

Data of the Respondent

1. Name
2. Organisation
3. Department
4. Position of respondent in their organisation
5. Position of respondent in the ERA-NET Cofund project
(options: coordinator, partner, WP leader, Task leader)
6. Years of experience in participating in ERA-NETs, ERA-NET Plus, ERA-NET Cofund projects

(options: 0-3; 3-6, >6 yrs)

A. Proposal and grant preparation

1. To the best of your knowledge how would you assess the quality of support provided for the preparation and implementation of ERA-NET Cofund proposals in terms of...?

(1 – Very dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, 4 – Satisfied, 5 – Very satisfied, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. support from the Joint Programming Team of DG RTD
- b. Support from the thematic Commission services
- c. Support from the ERA-LEARN 2020 project

2. To the best of your knowledge how would you assess the quality of advice/guidance in relation to the following?

(1 – Very dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, 4 – Satisfied, 5 – Very satisfied, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. operational aspects
- b. financial aspects
- c. administrative aspects
- d. technical content of proposal
- e. setting up the consortium agreement
- f. preparation of the grant agreement
- g. increasing the geographical scope of the networks

3. To the best of your knowledge how would you assess the documentation and IT services provided by EC in terms of...?

(1 – Very dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, 4 – Satisfied, 5 – Very satisfied, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. availability of templates/guiding documents
- b. clarity and relevance of the templates (Part A; Part B; mandatory WPs; budget tables)
- c. understanding of cost categories, calculation of EC contribution, ways to use EC contribution
- d. access and navigation in the ECAS/SyGMA system

4. To the best of your knowledge how would you assess the grant agreement preparation in terms of...?

(1 – Very dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Neither satisfied or dissatisfied, 4 – Satisfied, 5 – Very satisfied, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. Sufficiency of time
- b. User-friendliness of the SygMa system
- c. Understanding the EC requirements / regulations (e.g. new roles: PaCo, CoCo, LEAR, Official signatory, etc.)
- d. understanding the Model Grant Agreement and the explanations provided in the annotated MGA
- e. Understanding of country-specific’ requirements / regulations about participation in ERA-NETs
- f. flexibility in relation to inclusion / replacements of partners
- g. flexibility in relation to budget changes
- h. simplification of the negotiation phase

5. Approximately how many person-months does it take your organization to carry out the following activities and by whom are the costs of these person months covered?

(options: ‘Your own organization’; ‘Additional financial support at national/regional level’; ‘Using the EC top-up funding’; ‘Using the fixed EC unit costs’; ‘Other’ – please specify)

	Person-months needed/planned <i>(up to 0.5; 0.5 - 1; between 1 – 3; > 3, ‘Don’t know’)</i>	Who covers the costs of these person-months <i>(options as above)</i>
a. the preparation of the ERA-NET Cofund proposal		
b. the preparation of the Grant agreement		
c. the preparation of the Consortium Agreement		
d. the preparation and implementation of the co-funded call		
e. the management of the whole ERA-NET COFUND project		
f. the financial reporting		
g. the preparation and implementation of additional activities		

6. What were the main problems encountered in the proposal preparation and grant preparation for **your ERA-NET Cofund action**?

Please make any additional comments

B. Management and monitoring

1. In your opinion which of the following play an important role in addressing the management aspects in an ERA-NET Cofund project **effectively**?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- A manageable and well-resourced Coordination office
- A manageable, internal governance structures (steering committee, WP leader group, etc.)
- An active external bodies (advisory boards/stakeholders boards/etc.)
- A manageable and well-resourced Call Secretariat
- An internal strategy in managing ERA-NETs within own organisation/agency
- Responsibility for the management of the call secretariat and implementation of the call(s) to the same partner
- Outsourcing of management tasks to service providers
- ...Other....(please explain)

2. In your opinion which of the following are necessary to ensure adequate monitoring of the actions in an ERA-NET Cofund project?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- Reporting and monitoring obligations resulting from the Grant Agreement
- Internal reporting procedures set up additionally by the project partners
- Internal evaluation procedures set up additionally by the project partners
- Contingency plans and measures to avoid or mitigate risks during project implementation (e.g. delays in delivery of tasks, disputes among partners, withdraw of a partner, etc.)
- External audits
- ...Other....(please explain)

C. Implementation

1. Which are the activities that are implemented in **your ERA-NET Cofund project**?

List of activities	<i>Tick the box</i>
a. Mapping of national research in the specific thematic area	
b. Creating a database of funded national projects in the specific thematic area	
c. Implementing joint foresight activities to explore the future in the given thematic area	
d. Developing a common vision in the thematic area	
e. Developing/Updating a Strategic Research (and Innovation) Agenda in the thematic area	
f. Launching and implementing a co-funded call for proposals	
g. Launching and implementing additional call for proposals	
h. Organising joint mobility and/or researcher training activities	
i. Shared Use of existing infrastructures	
j. Joint development of (new) infrastructures	
k. Implementing joint activities related to pre-commercial public procurement or procurement of innovative solutions	
l. Implementing joint activities related to dissemination and up-take of research results	

m. Networking and brokerage events to extend participation to additional countries	
n. Capacity building and networking activities to foster participation of low budget/ performing countries	
o. Other....(please explain)	

2. How important are these activities for your organisation?
(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

List of activities	Degree of importance (options as above)
a. Mapping of national research in the specific thematic area	
b. Creating a database of funded national projects in the specific thematic area	
c. Implementing joint foresight activities to explore the future in the given thematic area	
d. Developing a common vision in the thematic area	
e. Developing/Updating a Strategic Research (and Innovation) Agenda in the thematic area	
f. Launching and implementing a co-funded call for proposals	
g. Launching and implementing additional call for proposals	
h. Organising joint mobility and/or researcher training activities	
i. Shared Use of existing infrastructures	
j. Joint development of (new) infrastructures	
k. Implementing joint activities related to pre-commercial public procurement or procurement of innovative solutions	
l. Implementing joint activities related to dissemination and up-take of research results	
m. Networking and brokerage events to extend participation to additional countries	
n. Capacity building and networking activities to foster participation of low budget/ performing countries	
o. Other....(please explain)	

3. Were the national contributions allocated to the co-funded call sufficient to retrieve the maximum available earmarked EC contribution? *(tick the box)*
- Yes, in full
- Partially...Why?

If partially, please provide a short explanation
--

4. ***OPTIONAL*** Thus far have there been or do you foresee any deviations in the implementation of **your ERA-NET Cofund project** from the provisions of the grant agreement in relation to...?

(tick the box): Yes / No / Maybe

- a. Number and duration of tasks
 - b. Number of deliverables
 - c. Submission date of deliverables
 - d. Implementation of the co-funded call
 - e. Evaluation of proposals for the cofunded call
 - f. Selection of proposals for the cofudned call
 - g. Implementation of the additional call(s)
 - h. Implementation of additional activities (such as mapping, SRA development, mobility, training, etc.)
 - i. Others ...(please explain)
5. Please provide explanations for any deviations that have occurred or you foresee?

Explanations

6. What were the main problems encountered in the implementation of activities in **your ERA-NET Cofund project** until now (referring to both joint calls and additional activities)?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. Delays in the preparation of the co-funded call
- b. Financial complexity (use of EC contribution in the context of the mixed mode of funding)
- c. Administrative burden/disagreements related to the preparation and acceptance of the consortium agreement
- d. (Financial) dependence of additional activities on the availability of funds after the implementation of the co-funded joint call
- e. Restriction of budgets for additional activities within the limits of the unit costs
- f. Costs of the preparation of the co-funded call not eligible for EC contribution
- g. Limited promotion of the co-funded call within the national / regional communities
- h. Lack of compatibility or complexity in timing, funding and participation rules across national / regional programmes
- i. Low availability of human resources at the national administrative level
- j. Lack of coordination at national level
- k. Lack of national/regional strategies for participating in international activities
- l. Shrinking national research budgets
- m. Limited long-term commitment at the national level
- n. Lack of previous collaboration between the partners (i.e. FP7 ERA-Net)
- o.other (please explain)....

7. ***OPTIONAL*** To what extent have the following simplification measures introduced in H2020 made the ERA-NET Cofund more efficient as compared for instance to ERA-NET in FP7?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. The simplified, single financial reporting at the end of the action
- b. The unit costs to cover additional activities without the need for financial reporting
- c. The length of the project (60 months) with the possibility to extend if delays occur
- d. The reduced reporting obligations vs. regular periodic reporting including financial reporting in FP7
- e. The time to grant reduced to 8 months vs. long negotiation periods of the past

- f. The new approach of less deliverables and milestones
 - g. The possibility to establish synergies with the European Structural & Investment Funds (ESIF)
 - h. The electronic system for signing the grant agreement, making amendments and uploading deliverables
8. ***OPTIONAL*** In your opinion how does ERA-NET Cofund compare with your FP7 ERA-NET experience concerning implementation of activities?

List of activities	Comparison with FP7 experience (options: 'activity done less efficiently than in FP7 ERA-NET', 'activity done as efficiently as in FP7 ERA-NET', 'activity done more efficiently than in FP7 ERA-NET', 'Non-applicable')
a. Mapping of national research in the specific thematic area	
b. Creating a database of funded national projects in the specific thematic area	
c. Implementing joint foresight activities to explore the future in the given thematic area	
d. Developing a common vision in the thematic area	
e. Developing/Updating a Strategic Research (and Innovation) Agenda in the thematic area	
f. Launching and implementing a co-funded call for proposals	
g. Launching and implementing additional call for proposals	
h. Organising joint mobility and/or researcher training activities	
p. Shared Use of existing infrastructures	
q. Joint development of (new) infrastructures	
i. Implementing joint activities related to pre-commercial public procurement or procurement of innovative solutions	
j. Implementing joint activities related to dissemination and up-take of research results	
k. Networking and brokerage events to extend participation to additional countries	
l. Capacity building and networking activities to foster participation of low budget/performing countries	
r. Other....(please explain)	

9. Overall, how would you assess the participation of your organisation in the ERA-NET Cofund instrument in terms of cost-benefit ratio?
(options: 'costs outweigh benefits', 'costs equal benefits', 'benefits outweigh costs')

D. Motivations and benefits of participation

1. To what extent do the following reflect your motivation for participating in the ERA-NET Cofund scheme?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. recognition of the international context of the specific challenge area
- b. access to complementary research expertise to achieve critical mass in certain areas
- c. access to complementary sources for funding nationally relevant research activities at EU level
- d. compatibility of research theme/topic addressed by the ERA-NET Cofund with the national/regional research priorities
- e. compatibility of research theme/topic with the organisational strategy and focus of research
- f. opportunity to ensure stable, repetitive funding for certain research domains
- g. opportunity to influence European policy in the specific challenge area
- h. opportunity to collaborate with other funding agencies
- i. opportunity to increase experience in managing internationalisation in research
- j. opportunity to improve the ‘international’ experience of the national research community
- k. opportunity to reduce / rationalize the costs of research activities
- l. ...other (please explain)...

2. To what extent do you perceive the following benefits from participating in the ERA-NET Cofund scheme?

(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)

- a. Design of new means of collaboration through joint activities (e.g. shared use of infrastructure, joint strategic analysis and foresight, knowledge hubs, etc.)
- b. Adoption of interdisciplinary approaches in research (collaboration between multiple academic disciplines)
- c. Adoption of transdisciplinary approaches in research (collaboration between multiple partners, both academic and non-academic)
- d. Increased capacities and skills (in relation to scientific areas, strategic thinking, international project management)
- e. Increased international collaboration of the national / regional research communities
- f. Increased quality of research projects at national / regional level
- g. Increased investments in certain research areas at national / regional level
- h. Access to additional European funding for certain areas
- i. Increased connectivity across different agencies (at national level)
- j. Increased coordination within the national level (at ministerial/funding agency level)
- k. Increased coordination at cross-national level in relation to research funding and strategies
- l. Increased coordination across different agencies in relation to funding, monitoring and evaluation procedures
- m. increased awareness of specific research topics at cross-national level
- n. Increased visibility of certain research issues at national / regional level
- o. Influencing the shaping of national research agendas and programmes
- p. Development of strategies in new areas at national level
- q. Influencing the shaping of research agendas of European / international organisations

- r. Development of strategies in new areas at European / international level
- s. Increased chances of finding effective solutions to societal challenges
- t. ...other (please explain)...

3. ***Optional*** How does the ERA-NET Cofund instrument compare with the following in relation to...

	FP7 ERA-NET	FP7 ERA-NET Plus	Art. 185 initiatives	National programmes
	(: ERA-NET Cofund is worse than; ERA-NET Cofund is similar to; ERA-NET Cofund is better than; 'Don't know')			
a. Activities tailored to the needs of partners				
b. possibility to implement additional joint calls				
c. possibility to implement additional activities (other than joint calls)				
d. Reporting requirements				
e. Funding rates				
f. Success rates of co-funded projects				
g. Management cost/benefit ratio				

4. According to you the ERA-NET instrument should be used:

(0 – not at all agree, 1 – agree to a very small degree, 2 – agree to a small degree, 3 – moderately agree, 4 – agree to a large degree, 5 – agree to a very large degree, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable')

- a. for implementation of joint calls (only)
- b. for implementation of additional activities not covered by other national/European programmes
- c. for implementation of both joint calls and activities
- d. as a preliminary step towards the formation of a JPI or an Art 185
- e. ...other (please explain)

5. Please provide any additional comments in relation to ways/means to improve the ERA-NET Cofund scheme

Comments

E. Relevance and coherence of the ERA-NET Cofund Instrument with EU/national policies

1. How much would you agree to the following statements

(0 – not at all agree, 1 – agree to a very small degree, 2 – agree to a small degree, 3 – moderately agree, 4 – agree to a large degree, 5 – agree to a very large degree, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable')

- a. The ERA-NET Cofund instrument corresponds to the needs of the beneficiaries (ministries, research funding organizations, research performing organisations).
- b. The ERA-NETs are implemented in areas in which the European added-value is clearly demonstrated.
- c. The ERA-NETs achieve a critical mass of resources with the calls they implement
- d. The ERA-NET Cofund actions are embedded in a long-term EU strategy for translational collaboration in tackling Societal Challenges (including also Joint Programming Initiatives, Art. 185s, etc.).
- e. There is adequate complementarity and synergies between ERA-NETs and other initiatives and/or instruments which have similar objectives (Article 185, JPIs, EJP Cofund, CSA, etc.)
- f. There is adequate coherence and complementarity between ERA-NETs within a same sector/area.
- g. ERA-NET Cofund actions are embedded in national policy portfolios and/or national strategies for translational collaboration in tackling Societal Challenges.
- h. ERA-NET Cofund actions complement national research programmes.

F. Achievement of key objectives of EU policies (ERA, H2020)

1. To what extent do you think the ERA-NET Cofund actions contribute to...
(0 – not at all, 1 – to a very small degree, 2 – to a small degree, 3 – moderately, 4 – to a large degree, 5 – to a very large degree, ‘Don’t know’, ‘Not applicable’)
 - a. strengthening the competitiveness of the European economy?
 - b. addressing major societal challenges?
 - c. enhancing trans-national cooperation?
 - d. facilitating mobility of researchers?
 - e. facilitating dissemination of results and transfer of knowledge?
 - f. strengthening gender equality?
 - g. promoting international cooperation beyond the EU?
 - h. coordinating national programmes?
 - i. Creating critical mass at European level in tackling societal challenges?
 - j. establishing a durable cooperation between partners?
 - k. Widening participation across the Union in research and innovation and helping to close the research and innovation divide in Europe?
 - l. Promoting cooperation between science and society (e.g. participation of civil society organisations, citizens, non-governmental organisations)?
 - m. Integrating the research and innovation dimensions?

Thank you for your collaboration – We will notify you about the report of the Expert Group as soon as this is published (June 2016)