting internationally oriented SMEs in developing new products and accessing new markets; facilitating cooperation between SMEs/startups and knowledge institutes across Europe; stimulating tech transfer.
The Netherlands strongly supports the possibilities the programme offers to internationally oriented start-ups/scale-ups.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Most, but not all products enter the market within two years. Due to the level of risk inherent to innovation/R&D, this is always difficult to assess. Nevertheless, Eurostars' support also for earlier stages in SMEs R&D-collaboration (including startups) is very valuable in the innovation ecosystem.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

The Dutch evaluation of Eurostars performed by Panteia in 2014 shows that 91% of the applicants to Eurostars whose application was rejected, did not execute or down scaled the project.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Just like in the SME-instrument and the rest of H2020, the level of participation varies from one country to another.

* Relevance

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

Eurostars is a valuable contribution to the innovation ecosystem. Especially the support to startups through this instrument has proven extremely valuable. Therefore, it could be valuable to increase the time for market introduction for Eurostars.

* Coherence

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

The cooperation with EEN is very valuable and could be extended. It would be good to involve Eurostars companies in coaching and investment/business readiness in programmes of H2020.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

There is a clear added value for Eurostars. The EU-contribution creates more volume, support and an incentive to deepen cooperation between states through Eurostars.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

It would be great to include the Eurostars participants in the various coaching- and investment/business-readiness programmes of H2020, such as phase 3 of the SME-instrument and Invest Horizon.

*** Effectiveness**

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

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

600 character(s) maximum

The Dutch evaluation of Eurostars states the following points as the most beneficial elements of Eurostars: access to valuable technological knowledge; widening of the application of technological products; valuable new partners for cooperation internationally; better quality of international consortia.

*** European Added Value**

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

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

600 character(s) maximum

Eurostars supports international cooperation through national programmes (pooling of resources). The EU contribution is an indispensable incentive for countries to cooperate through Eurostars, by covering part of the operational costs and the additional funding allowing more projects to be supported. The EU contribution creates the financial volume necessary to support enough businesses. The critical but constructive feedback of the EU keeps the programme lean, efficient and focused.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

*** Strengths, weaknesses and the future**

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

600 character(s) maximum

Strengths: high level of cooperation and harmonisation between countries.
Weaknesses: in some countries there is too little financial and political commitment.

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

600 character(s) maximum

There is a need to increase the level of participation of some inactive EU Member States.

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

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

Comments

600 character(s) maximum

D.21: Do you have any further comments?

1200 character(s) maximum

Contact

RTD-185-EVALUATION@ec.europa.eu
