

PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 312081

Project acronym: BILAT USA 2.0

Project title: Bilateral Coordination for the Enhancement and Development of S&T Partnerships between the European Union and the United States of America

Funding Scheme: Coordination and Support Action, CSA

Period covered: from 01/11/2012 (M1) to 31/10/2015 (M36)

Dr. Olaf Heilmayer

Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V.

International Bureau of BMBF at DLR

Heinrich-Konen-Str. 1

53227 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49-228-3821-1443

Fax: +49-228-3821-1444

E-mail: Olaf.Heilmayer@dlr.de

Vera Kammann

Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V.

International Bureau of BMBF at DLR

Heinrich-Konen-Str. 1

53227 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49-228-3821-1917

Fax: +49-228-3821-1444

E-mail: Vera.Kammann@dlr.de

Project website address: www.EuUsScienceTechnology.EU



**Bilateral Coordination for the Enhancement and Development
of S&T Partnerships between the European Union and the
United States of America**

Final project report

December 2015

Table of Content

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Final publishable summary report | 4 |
| 1.1 Executive Summary | 4 |
| 1.2 A summary description of project context and objectives | 5 |
| 1.3. Description of the main S&T results / foreground | 9 |
| 1.3.1. Main BILAT USA 2.0 conferences | 9 |
| 1.3.2. BILAT USA 2.0 Workshops / Events | 12 |
| 1.3.3. BILAT USA 2.0 Reports and Deliverables | 22 |
| 1.3.4. Other / Extra BILAT USA 2.0 Activities | 23 |
| 1.4. The impact (incl. the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far) and the main dissemination activities | 26 |
| 1.5. The address of the project public website and contact details | 30 |
| 2 Use and dissemination of foreground | 31 |
| 2.1 Section A1 (public) | 31 |
| 2.2. Section A2 | 33 |
| 3 Section B (Confidential or public: confidential information to be marked clearly) | 41 |
| 4 Report on societal implications | 42 |

1 Final publishable summary report

1.1 Executive Summary

The US Government and the European Commission (EC) with the Member States have cultivated their research and innovation systems to be highly productive, driven by excellence and geared towards answering societal needs and increasing economic productivity. It is well documented that increased international cooperation between science centres is a global trend, and that this trend is accelerating with the rise of new science powers. BILAT USA 2.0 was funded under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) for Research and Innovation as a Coordination and Support Action (CSA), a so-called "BILAT project". "BILAT projects" are EU funded projects that support the aim to facilitate international cooperation, the science-, technology- and innovation (STI) cooperation between the EU and an international partner country where an S&T Agreement exists. BILAT USA 2.0 was thematically mainly oriented towards the further EU-US cooperation in the thematic priority areas for cooperation determined by the EU-US Joint Consultative Group (JCG) for Science and Technology – namely Health, Marine and Arctic Research, Transport as well as NMP. It brought researchers and innovators together for thematic and match-making events, supported the policy dialogue as well as analysed the state-of-the-art and progress of transatlantic S&T cooperation.

The main goals of BILAT USA 2.0 consisting of six Work packages (WPs), whereof WP5 and WP6 regarded the dissemination and communication of activities and the general project management:

- **Supporting the EU-US STI Policy Dialogue** (WP1): Several policy bodies such as the European Commission (EC), the Strategic Forum for International S&T cooperation (SFIC) or the Joint Consultative Group (JCG) were to be supported by providing relevant recommendations deriving from different project activities, thus supporting the policy dialogue at large
- **Raising awareness about research and innovation opportunities** (WP2): Several awareness raising sessions in the EU and the US were implemented – on the one hand, information on Horizon 2020 was spread in the US, on the other hand, information on US funding was disseminated in Europe
- **Fostering innovation partnerships** (WP3): The fostering of innovation partnerships was performed by creating a 'knowledge base' (mapping of existing actors and programmes in the EU and the US) as well as facilitating the dialogue between key innovation stakeholders in several conferences and workshops
- **Enhancing EU-US research partnerships** (WP4): EU-US research partnerships could be enforced by workshops either on request of the EC or the scientific community. Here, the workshops were in particular oriented towards the priority areas for cooperation.

The project followed a "parallel working approach" meaning that all WPs ran during the whole duration of the project. All project objectives have been successfully achieved, information on mutual funding opportunities has been spread to a large extend with the main objective to enable

researchers, research managers and administrators to be successful in the respectively other funding programmes.

1.2 A summary description of project context and objectives

The European Union and the United States of America have had a fruitful and long-lasting science and technology cooperation tradition. BILAT USA 2.0 had the main objective to further enhance this long-lasting tradition – to support the science-, technology- and innovation (STI) cooperation between the United States of America and the EU, the EU Member States and countries associated to H2020 (AC). The project was particularly oriented towards a sustainable implementation in four thematic priority areas for cooperation determined by the high-level group that negotiates the EU-US Science & Technology Agreement (Joint Consultative Group, JCG) – namely Health, Marine and Arctic Research, Transport as well as NMP. The project’s main tasks were to bring researchers and innovators together for thematic exchanges as well as match-making events and raising their awareness on funding opportunities, the support of the policy dialogue and the analyses of the state-of-the-art and progress of transatlantic S&T cooperation.

BILAT-USA 2.0 conducted a “parallel working approach” meaning that project activities basically run in a parallel way. Therefore, the realization of the *project objectives* had started in M1 of the project and completed in M36 of the project. The project consisted of six WPs, whereof WP6 regarded the general project management:

- WP1 – Supporting the EU-US STI Policy Dialogue: The support of the EU-US STI Policy Dialogue on the different levels (e.g. EC, SFIC, JCG) as well as its facilitation by providing respective recommendations deriving from different project activities
- WP2 – Raising awareness about research and innovation opportunities: The increase of awareness about mutual funding opportunities in the respective other country – the EU and the USA
- WP3 – Fostering innovation partnerships: The fostering of innovation partnerships by creating a “knowledge base” (report on EU and US framework conditions) as well as the facilitation of a dialogue between key innovation stakeholders and players (e.g. via the “innovation conference”)
- WP4 – Enhancing EU-US research partnerships: The Enhancement of EU-US research partnerships (incl. the organization of thematically specific workshops bringing researchers of one area together and providing funding information for joint R&I projects)
- WP5 – Communicating and disseminating information: The communication and dissemination of information to a broad range of relevant stakeholders via different available channels.

The main advantages of the “parallel working approach” was that all BILAT USA 2.0 partners were involved in the project implementation process from the very beginning to the project’s end. This led

to a high inter-connectedness of results, the creation of synergies between WPs and an assurance of the commitment of all partners throughout the duration of the project.

All project objectives could be achieved during the project's 36 months, in some cases in a slightly modified way. In such cases, this was communicated to the EC.

Objectives for Work Package 1

The main objective of WP 1 was to support the bilateral EU-US STI Policy dialogue between policy makers and other stakeholders from the EU and the USA. The sub-objectives included conducting a larger conference in the USA, the coordination and the detection of synergies between the EU Member States and Associated Countries (AC) concerning the bilateral approaches in the STI cooperation with the USA as well as the support to other relative bodies and an assessment of the European interests in a joint representation in the USA.

The following objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Flexible support to the EC as well as other relevant policy bodies
- Mapping of existing EU projects, EC programmes, initiatives in the four priority areas (EU-US S&T Agreement)
- Implementing a large conference – on the relevant topic of Science Diplomacy with EU and US representatives
- Giving recommendation for possible joint activities between the EU and the USA¹
- Examining and assessing the operational feasibility of a joint European STI Liaison Office in the USA.

Objectives for Work Package 2

The principle objective of WP2 was to raise the awareness for cooperation opportunities in H2020 as well as US funding programmes in Europe. Engaging researchers in international cooperation activities was another goal. Activities had a focus on the research fields: health, NMP, Marine and Arctic and Transport research. However, other areas were not excluded. Activities in this WP were designed to be closely aligned with those of other WPs, especially with WP4 and WP5.

The following objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Organizing several awareness raising events in the USA for the promotion of H2020 (additional activity: production of an H2020 guide for US researchers)
- Data collection on US and EU participation in the respectively other research programmes in order to be able to assess the state-of-the-art of reciprocity

¹ This objective was modified on request of the EC (at the beginning of 2014).

- Report on US funding opportunities for EU researchers
- Organizing several events in Europe on open US funding opportunities and general information session on how to deal with and manage US funding.

Objectives for Work Package 3

WP3 was to facilitate the innovation cooperation between the USA and the EU starting from the comparison between the EU and US system and its framework conditions. WP3 intended to bridge the gap between industry and research and innovation by different means such as examining the innovation landscape in the USA, identifying existing innovation collaborations, analysing cooperation measures to improve the framework conditions for innovation in the EU and the USA and promote the dialogue between research and innovation stakeholders.

The following objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Building up a “knowledge base” on the two innovations systems, programs, framework etc., thus enhancing the understanding of the conditions and (dis)centives for innovation cooperation
- Organisation of the EU-US innovation conference together with the EC (and SFIC) to ensure an involvement of relevant key players and innovation actors on how to best integrate the innovation dimension in the EU-US S&T Agreement
- Organisation of a series of events on barriers and drivers to EU and US businesses involvement in transatlantic STI cooperation and policy recommendations to enhance such an involvement.

Objectives for Work Package 4

WP4 had a focus on bringing together major EU and US research and innovation actors in order to share good practices and promote transatlantic STI cooperation. The aim was to enable European and US American researchers to strengthen their transatlantic ties. This WP was in particular aiming to strengthen cooperation in the four priority areas for cooperation (EU-US S&T Agreement). WP4 was however also open to finding interesting and promising new areas for transatlantic cooperation (“foresight”).

The following objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Bringing together major research and innovation actors for them to jointly discuss research cooperation endeavours
- Sharing good practices so that researchers could profit from previous researcher’s experiences with EU/US funding programmes
- Guiding and assisting the US and EU research community towards H2020 (providing information on (collaborative) funding opportunities.

Objectives for Work Package 5

The aim of this WP was to develop a collaborative environment that could be accessed through the project's website and that facilitated the various consultations and research activities that took place during the project implementation. It included a) the BILAT USA 2.0 web portal to inform the interested public about the project objectives, activities, partners and outcomes to create awareness of the opportunities for cooperation, to disseminate project results, and to manage internal information sharing, b) a repository for information sharing and know-how transfer in STI matters building on best-practice examples of successful MS/AC and EU programmes with the USA, and c) a 'Collaborative Environment' that provided an interactive platform and diverse ICT tools for the partnering of US and European research and innovation actors for information dissemination about STI landscapes in the USA and Europe.

The following particular objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Creating a website for dissemination and information sharing
- Development of a collaborative environment that could be accessed through the project's website and facilitated the internal communication during the project implementation
- Perform an active dissemination on all project and related US matters
- Produce project dissemination material
- Establishing links to and support dissemination activities of other related European research marketing campaigns / initiatives.

Objectives for Work Package 6

The objective of WP 6 was to assure an effective implementation, incl. the financial management and the controlling of the BILAT USA 2.0 project as well as the quality assurance.

The following objectives were to be met during the project period:

- Comprehensive administrative and financial management (incl. the periodic report)
- Ensuring an internal and external communication processes
- Development of the project handbook for quality assurance
- Organization of the Kick-off, Midterm- and Final meeting with EC, Advisory Board (AB) and all partners.

1.3. Description of the main S&T results / foreground

BILAT USA 2.0 is not a research project. It is rather a CSA that supports different policy processes / bodies, organizes events and conferences and assesses the progress of EU-US transatlantic collaboration. Therefore, the foreground this project that has been produced consists of a list of reports, successful events and conferences as well as other activities that aimed to raise the awareness of the scientific mutual funding opportunities and cooperation in the community at large.

1.3.1. Main BILAT USA 2.0 conferences

According to the Description of Work (DoW), BILAT USA 2.0 had planned to organize two larger conferences – one in the EU and one in the USA – aiming at inviting around 100-150 people. Accordingly, two conferences were organized, one related primarily to innovation, the other to science / research (Science Diplomacy).

EU-POLICY-MAKER Innovation Conference: The EU-US Innovation Conference on “How to integrate the innovation dimension in the EU-US S&T Agreement” was organised by FFG in cooperation with DLR, inno TSD, and RTI International (sub-contracted) on January 14-15, 2015 in Brussels. It gathered about 150 experts, policy-makers and stakeholders from the US and from Europe. In several panels and roundtables, participants discussed the upcoming challenges and opportunities in innovation partnerships under the EU-US Science and Technology Agreement (STA) considering the lessons learned from best practice examples on academia-academia and academia-industry cooperation.

The conference was opened with two speeches held by policy-makers, one from Robert Burmanjer, Head of Unit North America, Latin America and Caribbean at DG Research and Innovation, and the other one from Jennifer Haskell, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Cooperation at the U.S. Department of State. After that, five panel discussions / expert roundtables were organised during the conference on:

- Research, technology and innovation (panel discussion): the aim was to discuss tools and mechanisms for the successful and effective transition of technology from discovery (basic research) to invention (applied research) and the role that governments play in supporting the innovation process. Major recommendations for well working academia-industry collaboration were, among others, the establishment of collaboration platforms, mobility of research personnel between academia and industry, transparent management and collaboration rules as well as including R&D, recruitment and education in the process and finally finding ways to adopt these provisions into the S&T Agreement.
- Best Practices on Transatlantic innovation policies between EU MS & the USA or States (best practice workshop): the objectives of the session were to understand the basic principles of well-working Science and Technology Agreements (STAs) and its effects and benefits on EU-US cooperation, and to learn from practical EU-US innovation cooperation examples to be able to formulate recommendations to policy-makers.

