



Self-Evaluation of FACCE-JPI 2010-2019:

FACCE-JPI Questionnaire to FACCE-JPI Member Countries Second Evaluation Cycle

Authors: Paul Wiley; Manju Bura (UKRI-BBSRC)
Stefanie Margraf (JUELICH)

Dissemination level: public

Date: November 2020

Implementation of the survey: March-September 2019

Evaluation report: March 2020 (confidential)
November 2020 (public)



This survey has been developed and used during the project FACCE-Evolve. The project has been financed by a Coordination and Support Action from the European Commission (FACCE-Evolve - Contract number 652612) and fees from the participating countries.

Introduction

To be able to assess the progress of the FACCE-JPI, it was decided by the FACCE-JPI Governing Board to initiate an evaluation of the joint activities of FACCE-JPI. The first step of this evaluation is to assess the ability of FACCE-JPI to align national and European research programmes. In this context, the first round of evaluation of FACCE-JPI was concluded in December 2016, analysing the period from October 2010 until December 2015.

Alignment is a continuous process, which requires iterative monitoring and evaluation. As part of this work, FACCE-JPI is conducting the second round of evaluation to analyse the perceptions and expectations among the Members of the FACCE-JPI Governing Board on the ability of FACCE-JPI to align national research programmes. The data collected from this exercise will be compared with the information gathered through the first survey to Governing Board Members, implemented six years after the start of FACCE-JPI. This will enable us to assess the progress of FACCE-JPI towards alignment and to identify areas where further effort is needed.

The report on the second round of evaluation will be complemented with an analysis on the high quality transnational research activities within FACCE-JPI.

The questionnaire is divided into the following sections:

- 1. Information about you and your organisation*
- 2. Coordination among FACCE-JPI members*
- 3. Alignment of national research strategies*
- 4. FACCE-JPI joint actions*
- 5. Review of recommendations from first evaluation cycle*
- 6. Future expectations*
- 7. Further comments*

Section 1 - Information about you and your organisation

This first section concerns the background information of you and your organisation. Please provide us with information that characterises you, your organisation and the country you represent in the FACCE-JPI Governing Board.

1) Please provide:

Name:

Organisation:

Your position in your organisation:

Country represented by you in the FACCE-JPI Governing Board:

E-mail Address:

Phone Number:

2) Which of the following describes the **primary** function of your organisation?

- a) Funding organisation
- b) Ministry
- c) Research organisation
- d) Other, please specify

3) Are you completing this survey jointly with a second GB member from your country?

- a) Yes (please provide background information of the other GB member below)
- b) No (answers represent individual GB member's view)

If Yes:

4) *Please provide the details of the second GB member:*

Name:

Organisation:

Position in the organisation:

Country represented in the FACCE-JPI Governing Board:

E-mail Address:

Phone Number:

5) *Also for the second GB member:*

Which of the following describes the **primary** function of second GB member's organisation?

- a) Funding organisation
- b) Ministry
- c) Research organisation
- d) Other, please specify

Section 2 – Coordination among FACCE-JPI members

Section 2 concerns the FACCE-JPI ability to coordinate among the FACCE-JPI members. Although the main purpose of the survey is to evaluate FACCE-JPI's alignment of national and European programmes, the opportunity is taken to gather GB members' views on organisational aspects of FACCE-JPI. The questions in this section refer to internal FACCE-JPI processes, rather than to the FACCE-JPI actions themselves.

- 6) To what extent do you agree that FACCE-JPI has established efficient decision making procedures?
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all
- 7) Please describe any cases where FACCE-JPI has worked well in this aspect:
- 8) If you have any suggestions for improvement of the FACCE-JPI decision making procedures, please elaborate:
- 9) To what extent do you agree that the current methodology of developing Strategic Research Agenda (SRA)¹ and Implementation Plan (IP)² are effective and efficient:
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all
- 10) If you have any suggestions for improving the process of developing SRAs and IPs in future, please elaborate:
- 11) To which extent do you agree that, as a GB member, you receive enough and appropriate information about on-going FACCE-JPI actions:
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all
- 12) If you have any comments, please elaborate (e.g. what communications would you like to receive about FACCE-JPI activities?):

¹ <https://www.faccejpi.com/medias/FACCE-JPI-SRA-2016>

² <https://www.faccejpi.com/medias/New-IP>

Section 3 – Alignment of national research strategies

Section 3 concerns the ability of FACCE-JPI to facilitate the necessary decision procedures for alignment of the national research strategies within food security, agriculture and climate change.

