Public consultation on ex-post evaluation of the 7th framework programme

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The Decision [1] setting up 'Seventh Framework Programme' (FP7) of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities' stipulates that "two years following the completion of this Framework Programme, the Commission shall carry out an external evaluation by independent experts of its rationale, implementation and achievements."

The evaluation is an important instrument for informing the European Parliament and the Council, Member States, the research community, the general public and other stakeholders about the achievements of FP7. It will also contribute to improving implementation of Horizon 2020 and provide a solid evidence base for designing future framework programmes. The evaluation will examine the effectiveness of FP7 implementation, the efficiency of resources used and the wider socio-economic impacts of the Framework Programme.

The evaluation covers the entire period of FP7 implementation in between 2007-2013.

The ex-post evaluation is carried out by an independent High Level Expert Group, supported by an extensive evidence-base. It will be completed by the end of 2015. This will be followed by a Commission Communication on the Ex-Post Evaluation.

In order to provide the experts with a range of opinion and views about the functioning, achievements, and impacts of FP7, this interactive consultation has been set up to allow for contributions both from those with direct experience with the FP7, as well as groups or individuals who wish to give their views. The results of this consultation will be made publicly available and will be taken into account in the Commission Communication reacting to the Evaluation Report of the High Level Expert Group.

[1] Article 7(3), see OJ L 412 of 30 December 2006, p1.

More information:

- on this consultation
- on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation

Important notice on the publication of contributions

Contributions received are intended for publication on the Commission's website. Do you agree to your contribution being published along with your identity? (on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation) *

- Yes, I agree to my contribution being published under the name I indicate
- I do not want my contribution to be published

1. Information about the respondant

Please provide us with the following information on your identity and on the authority / organisation / company you represent (if any):

Name of the public authority / international organisation / organisation or company you represent, if any, or your full name as an indivdual if your reply as such:*

The information you provide here is for publication

Full name (first and last name) of the individual respondent:*

The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published

Email address of the individual respondent:

The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published

Are you replying:*

- on behalf of an organisation
- as a private individual

Your role in the organisation:*

- None - I am answering as an individual
- Senior Management
- Management
- Researcher
- Strategy/Policy function
- Specialist/Expert
- Other (please specify)

Please specify:

Country of origin (of the organisation when relevant)*

Your organisation's geographical area of activities (indicate your area of activities if answering as an individual person)*

- [ ] Local
- [ ] Regional
- [ ] National
- [ ] European
- [ ] International
- [ ] Not applicable

Your organisation's type of activity (indicate your activity type if answering as an individual person)*

- [ ] Higher or Secondary Education
- [ ] Research Organisation
- [ ] Private For-Profit (excluding education)
- [ ] SME
- [ ] Research and/or Innovation Funding Agency
- [ ] Ministry
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Please specify:

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 to reply to the consultation)*

Citizens have a right to expect that European institutions' interaction with citizens' associations, NGOs, businesses, trade and professional organisations, trade unions, think tanks, etc. is transparent and takes place in compliance with the law as well as in due respect of ethical principles, avoiding undue pressure, illegitimate or privileged access to information or to decision makers. The Transparency Register exists to provide citizens with direct and single access to information about who is engaged in activities aiming at influencing the EU decision-making process, which interests are being pursued and what level of resources are invested in these activities. Please help us enhancing transparency by registering!

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

If so, please indicate your Register ID number:*

2. Questionnaire

Implementation of FP7

Based on your experience has the implementation of FP7 been effective?*

- Yes
- Generally yes, but with some problems
- Generally no, although with some successes
- No
- Don't know

Has the implementation of FP7 been effective? - Comments (optional)

In case you have not been participating FP7, please specify here the reasons for non-participation (optional)

Simplification

Which of the following FP7 simplification measures generated most impact?

Out of the 11 FP7 simplification measures listed below, please select the 5 FP7 simplification measures which, in your view, generated most impact and rank them accordingly (5 generating most impact)

	Certification of costs (fewer audit certificates)	Participants Guarantee Fund (fewer ex-ante financial checks)	Unique Registration Facility (URF)	Certification of methodology	Web-based electronic system for negotiations (NEF)	Project reporting – streamlined guidelines and structure of reports	Grant amendments – streamlined rules and procedures	Research Participant portal	Simplification of recovery process (flat rate corrections)	Wider acceptance of average personnel costs	Flat rate system for SME owners and natural persons without salary
5 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

To what extend have the FP7 simplification measures been successful? - Comments (optional)

Achievements and impact

Impacts of each Specific FP7 Programme

In which of the following areas did each Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas per specific programme listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

In which of the following areas did **COOPERATION** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
3 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○	○

In which of the following areas did **IDEAS** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
3 *	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
2 *	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
1 *	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

In which of the following areas did **PEOPLE** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
3 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○	○

In which of the following areas did **CAPACITIES** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
3 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○	○

Impacts of each Specific FP7 Programme – Comments (optional)

Please specify the reasons for the ranking given in previous question and/or refer to any further evidence on impact (scientific, behavioural, technological, innovation, structural, policy, and other) FP7 has had.

Based on your experience to what extent did FP7 research activities produce enduring impact?*

- High
- Medium
- Low
- I don't know

To what extent did FP7 research activities produce enduring impact for you as FP7 beneficiary (e.g. networking, benchmarking, joint agenda setting, harmonisation of peer review systems)? – Comments*

Contribution of FP7 activities to the European Research Area (ERA)

To which of the following ERA areas did FP7 activities contribute most? Please rank the following areas on a scale from 1 – 5 (5 being the area to which FP7 activities contributed most).

More information on ERA: http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index_en.htm

	More effective national research systems	Optimal transnational co-operation and competition	An open labour market for researchers	Gender Equality and gender mainstreaming in research	Optimal circulation, access to and transfer of scientific knowledge
5 *	○	○	○	○	○
4 *	○	○	○	○	○
3 *	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○

Contribution of FP7 activities to the European Research Area (ERA) – Comments (optional)

European Added Value

EU added-value of FP7

In which of the following dimensions of EU added-value has FP7 been most successful?

Out of the 9 EU added-value areas identified below, please select the 3 which in your view have been most successful and rank them accordingly (3 being the EU added-value dimension in which FP7 has been most successful)

	Tackling pan-European challenges	Coordination of national research policies	EU scale of dissemination of research results	Pooling of resources (achieving critical mass; economies of scale and scope)	Reduction of research risk / of commercial risk	Increase competition in research	Leverage on private investment / on public investment	Improving of S&T capabilities	Enhance researchers' mobility
3 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
1 *	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

EU added-value of FP7 – Comments (optional)

Final questions

What are the key achievements/strengths of FP7 in particular?*

Are there shortcomings in FP7 that you think should be corrected? According to your experience have these already been addressed to in the Horizon 2020 Programme?*

Do you intend to participate again in future?*

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you know your partners in the project before?*

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Did you participate for the first time?*

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Do you intend to stay in touch with the partners of your project after the end of the research work?*

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

How quick do you think the result of your research will lead to marketable products and services?*

- Within 1 year
- 1 - 5 years
- 5 - 10 years
- In more than 10 years
- Don't know

Overall are you satisfied with FP7?*

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Moderately dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Should you want to provide additional input on the subject of this consultation or raise specific points not covered in the questionnaire, please upload your additional contribution here: