

## ERA-NET Survey 2016 – organised by ERA-LEARN 2020

---

### Data of the Respondent

1. Name
2. Organisation
3. Department
4. Position of respondent in their organisation
5. Country
6. Years of your personal experience in participating in ERA-NETs<sup>1</sup>

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

7. Type of experience in participating in ERA-NETs<sup>2</sup>

(options: mostly as Coordinator; mostly as Partner; almost equally as Coordinator and Partner)

8. In which versions of the ERA-NET Scheme have you participated in? (tick – multiple ticks possible)

	Tick
FP6 ERA-NETs	
FP7 ERA-NETs	
FP7 ERA-NET Plus	
H2020 ERA-NET Cofund	

### A. Proposal and grant preparation

1. To the best of your knowledge how would you assess the quality of advice/guidance provided by the Commission services over the years in relation to the following?

(1 – it was bad and further worsened over the years; 2 – it was bad but improved over the years; 3 – it was of adequate quality and remained stable over the years; 4 – it was good but slightly worsened over the years; 5 – it was good and further improved over the years; ‘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

---

<sup>1</sup> By ERA-NETs we refer to all the different versions of the scheme, i.e. ERA-NETs, ERA-NET Plus, and ERA-NET Cofund.

<sup>2</sup> By ERA-NETs we refer to all the different versions of the scheme, i.e. ERA-NETs, ERA-NET Plus, and ERA-NET Cofund.

## B. Management and monitoring

1. Based on your overall experience, which of the following play an important role in addressing the management aspects in an ERA-NET 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. A manageable and well-resourced Coordination office
- b. Manageable, internal governance structures (steering committee, WP leader group, etc.)
- c. Active external bodies (advisory boards/stakeholders boards/etc.)
- d. A manageable and well-resourced Call Secretariat
- e. An internal strategy in managing ERA-NETs within own organisation/agency
- f. Responsibility for the management of the call secretariat and implementation of the call(s) to the same partner
- g. Outsourcing of management tasks to service providers
- h. ...Other....(please explain)

2. Based on your overall experience which of the following are necessary to ensure adequate monitoring of the actions in an ERA-NET 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’)*

- a. Reporting and monitoring obligations resulting from the Grant Agreement
- b. Internal reporting procedures set up additionally by the project partners
- c. Internal evaluation procedures set up additionally by the project partners
- d. Contingency plans and measures to avoid or mitigate risks during project implementation (e.g. selected projects not going forward, delays in delivery of tasks, disputes among partners, withdraw of a partner, etc.)
- e. External audits
- f. ...Other....(please explain)

## C. Implementation

1. Based on your overall experience, what are usually the main problems encountered in the implementation of activities in an ERA-NET project (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 joint call
- b. Financial complexity in using the EC contribution
- 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 joint call (relevant for ERA-NET Cofund only)
- e. Restriction of budgets for additional activities within the limits of the unit costs (relevant for ERA-NET Cofund only)
- f. Costs of the preparation of additional joint call not eligible for EC contribution (relevant for ERA-NET Cofund only)
- g. Limited promotion of the joint 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 ERA-NET partners
  - o. ....other (please explain)....
2. Overall, how would you assess the participation of your organisation in the ERA-NET Scheme in terms of cost-benefit ratio?  
(options: 'costs outweigh benefits', 'costs equal benefits', 'benefits outweigh costs')

**D. Motivations and benefits of participation**

1. Based on your overall experience, to what extent do the following reflect your organisation's motivation for participating in the ERA-NET 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 ERA-NETs 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. Based on your overall experience which could be possible de-motivators for participation in the ERA-NET Scheme?

Comments
----------

3. Based on your overall experience, to what extent have you realised the following benefits from participating in the ERA-NET 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)...

## E. Added value of the ERA-NET instrument

1. **\*Optional\*** Based on your overall experience how do the different ERA-NET versions compare with each other as well as with national programmes in terms of the following features?

*options: 1 - the worst, 2 - worse than the others, 3 - similar to the others, 4 - better than the others, 5 - the best, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'*

	FP7 ERA-NET is...	FP7 ERA-NET Plus is...	ERA-NET Cofund is...	National Programmes are...
	options: 1 - the worst, 2 - worse than the others, 3 - similar to the others, 4 - better than the others, 5 - the best, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'	options: 1 - the worst, 2 - worse than the others, 3 - similar to the others, 4 - better than the others, 5 - the best, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'	options: 1 - the worst, 2 - worse than the others, 3 - similar to the others, 4 - better than the others, 5 - the best, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'	options: 1 - the worst, 2 - worse than the others, 3 - similar to the others, 4 - better than the others, 5 - the best, 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'
a. Flexibility of the instrument to implement additional joint calls				
b. Flexibility of the instrument to implement additional activities (other than joint calls)				
c. Reporting requirements of the instrument/programme				
d. Funding rates of the instrument/programme				
e. Success rates of (co)funded projects under the instrument/programme				
f. Cost/benefit ratio of managing the instrument/programme				

2. According to you should which joint activities should the ERA-NET instrument support?

*(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	
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. Additional activities related to extending cooperation to third / non-EU countries	
p. Monitoring and evaluation/assessment activities both in relation to the network itself or the co-funded projects	
q. Collaboration activities with other initiatives in the same thematic area	
r. Activities promoting early career scientists and young researchers' programmes	
s. Other....(please explain)	

## F. Relevance and coherence of the ERA-NET Instrument with EU/national policies

1. Based on your overall experience, 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 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 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 actions are embedded in national policy portfolios and/or national strategies for translational collaboration in tackling Societal Challenges.
- h. ERA-NET actions complement national research programmes.

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

1. Based on your overall experience, to what extent do you think the ERA-NET scheme contributes 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?

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

Comments

Thank you for your collaboration – The results will be presented in the Annual Joint Programming Conference in Nov. 2016