- 13) To which extent do you agree that the FACCE-JPI Strategic Research Agenda has influenced the focus of the national research programmes in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change in your country:
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all
- 14) If you have specific examples of how the FACCE-JPI Strategic Research Agenda has influenced in the above context, please elaborate:
- 15) To which extent do you agree that the FACCE-JPI Strategic Research Agenda reflects the research priorities of your country:
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all
- 16) If you have any comments or specific examples, please elaborate:
- 17) If you have any comments on the alignment of research strategies, in particular, examples of where alignment has been especially effective, and in which Core Theme or research areas, please elaborate:
(Note: Core Themes: 1. Sustainable food security under climate change; 2. Environmentally sustainable intensification of agricultural systems; 3. Developing synergies and reducing trade-offs between food supply, biodiversity and ecosystem services; 4. Adaptation to Climate Change, and 5. Mitigation of Climate Change)
- 18) If any, what do you regard to be the main obstacles for the adoption of the FACCE-JPI's Strategic Research Agenda into the national research programmes in your country, and how could these be overcome?
- 19) To which extent do you agree that FACCE-JPI has contributed to avoiding duplication and filling gaps between FACCE-JPI participating countries:
5. Very large extent
 4. Large extent
 3. Moderate extent
 2. Small extent
 1. Very small extent
 0. Not at all



20) If you have any specific examples or additional comments, please elaborate:

Section 4 – FACCE-JPI joint actions

Section 4 addresses the effectiveness of the different instruments used by FACCE-JPI. This section is divided into four subsections:

- 4A) Transnational calls/ funding activities
- 4B) Alignment activities
- 4C) Exploring activities
- 4D) FACCE-JPI joint actions – general aspects

4A) Transnational calls/ funding activities

21) To which extent do you agree that **transnational calls** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

22) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

23) To which extent do you agree that **European Joint Programmes (e.g. EJP SOIL)** are/will be effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

24) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

25) To which extent do you agree that **transnational calls / funding activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

26) If you have any specific examples or comments (especially if you do not agree that **transnational calls / funding activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI), please elaborate:

4B) Alignment activities

27) To which extent do you agree that **Knowledge Hubs (e.g. MACSUR)** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

28) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

29) To which extent do you agree that **Knowledge Networks (e.g. KNSI)** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

30) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

31) To which extent do you agree that **Thematic Annual Programming (e.g. TAP SOIL)** is effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

32) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

33) To which extent do you agree that **alignment activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

34) If you have any specific examples or comments (especially if you do not agree that **alignment activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI), please elaborate:

4C) Exploring activities

35) To which extent do you agree that **Exploratory Workshops** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

36) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

37) To which extent do you agree that **exploring activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

38) If you have any specific examples or comments (especially if you do not agree that transnational **exploring activities at large** are effective in addressing the aims and objectives of FACCE-JPI), please elaborate:

4D) FACCE-JPI joint actions – general aspects

39) Are there any type of actions or instruments that you think are missing and should be implemented or used by FACCE-JPI and why? Please elaborate:

40) To which extent do you agree that the FACCE-JPI actions to date are relevant for your country:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

41) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

42) To which extent do you consider beneficial the inclusion of international partners (outside of Europe) in FACCE-JPI actions:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

43) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

Section 5 - Review of recommendations from first evaluation cycle

Section 5 asks about the extent to which the recommendations and suggestions emerging from the first cycle of evaluation have been taken into account. If your country joined FACCE-JPI after 2016 (Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania), please move on to the next section.

This section is divided into four subsections:

- 5A) Operational level
- 5B) National ownership and strategic alignment
- 5C) FACCE-JPI actions
- 5D) Instruments used to implement the Strategic Research Agenda:

5A) Operational level

- 44) To which extent do you agree that GB meetings have become more efficient by considering
- the communication of status updates of on-going FACCE-JPI actions to GB members
 - the preparation of clear and short GB papers
 - the communication of decisions to be taken and follow-up actions
 - the minimization of procedural items in GB meetings.

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

- 45) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

5B) National ownership and strategic alignment

- 46) The first evaluation report emphasised to re-consider the recommendations of the FACCE-JPI Working Group on National Ownership, who advised members of the GB in May 2016
- to inspire/empower functional structures support national ownership for joint programming and
 - to enhance and promote the dissemination of FACCE-JPI activities and results at the national level, including the highest political level.

To which extent do you agree that those recommendations from the report have been taken into account to date within your country:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

- 47) If you have any specific examples or comments (especially on barriers to take these recommendations into account and on possible solutions), please elaborate:

- 48) The report of the FACCE-JPI Working Group on National Ownership further recommended to facilitate high-level agreements between senior figures in charge of core national budgets.

To which extent do you agree that this has been advanced in your country:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

- 49) If you have any specific examples or comments (especially on barriers to take these recommendations into account and on possible solutions), please elaborate:

5C) FACCE-JPI actions

- 50) To which extent do you agree that Core Theme 3 has been advanced further since the last evaluation in 2016:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

- 51) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

- 52) To which extent do you agree that outcomes and impacts of actions have been communicated to provide evidence base of achievements and thereby improving FACCE-JPI's visibility and national commitment:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

- 53) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

- 54) To which extent do you agree that the inclusion of international partners has been promoted in a targeted and selective way:

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

55) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

5D) Instruments used to implement the Strategic Research Agenda:

56) To which extent do you agree that the demand to use the Knowledge Hub model for further alignment actions has been taken into account:

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

57) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

58) To which extent do you agree that purposes of workshops have been clearly defined when chosen as an instrument to address priorities:

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

59) If you have any specific examples or comments, please elaborate:

Section 6 – Future expectations

Section 6 addresses the expectations on the future outputs of FACCE-JPI.

60) Please estimate how large an increase or decrease in funding your country is expected to allocate **for research in the broad area** of food security, agriculture and climate change in the next 5 years:

1. More than 5% increase
2. Between 0.1 % and 5% increase
3. No change
4. Between 0.1 % and 5% decrease
5. More than 5% decrease

61) In case your country considers to increase or decrease the amount of funding **for research in the broad area** of food security, agriculture and climate change, please state the reasons (e.g. not in line with the country's priority,...):

62) Please estimate how large an increase or decrease in funding your country is expected to allocate **for FACCE-JPI actions** in the next 5 years:

1. More than 5% increase
2. Between 0.1 % and 5% increase
3. No change
4. Between 0.1 % and 5% decrease
5. More than 5% decrease

63) In case your country considers to increase or decrease the amount of funding for **FACCE-JPI actions** please state the reasons (e.g. not in line with the country's priority,...):

To which extent do you assess the importance firstly, **for your country**, and secondly, **for FACCE-JPI as a whole**, of each of the following (Question 64-84)?

64) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **further aligning the national strategies** on food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

65) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **further aligning the national strategies** on food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

66) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **increasing the funding** allocated to **national research** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

67) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **increasing the funding** allocated to **national research** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

68) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **increasing the national funding** allocated to **transnational activities** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

69) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **increasing the national funding** allocated to **transnational activities** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

70) To which extent do you assess the importance of **increasing the European Commission funding of research** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change in your country?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

71) To which extent do you assess the importance of **increasing the European Commission funding of research** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change for FACCE-JPI?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

72) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **aligning national research programmes** (e.g. through mechanisms such as Thematic Annual Programming) in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

73) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **aligning national research programmes** (e.g. through mechanisms such as Thematic Annual Programming) in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

74) If any, what do you regard to be the main obstacles for the alignment of national research programmes, and how could these be overcome?

75) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **increasing the number of researchers** working in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

76) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **increasing the number of researchers** working in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

77) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **increasing collaborations between current researchers** within food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

78) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **increasing collaborations between current researchers** within food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

79) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **increasing the scientific impact of European research** on food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

80) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **increasing the scientific impact of European research** on food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

81) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of increasing collaboration in **sharing existing research infrastructure** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

82) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of increasing collaboration in **sharing existing research infrastructure** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

83) To which extent do you assess the importance for your country of **developing new research infrastructures** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

84) To which extent do you assess the importance for FACCE-JPI of **developing new research infrastructures** in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

85) To which extent do you expect the FACCE-JPI Strategic Research Agenda to be taken into account in your country's national research programmes in the next 5 years?

5. Very large extent
4. Large extent
3. Moderate extent
2. Small extent
1. Very small extent
0. Not at all

86) To which extent do you consider that FACCE-JPI is meeting your expectations of outputs in the area of food security, agriculture and climate change?

- 5. Very large extent
- 4. Large extent
- 3. Moderate extent
- 2. Small extent
- 1. Very small extent
- 0. Not at all

87) If you have any comments on the expectations of the future output of FACCE-JPI, please elaborate:

Section 7 – Further Comments:

88) What, in your opinion, have been the main achievements of FACCE-JPI to date, and why?

89) What, in your opinion, has improved since the last evaluation on alignment?

90) What, in your opinion, got worse since the last evaluation on alignment?

91) What, in your opinion, are the reasons for a lack of improvement, if any and what are your suggestions for improvement?

92) If you have additional comments about FACCE-JPI that have not been addressed elsewhere in the survey, please elaborate here:

Thank you for your help!