- Framework conditions for transatlantic innovation cooperation: promotion of Entrepreneurship, Exploitation, and Dissemination of research results (expert roundtable): the purpose of the expert roundtable was to discuss the comparative US and EU framework conditions supporting entrepreneurship and innovation, and how to better exploit and disseminate research results leading to greater innovation. The panellists represented multiple organizational views such as innovation education programs, companies, venture capital firms, universities and research organizations, as well as multiple country views.
- Building transatlantic bridges: standards and norms, legal issues, confidentiality, data security, IPR issues (expert roundtable): the expert roundtable aimed at highlighting challenges and discussing solutions and recommendations in terms of framework conditions for transatlantic STI Cooperation, i.e. IPR, standards, norms, guidelines and major legal issues, data security, and funding instruments. It was discussed that there is the need to reduce time required to conclude agreements between actors. One recommendation was to continue with the development of template agreements for cooperation, going beyond the STI framework. Particular emphasis was given regarding the attitude of actors in the STI cooperation, with a strong message on the idea of a “yes” culture for administrations, universities, and businesses. This idea was developed as a will to cooperate and work to create the right conditions for collaboration between various communities and different types of organizations (e.g. universities, research institutions, businesses) with the objective to driving innovation
- Future innovation direction of the EU-US S&T relations (panel discussion): The goal of the final panel discussion was to elaborate on how the EC and Member States (MS) could better coordinate their S&T strategies, and which functions the EU-US S&T Agreement should have with respect to supporting transatlantic innovation policies. Addressing major and common societal challenges such as food, water, and security as a means to support transatlantic innovation policies was a recommendation given by the European Commission.

The recommendations stemming from the EU-US Innovation Conference were gathered in an [input paper](#) which constitutes the report of the event (D3.2). Recommendations mainly focus on the major thematic of the various panel discussions and roundtables, that is to say a successful and effective transition of technology from basic research to applied research, alignment of transatlantic innovation policies between EU MS & the USA or States, and framework conditions for transatlantic innovation cooperation (exploitation, dissemination of research results, and standards and norms, legal issues, confidentiality, data security, and IPR issues).

Science Diplomacy Conference: The promotion of scientific cooperation is an important part of foreign policy. As research and innovation cooperation between countries can help solve technological problems, address grand societal challenges and build constructive international partnerships, many countries pro-actively integrate science as an important element into their international agendas and foreign policies (utilizing the term ‘Science Diplomacy’ to describe international cooperation in research and innovation cooperation, even in times of crisis.) In

particular, EU Commissioner for Research and Innovation, Carlos Moedas at the beginning of his term repeatedly stressed the importance of Science Diplomacy in current times. Upon the invitation of BILAT USA 2.0, high-level policy-makers, reputable scientists as well as high level experts and political advisors came together to discuss on the importance of science diplomacy and areas of potential cooperation for both sides of the Atlantic. Dan Hamilton, Executive Director of the SAIS Center for Transatlantic Relations opened the conference to which two high-level key note speakers could be won: the Nobel Laureate Peter Agre, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School and former President of the AAAS conveyed what science diplomacy implies in practical terms. David O’Sullivan, Ambassador of the European Union to the United States of America, stated that science diplomacy was a powerful tool that could guide political leaders to complex political decisions as it combines evidence-based science with foreign diplomacy. The three further roundtable discussions elaborated on energy and health science diplomacy, and on a more general note common approaches and differences in science diplomacy.

Main outcomes of the conference can be summarized as:

- There is an increasing need for 'science diplomats' worldwide and for effective platforms, mechanisms and spaces for dialogue between policy-makers, academics and researchers working on foreign policy to identify projects and processes. On the one hand, scientists need to be able to “translate” their research and their results into an understandable language, on the other hand, policy-makers and diplomats need to be open to these results and consider them for an evidence-based decision making.
- Areas of common interest in the field of **energy and climate change**: Scientists have the responsibility to answer to societal needs and guide policy-makers with evidence-based knowledge. The following research areas were indicated as possible areas of EU-US research collaboration in the field of energy and environment:
 - Arctic is the key area that US and Europe should work together
 - Smart grid technology on climate change
 - Nuclear energy is still in place in US and in Europe. However, the plants are getting old and handling these aging nuclear plants is an important issue to deal with
 - Combustion inefficiencies, high temperature materials
 - Biofuels catalytics, increasing biofuel production
- Areas of common interest and future engagement in the **health** area can be summarized with:
 - Recommitment and common efforts towards the strengthening of the World Health Organisation is crucial. A political mechanism was advocated for in order to reverse the erosion of WHO capacities.
 - There is a necessity to reflect on how the global community should approach research that is considered particularly dangerous – but perhaps particularly beneficial - to the global community? What should be the expectations between countries when

pursuing this kind of work? There are no international rules to guide whether this work should proceed. The EU and the US should work together toward developing a common approach on such issues.

- Governments' investment in basic science and in advanced development of new medicals and vaccines: there is a need for a system allowing different parts of the medicine and vaccine development community to work more effectively together. A dedicated organisation would be needed to work on translating basic science into medicines and vaccines when the private sector is not likely to do it on its own. A dedicated regulatory approach would be a key development here. The EU and the US should explore existing models to see what they might learn from each other's experience on these issues.
- **General common approaches:** Funding international research cooperation: Given the still nationalistic mechanisms for funding science and research, ways of more multilateral or even global (funding) mechanisms should be thought of in order to better reflect the global nature of the science community's needs (e.g. via more coordinated calls between countries etc.). A rapid, non-bureaucratic possibility of obtaining funding for international research cooperation projects would enable researchers to more effectively tackle global challenges.
- Cultural differences between the EU and the US are at times not enough considered e.g. by policy-makers. However, these cultural differences should be kept in mind when making agreements such as TTIP. Different societies may e.g. react differently to the results of research or different processing although they are "normal" in another country. Trust is important but cultural differences should be taken into account at all times.

The full Science Diplomacy conference report can be downloaded on the BILAT USA 2.0 [project website](#).

1.3.2. BILAT USA 2.0 Workshops / Events

BILAT USA 2.0 conducted many workshops and sessions during the three years of the project's lifetime – several more than originally proposed in the DoW. Next to the two larger conferences, 45 workshops were held across WP1-5. The workshops were organized – in agreement with the EC – in a flexible, sometimes ad-hoc manner and could have the following different formats:

1. Thematic workshops: these workshops specialized on one thematic area and addressed EU and US researchers, research and innovation organizations and institutions covering one particular research question, challenge or joint endeavour. Opportunities in existing funding programmes were in most cases dealt with at some point during the workshops.
2. Workshops on request of the EC: these workshops were implemented by the project on request of the EC. Whereas the agendas of "usual" project workshops were in general elaborated by BILAT USA 2.0 responsible partners, those workshop agendas were elaborated in close collaboration with the EC.

3. Workshops on Funding opportunities: these workshops were mostly held in WP 2 and concentrated on the sole aspect of funding opportunities on both sides as well as an adequate and efficient grant management.
4. Project administrative meetings / meetings with the EC: during the three project years, three workshops with the whole consortium could be realized dealing with project implementation and status quo, financial and administrative issues as well as dissemination activities.

Also, a lot of the BILAT USA 2.0 meetings and events were attended by a representative of the EC or the EU Delegation to the United States of America.

1. Thematic workshops

Thirteen thematic workshops (mostly organized within WP4 but also WP3) that took place in Europe and in the United States of America (USA) targeted experienced European and US researchers/innovators from academia and enterprises. The thematic foci of the workshops fell into the EU-US priority areas: Nanotechnologies, Advanced Materials, Advanced Manufacturing and Processing, Health research, Marine and Arctic sciences and Transport research. One workshop was organized flexibly in another area: Internet of Things. The aim of the workshops was to make suggestions to remove or reduce collaboration barriers and improve the joint cooperation between EU and US. More clearly, the main goals of these workshops can be explained as:

- Strengthening links between European and US researchers and promoting transatlantic collaboration, thus enhancing and developing STI partnerships between the EU and US
- Exchanging of good practices and formation of new partnerships by bringing together European and US researchers
- Increasing the awareness of US research community towards the new Horizon 2020 programme
- Identifying mutual interests and good practices to enhance the quality and quantity of future actions taken by policy-makers as well as implementing agencies.

List of thematic workshops (in WP 3 and WP 4)

| Time | Venue | Project Meetings |
|---------------------|----------------------|--|
| 20 June 2013 | Dublin, Ireland | BILAT USA 2.0 workshop during the EuroNanoForum |
| 12-16 January 2014 | Washington, D.C. USA | TRB 2014, H2020 Information booth (on request of EC) |
| 23-28 February 2014 | Hawaii, USA | BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop – Enhancing EU-US research cooperation in Marine & Ocean sciences |
| 3-4 April 2014 | Frederick, USA | BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop with European Technology Platform on Nano-medicine |
| 20 June 2014 | Boston, USA | Accelerating EU-US business collaboration in health/e-health Research & Innovation: Opportunities, Barriers and Best Practices |
| 6-8 October 2014 | Cambridge, MA, USA | ICT – Internet of Things Meeting during 4 th International Conference on the Internet of Things |
| 11-15 January 2015 | Washington, D.C. USA | TRB 2015, H2020 Information booth (on request of EC) |
| 14 January 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | “Towards enhanced EU-US innovation collaboration through policy measures” |
| 23-24 February 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Seabed Mapping Workshop (Follow-up of Atlantic Seabed Mapping Workshop held in Dublin) |
| 16-17 April 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Atlantic – our Shared Resource / Making the vision reality |
| 21 July 2015 | Barcelona, Spain | Innovating in Medtech, Experiences from EU and USA |
| 1 October 2015 | Strasbourg, France | WS “EU-US and international cooperation” at the EU Brokerage event on KET |
| 6-7 October 2015 | Barcelona, Spain | Brain Health Workshop |

Concluding, the experience from BILAT USA 2.0 thematic workshops shows that:

- Political commitment and (with this in some cases additional) funding is key. The Galway Statement and resulting calls have brought up projects with impressive consortia with partners from the EU and the USA (and Canada in this case).

- Oftentimes, existing funding opportunities are unknown among the scientific community and respectively more funding opportunities are needed to achieve more cooperation. For leveraging existing funding and creating new funding opportunities, mapping the available landscape was considered a necessary starting point.
- The need for more awareness raising activities about H2020 and principal ways or channels to find partners to address open calls was expressed. Partner search as well as a lack of funding was emphasized as a main barrier to cooperation. In the USA, there is still a lack of awareness of the overall launch of Horizon 2020 –and principal channels to find partners for research projects to address open calls unless they had participated in prior EU funding programs. This underscores the need for more practical, tactical programs to help educate potential US partners with the process.
- There is further a need for a common vocabulary (terminology) between the EU and the US in order to correctly define challenges related to the research questions but also in terms of funding conditions. If a common understanding and basis is formed that the research community on both sides can build on, international cooperation will be increased.
- The idea of launching pilot projects and issuing white papers on key topics for international cooperation were considered as a strong way of developing transatlantic cooperation. Initiating and sustaining a dialogue in an informal setting between researchers on both sides is very useful on the researcher level.
- Coordinated calls – between the EC and respective US agencies – were mentioned as effective and attractive tools for international research consortia. The desire to have more of such calls or steps to a further alignment of funding was expressed.
- More emphasis on success stories on EU-US collaborations was mentioned as a need to improve collaboration. “(Experienced) researchers help researchers” is an effective way to show that cooperation works and that it is worth to work the way through a different bureaucracy. It is an advantage if researchers of the same nationality motivate their countrymen as they know the process and the national (funding) landscape. In parallel, organizing briefings on building teams and replying to open calls, including finding partners, were stated as the possible steps to take.
- Innovation (application and commercialization) has to be one of the main goals also in the minds of researchers. Researchers have to be careful not making research “only for the sake of research” but they need to try to perform the programmatic approach stated e.g. in H2020 – putting the research to the market.
- Transatlantic research, development and innovation cooperation should remain a top priority on both sides of the Atlantic. It is well-developed but it appears important to enhance and develop industry and businesses at the heart of this cooperation in the very near future through appropriate businesses-oriented policy measures, such as: Development and further promotion of funding opportunities for EU and US businesses in RTDI programs, Simplification and harmonization of administrative procedures in EU and US RTDI programs to reduce administrative burden in

particular for US (and EU) businesses, or the harmonization and clarification of Intellectual Property Rights regulations and requirements between the two regions. (See all recommendations in BILAT USA 2.0 [Policy Brief](#) from November 2014).

Participants in performed workshops underlined that joint cooperation avoids duplication of money spent and efforts, enables exchange of knowledge and higher quality of research, increases the critical mass and allows sharing of best practices and learning processes.

The report on the thematic workshops was submitted as D4.1. to the EC at the beginning of November 2015.

2. Workshops on request of the EC

WT1.1. “Coordination with SFIC, JCG and EC Directorates” assures among others that project activities are conducted in agreement and – in some cases – on request of the EC. Whereas most of the project workshops were organized under the project’s own direction, eight workshops were organized on specific request of the EC in a flexible manner.

List of Workshops on request of the EC

| Time | Venue | Project Meetings |
|---------------------|-------------------|---|
| 15-16 November 2012 | Brussels, Belgium | Meeting between SFIC Task Force and Coordinator, afterwards between Policy Officer and Coordinator |
| 23-25 May 2013 | Galway, Ireland | Attendance of Meeting for the Signature of the Galway Agreement (workshop was not organized by BILAT USA 2.0 project) |
| 4-9 September 2013 | Plymouth, England | Transatlantic Ocean Literacy Workshop |
| 3-4 April 2014 | Frederick, USA | BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop with European Technology Platform on Nano-medicine |
| 5-7 October 2014 | Rome, Italy | WS on Marine and Arctic Research and information sharing |
| 21 January 2015 | Tromsø, Norway | Trilateral EU, US and CAN WS on priority setting in the Arctic research |
| 23-24 February 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Seabed Mapping Workshop (Follow-up of Atlantic Seabed Mapping Workshop held in Dublin) |
| 16-17 April 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Atlantic – our Shared Resource / Making the vision reality |

Concluding from these workshops, it can be stated that:

- A lot of the ad-hoc events on EC request were conducted in the area of Marine and Arctic research as a follow-up of the Galway Agreement. BILAT USA 2.0 resources were used in order to organize pre-meetings for future potential consortia (e.g. Rome workshop in October 2014) or to launch Blue-Growth projects (e.g. Plymouth workshop in September 2013 and Brussels workshops in February and April 2015), thus utilizing especially the effects of the fact that BILAT USA 2.0 is a CSA.
- On request of the EC, BILAT USA 2.0 conducted a workshop with European and US-American Nano-medicine scientists. The aim was to establish a Nano-characterization lab in Europe after the already existing model. As far as BILAT USA 2.0 knows, the consortium that met at that workshop handed in a proposal for such a lab creation in Europe (under the lead of the ETP nanotechnology).
- At project start, BILAT USA 2.0 was asked to meet with SFIC and explain the project working structure, plan and future activities. The result of this meeting was that both sides confirmed their interest to work together and inform each other about activities to be conducted in relation to the USA. Reports such as D3.1. “Report on US innovation and technology transfer landscape” were sent to SFIC and information on the two larger conferences in particular was shared with SFIC. SFIC US core group leader BMBF actively participated in the BILAT USA 2.0 Innovation Conference in January 2015.

3. Workshops on Funding Opportunities

BILAT USA 2.0 organized 25 workshops, events and sessions either particularly aiming to reach researchers or those particularly aiming for multipliers – here, in particular research administrators and managers. Research managers and administrators are very good information disseminators to their respective community / clients as they are the key persons within a US University or research institution that assess, approve and sign grants.

In order to address both, the European and US research community’s needs, BILAT USA 2.0 organized information sessions on European funding opportunities and grants management in the USA and vice versa, information sessions on US funding opportunities in Europe. All sessions were generally well-visited.

For the US audience, it further proved well to slightly distinguish between two different types of events and information sessions:

- One principally aiming to serve researcher’s needs: here, most researchers and innovators already knew about H2020 in general, ERC or MSCA and had very specific questions regarding mostly individual fellowships.

- The other particularly targeting to inform research managers and administrators. They were on a general note asking e.g. about legal and financial specificities, and looking for support regarding administrative difficulties or regarding questions with the EC Participant Portal.

For both types of sessions, the [BILAT USA 2.0 H2020 Guide for US researchers](#) was particularly helpful as it covers the whole of H2020 and is particularly targeting US researchers and research managers. This guide was taken in printed form to the events and could and can in the future be downloaded even after the project's end.

List of Workshops on Funding Opportunities

| Time | Venue | Project Meetings |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| 4-7 November 2012 | Washington D.C., USA | Presentation of BILAT USA 2.0 & Presentation of results of BILAT USA project |
| 7 August 2013 | Washington D.C., USA | BILAT USA 2.0 – “Practical Workshop” on recent developments concerning the European Framework Program, including tentative changes that will appear when Horizon2020 calls begin in 2014 |
| 25 September 2013 | Miami, USA | Network Workshop on Horizon 2020 (with EU Delegation) |
| 25 September 2013 | Miami, USA | Workshop on Horizon 2020 and possibilities of research funding for US scientists and faculty |
| 19 March 2014 | San Francisco | NCURA 8 th Pre-award Research Administration Conference, H2020: an overview – management of collaborative Research grants and projects |
| 22 March 2014 | Miami, USA | BILAT USA 2.0 – Training Session on H2020 |
| 9 April 2014 | Washington D.C. USA | Going global: fostering innovation and strengthening synergies |
| 9 April | Miami, FL, USA | Practical workshop on EU research and innovation Funding |
| 10-13 April 2014 | Washington D.C., USA | INORMS meeting – Promoting H2020 and BILAT USA 2.0 |
| 18-20 May 2014 | San Francisco | NCURA 8 th Pre-Award Research Administration Conference HORIZON 2020: An Overview of Management of Collaborative Research Grants & Projects |

| Time | Venue | Project Meetings |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 9 June 2014 | Blackpool, UK | Introduction to the US Funding Environment |
| 12-16 January 2014 | Washington, USA | BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop – Horizon 2020 funding opportunities (TRB 2014) |
| 27-31 October, 2014 | Brussels, Oslo, Berlin | EU information tour on US funding programmes |
| 11-15 January 2015 | Washington, D.C. USA | TRB 2015, H2020 Information booth (on request of EC) |
| 4 March 2015 | Orlando, FL, USA | PRA and FRA conference, awareness raising on H2020 and administrative issues |
| 3-6 May 2015 | Miami, USA | eMerge Conference 2015 with H2020 information booth |
| 26-29 April 2015 | Chicago, USA | Joint Region IV and VIII Spring Meeting 2015 – Research Administration going global |
| 4-6 August 2015 | Washington D.C, USA | NCURA Annual Meeting, H2020 Workshop |
| 24-25 September 2015 | Miami, Jupiter, FL, USA | Four Information sessions on H2020 |
| 1 October 2015 | Strasbourg, France | WS “EU-US and international cooperation” at the EU Brokerage event on KET |
| 5-9 October 2015 | Warsaw, Rome, Lisbon | EU information tour on US Funding Opportunities |

There is a large amount of interest in Horizon 2020 from US American scientists, faculty, and companies. After several workshops and meetings organized by and with BILAT USA 2.0 partners as well as external partners, it can be concluded that many researchers and fellows are interested in Europe and in cooperating with European partners. In the following, the main conclusions from the H2020 awareness raising events are drawn:

- The primary question from the US researchers was about practical information and how to apply for a grant. They generally want to know what they and their US entities are eligible to apply for, and under what circumstances they can receive funding. They also want to know what help is available to US researchers interested in cooperating with Europe (e.g. a similar structure to an NCP). They generally rated these personal information sessions as helpful.

- The primary question of US research administrators and managers was related to the Grant Agreement (GA) and whether they – if they take part in an EU project – would need to sign the agreement. As the GA is an agreement under foreign (Belgian) law, US entities encounter many challenges. Several instances were mentioned in the workshops where they dropped out of a consortium with other EU partners as they were not entitled to sign any agreements under foreign law.
- Researchers and research managers expressed a particular interest in individual fellowship programmes such as the MSCA and the ERC programme. They are very attractive for US researchers and statistics show that US participants are generally quite successful in these European programme lines. In order to keep US participation high in these fields, it is essential to continue the efforts so far performed by BILAT USA 2.0 as well as EURAXESS links and increase information here.
- Dissemination of material is essential during workshops, fairs, conferences, and information sessions. Within BILAT USA 2.0 a lot of information material and gimmicks were produced at project start, among them roll-ups, boarding cards with information on the project, pens with the project logo etc. They were always brought to events and could thus further raise awareness on the project and on H2020 as well as the project corporate identity. Here, in particular the H2020 guide for US researchers was of high importance.
- Webinars are an economic and easy-to-use tool to spread information to large audiences. Webinars having been organized by BILAT USA 2.0 were generally well attended with more participants in the range of 50-200 listeners. They thus provide a good discussion space that can combine people in different time zones. However, this does not replace a person-to-person contact.

In conclusion, after organizing many workshops and information sessions on Horizon 2020 and its different EU funding possibilities in the United States, there is a big interest in Horizon 2020 from the US community. It is important to continue to organize other information sessions and follow-up sessions in order to achieve and raise awareness of H2020.

At this point, it needs to be stressed however that there was a very large interest of European researchers in the information sessions on US funding opportunities. BILAT USA 2.0 conducted two tours covering altogether six European cities (Brussels, Oslo, Berlin, Warsaw, Rome and Lisbon). All events were overbooked. With these information sessions bringing experts in US grant management to Europe passing on first hand and very practical information hit a nerve in the European community.

During the information sessions in particular in Europe, it has become evident that a common challenge for Europeans when applying in a “foreign” programme is the different wording used in different funding programmes. A first step towards solving this problem has been initiated by the EC already in December 2013 where it was discussed to have a sort of “glossary” juxtaposing the EU-term and the US term and giving a short description on the meaning. Working towards such a glossary would particularly help the researchers and researcher managers on both sides of the Atlantic.

On a general note, information sessions in both directions should be continued by the follow-up project to serve the need for more and thorough information that was expressed by the community.

4. Project Administrative Meetings / Meetings with the EC

To ensure an efficient project implementation, BILAT USA 2.0 held three project consortium meetings where administrative or content-related questions and difficulties could be discussed and solved. To complement the personal meetings, several telephone conferences and some video-conferences were held – sometimes with the whole consortium, other times just with those partners responsible for a tasks, workshop or report.

Personal meetings with the EC and other policy bodies in addition to telephone calls are of course essential to fully understand the need of the EC and directions they want to go into.

List of Project Administrative Meetings / Meetings with the EC

| Time | Venue | Project Meetings |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| 7-8 November 2012 | Washington D.C. USA | Project's Kick-off Meeting (with all project partners) |
| 15-16 November 2012 | Brussels, Belgium | Meeting between SFIC Task Force and Coordinator, afterwards between Policy Officer and Coordinator |
| 22 January 2013 | Brussels Belgium | Meeting with PO on BILAT USA 2.0 |
| 16-17 April 2013 | Brussels, Belgium | Meeting with Project Officer |
| 30 October 2013 | Bonn, Germany | WS on Survey to the EU research and funding institutions for the assessment of having a joint EU representation in the USA (coordination with other BILAT projects) |
| 5-6 December 2013 | Brussels Belgium | Meeting with EC regarding Workshop on Marine and Arctic Science (WT1.3.) |
| 1-2 April 2014 | Brussels, Belgium | Project Periodic Meeting (with all project partners) |
| 26 May 2015 | Brussels Belgium | Meeting on request of the EC regarding Workshop for WT 1.3 (with unit F.4) |
| 29 September 2015 | Washington D.C. | Project Final Consortium Meeting |

1.3.3. BILAT USA 2.0 Reports and Deliverables

Altogether, BILAT USA 2.0 had to submit 21 deliverables (RE and PU deliverables). All of them have been submitted via the participant portal, some with a slight delay which has been communicated to the EC. Section A, table 1 shows the deliverables that have been produced starting with the most important ones. However, at this point, five important deliverables and their results will briefly be summarized.

D1.2. Input paper for a better coordination of EU, MS and AC STI initiatives with the USA:

This deliverable had originally been planned to be based on a conference (EU-US STI Cooperation Forum) with the EC as well as the US counterparts. This conference was intended to gather various stakeholders from Europe and the USA to provide room for dialogue and scenario development in an identified cooperation research theme (e.g. open access or others). D1.3 “Inventory of existing programmes in Europe and the USA” was supposed to feed into this conference so that stakeholders would have been able to define a certain key topic of mutual interest. On request of the European Commission (EC) however, BILAT USA 2.0 changed the focus of the conference to the very relevant topic of “Science Diplomacy”, as there was a need for support in this particular area. After consultation with the Policy Officer, it was agreed to organize a high-level conference on the topic requested by the EC in Washington D.C.

D1.4. European research centres and representations in the USA: About 400 research organizations, research funding agencies, universities, university associations, SMEs, Clusters, and/or Technology Transfer offices in 42 European Union Member States (MS) and Associated Countries (AC) had been contacted by the twelve BILAT-project consortia. The participation or response rate was about 25%, with a total number of 94 responding organizations from 28 European MS and AC. In December 2014, BILAT USA 2.0 was contacted to provide the first overall reflections resulting from the survey (online between 1 September and 31 October 2014). In January 2015 the first overall results had been sent to the EC as a basis to prepare the (at that time Draft) Work Programmes 2016/2017. Consequently, the EC published a [call](#) to create Centres / Networks of European research and innovation addressing all or part of China, the USA and Brazil (those countries that were the top three destinations of EU research organisations and funding agencies).

The overall results, conclusions and recommendations of all BILAT projects have been compiled in a report by FFG. The USA related results incl. analyses, conclusions and recommendations were compiled and submitted via the Participant Portal. The study demonstrated in particular the interest of EU research organisation in getting in touch or staying in close contact to the US research landscape / market.

D2.2 Report on monitoring and evaluation of the Horizon 2020 activities: The objective of this deliverable is to assess the US participation in Horizon 2020 by providing analytical data on the number of applications and selected proposals, success rates of participation, the most frequented cooperation areas, cooperation partners and partner profiles. US American scientists are very important research partners for European consortia, mainly in areas related to health and individual fellowship grants like MSCA. The analysis showed that at this moment the participation in the MSCA is predominant (68.66% of all submitted applications and 65.63% of all applications that were on the list of granted proposals). US Americans are very successful also in the Health theme as

in this programme section within the third pillar US American scientists are fully eligible for funding. US researchers are also very successful in the ERC grants.

D3.1. US innovation and technology transfer landscape: The overall objective of this [report](#) is to set the ground for fostering cooperation between the EU and the USA in innovation-related matters through the creation of a sound knowledge base. This report is aimed at EU and US researchers and policy-makers, but also anyone interested in getting an overview of the current state of play on innovation policy both in the EU and the US. The deliverable analyses the innovation measures and the framework conditions for research and innovation in the US and EU. It gives an overview of the US national innovation system and presents the latest developments in terms of the broader EU innovation policy and respective policies and performance in the EU Member States and the US. In the report, quantitative and qualitative information are provided about the programmes in order to highlight their impact. Besides, the report presents the S&T cooperation patterns and agreements between EU and US, and presents a brief comparison of the EU and US innovation policy systems and innovation performance indicators. Furthermore, there is a brief set of policy recommendations for further improving STI cooperation between the EU and the US. The report was published on the website (knowledge base).

D3.2. Input paper based on the outcomes of the EU-US innovation conference: This [deliverable](#) summarizes the recommendations stemming from the EU-US Innovation Conference which constitutes parts of the report of the event (D3.2). Recommendations mainly focus on the major thematic of the various panel discussions and roundtables, that is to say a successful and effective transition of technology from basic research to applied research, alignment of transatlantic innovation policies between EU MS & the USA or States, and framework conditions for transatlantic innovation cooperation (exploitation, dissemination of research results, and standards and norms, legal issues, confidentiality, data security, and IPR issues)².

1.3.4. Other / Extra BILAT USA 2.0 Activities

Due to the fact that BILAT USA 2.0 either had remaining budget and capacity or the project had received an official request, several extra project activities could be conducted. Despite the fact that more workshops than originally planned could be conducted, these additional activities range from cooperation with other initiatives to extra and additional reports and surveys.

Within the frame of WP 1: Towards the goal of examining the feasibility and the benefit of establishing a Joint European Liaison Office of research organisations in the USA, BILAT USA 2.0 had the idea to join forces with twelve other EU-funded BILAT projects. All these BILAT Projects had this same task. (The task responds to the FP7 Capacities Work Programme 2012, Part 7 (FP7-INCO-2012-2, BILAT) which states (p. 14) that the BILAT projects should “study the feasibility of bringing together representations of European research organisations in the targeted country, with the view to establish a joint liaison office”).

² For more information on the innovation conference, see page 8.

In order not to bother EU research organisations with twelve different questionnaires on the same subject and with the aim to obtain comparable results to give to the EC, BILAT USA 2.0 suggested to the project coordinators to join forces and conduct this survey and the feasibility study together. Although results are good and a report covering twelve different BILAT countries could be written, the activity that was coordinated by BILAT USA 2.0 was a much larger coordination effort having so many different projects on board. However, the EC acknowledged the added value from this activity.

Within the frame of WP 2: In WP 2, three additional reports were written and sent to the EC. These include:

- A report called “[EU research organizations’ participation in US programs](#)”

The report presents the results of an analysis based on data regarding project-related sub-grants. The information provided in the report is based on a survey conducted by NCURA, while the final report was prepared by the IPPT PAN and DLR. The report has been sent to the EC.

- A report called “Existing Challenges for EU-US research cooperation and Policy Recommendations for S&T Cooperation between the EU and the US” (restricted).

BILAT USA 2.0 conducted a survey following a report that had originally been written by the first BILAT USA and Link2US project. The report has been sent to the EC but not published on the website as it includes partly sensitive information.

- H2020 Guide for US researchers: On request of the EC, BILAT USA 2.0 further produced a guide for US researchers and research managers entitled “A Guide to US participation in the European Union’s Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)”. This [guide](#) was oftentimes taken to events and spread to the participants either in a printed version or virtually which can be done even after the end of the project.

Within the frame of WP 3: Additional task called “Industry participation in H2020”

The WP3 partners replied positively to a demand expressed by the EU Delegation to the United States to conduct further activities aimed at enhancing US industry participation in H2020. inno TSD proposed the methodology to achieve this goal. A report was produced, “US industry participation in FP7 - Focus on Health and ICT” (July 2015) with the aim to assess the US industry participation in the Seventh Framework Programme by providing detailed, analytical and comparative data on this participation on the one hand; and gathering the feedback of US industry participants and EU project coordinators involved on the other hand, especially to better understand their barriers and drivers for an enhanced participation in the future. The focus was put on two areas: Health and ICT. The final aim was to help policy-makers and the project BILAT USA 2.0 understand which elements make US industry participation rise, provide elements on how to approach US industry and suggest ways to make their participation in EU programmes more attractive, notably in view of the Horizon 2020

Work Programme 2016-2017 and future programmes. The report was submitted to the EC and the EU Delegation in the USA.

Based on the conclusions of the report, additional adapted dissemination materials' intending to promote participation in H2020 of US industries was designed. A leaflet with sections such as "Benefits for US companies to participate in H2020" and "Past experiences of US companies' participation" was created.

LINKS OF INTEREST

Project stories:
<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/newsroom/551/>

How to get funding?
<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/how-get-funding>

MORE INFORMATION AND NEXT INFORMATION SESSION

Do not miss the next information sessions:

- Health calls: September 2015 in Brussels
<http://goo.gl/FK0Hr8>
- ICT calls: 20-22 October 2015 in Lisbon
<http://goo.gl/6JopOg>

Bilat website:
<http://www.eu-science-technology.eu/>

BILAT USA 2.0 has received funding from the European Union's seventh framework programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant 312201

Edited by:

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR US COMPANIES

WHAT IS H2020?

Horizon 2020 is the world's biggest EU Research and Innovation programme with nearly 480 billion of funding available over 7 years (2014 to 2020). It promises more breakthroughs, discoveries and work-projects by taking great ideas from the lab to the market.

Horizon 2020 is open to everyone, with a simple structure that makes sure new projects get off the ground quickly – and achieve results faster. H2020 is seeking for US companies to participate on the upcoming calls.

For more information:
<http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/what-horizon-2020>

HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN H2020

1. FIND A CALL 2. FIND PARTNERS 3. CHECK YOUR PROJECT 4. REGISTER YOUR PROJECT 5. SUBMIT AN APPLICATION

If you are willing to get involved in the H2020 program, here you have some information about where to find a suitable call for proposals or project partners and how to submit your proposal.

First of all you need to find your EU partners: <http://goo.gl/vDp9GI>

The following guidance services facilitate your participation:

- H2020 China Manual: step-by-step online guide through the Portal processes from proposal preparation and submission to reporting on your on-going project
- Reference documents: library of legal documents, guidance notes, and additional reference material for H2020 and FP7
- Search for already registered organisations and their PICs
- Financial viability self-check: tool allows you simulating the financial viability check of your organisation
- SME participation: dedicated H2020 guidance page for SME

You can find further information on the H2020 website participants section: <http://goo.gl/vDp9GI>

Do not hesitate to ask your project coordinator whether you are eligible or not to specific calls.

WHICH ARE THE BENEFITS FOR US COMPANIES TO PARTICIPATE IN H2020?

- Access to complementary scientific experience, expertise and technology development
- Stepping stone to business development and export activity in the EU/US by gaining deeper knowledge of US/EU ecosystem and identifying suitable business/trade partners
- Gaining expert reputation by participating in prestigious RTDI programs
- Contact to suitable networks, market structures and business cultures
- Tap into new and wider sources of funding (in some specific calls)
- To keep abreast with the most recent R&D activities and technologies conducted in Europe and other parts of the world

PAST EXPERIENCE OF US COMPANIES PARTICIPATION

Before H2020, similar programme was implemented in EU named FP7. With a total of 517 US participations in FP7 in 411 projects, the US has represented a major international partner, and represented 11% of the total non-European participation in FP7. The US is also a major international player in terms of proposals, with 1,686 proposals submitted with at least one US participant in the first three years of the FP7 program.

US companies that participated in FP7 programmes include big companies (such as Intel corporation or Siemens Corporation) as well as a certain number of innovative or research-based US SMEs (such as Securus Corporation, ENLISIO and PatientCrossroads). Additionally, US companies that led proposals include Grass Commmons, BIONVISION, Cardiova and Particle Science INC.

The experience of this past participation was really successful.

"We felt very supported by EU counterparts and we appreciated the best practices and the advice shared by the EU partners, who are much more experienced in the participation of such projects." - BILCOM

Picture 3 - Leaflet to promote H2020 towards US industries

1.4. The impact (incl. the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far) and the main dissemination activities

The FP7 funded project BILAT USA 2.0 has successfully achieved all of its proposed project tasks, events and workshops as well as activities. The project has managed to a) facilitate contacts with partners in third countries with the aim to provide better access to research carried out elsewhere in the world, b) to address specific problems that have a global character, on the basis of mutual interest and mutual benefit, c) proposed recommendations to overcome barriers for cooperation, and d) assessed the status-quo and progress of transatlantic cooperation. Thus, BILAT USA 2.0 has achieved all aspects to be addressed according to the International Cooperation Programme's (INCO) 2012 Work Programme. Towards a research area that solves "problems of a global character", the research and innovation cooperation between Europe and the United States plays an outstanding role.

With the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee of the Regions entitled "Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: A strategic approach"³, the EC described the approach with which they committed to certain ways of how to shape the EU's international research and innovation cooperation and partnerships:

"International cooperation in research and innovation contributes to the broader policies of the Union, as reflected in the Europe 2020 strategy, in supporting the following objectives:

- a) **Strengthening the Union's excellence and attractiveness in research and innovation as well as its economic and industrial competitiveness** – by creating win-win situations and cooperating on the basis of mutual benefit; by accessing external sources of knowledge; by attracting talent and investment to the Union; by facilitating access to new and emerging markets; and by agreeing on common practices for conducting research and exploiting the results;*
- b) **Tackling global societal challenges** – by developing and deploying effective solutions more rapidly and by optimising the use of research infrastructures; and,*
- c) **Supporting the Union's external policies** – by coordinating closely with enlargement, neighbourhood, trade, Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), humanitarian aid and development policies and making research and innovation an integral part of a comprehensive package of external action.*

*'Science diplomacy' will use international cooperation in research and innovation as an instrument of soft power and a mechanism for improving relations with key countries and regions. Good international relations may, in turn, facilitate effective cooperation in research and innovation.'*⁴

Global research and innovation were, until recently, dominated by the European Union, the USA and Japan. Although emerging economies such as Brazil, China, India and South-Korea grow in scientific output, the USA still plays a key part in global science and is an important partner to team up with. The impact of this "teaming up" with the USA through different tasks and activities of

³ COM(2012) 497 final, 14 September 2012.

⁴ COM(2012) 497 final, 14 September 2012, p.: 4

BILAT USA 2.0 will be demonstrated taking a look at the objectives laid out in the international cooperation strategy:

BILAT USA 2.0 has strengthened the **Union's excellence and attractiveness** in research and innovation as well as its economic and industrial competitiveness by:

- **Spreading information on open funding opportunities both in the EU and the USA:** the project has altogether organized 25 workshops and sessions at larger events and conferences both in the EU and the USA to inform researchers and innovators on existing funding possibilities. Both regions / country have very great programmes that attract excellent researchers worldwide. On the EU side, individual fellowship programmes such as the MSC-Actions or the European Research Council are important programmes US researchers apply for with great enthusiasm. Further, the collaborative projects in the health area but also those that encourage US American participation are considered extensively by US scientists. On the US side, in particular the programmes of well-known research funding institutions and agencies such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) strongly appeal to European scientific performers. The interest that BILAT USA 2.0 experienced from European scientists in the EU-tour on US funding programmes was immense as such (free of charge) information sessions are rare in Europe. Therefore, with the several information sessions on H2020 as well as US programmes, the project has increased the Europeans attractiveness regarding its programmes while at the same time, it increased their knowledge on how to obtain and manage US funds. The further different dissemination activities also contributed to this goal.
- **Spreading information to increase industry participation in H2020:** On the basis of a BILAT USA 2.0 report “US industry participation in FP7 - Focus on Health and ICT”⁵ (July 2015), the project designed additional adapted dissemination material targeting in particular US industry actors and promote their participation in H2020. A leaflet with sections such as “Benefits for US companies to participate in H2020” and “Past experiences of US companies’ participation” was created, published on the website and spread at certain events. Thus, with such targeted information material, the project contributed to strengthen the Union's attractiveness regarding innovation as it addresses doubts and problems, US industry partners encounter when cooperating.
- **Conducting an analysis on the innovation landscape** in the USA in comparison to the one in Europe: The overall objective of this report is to set the ground for fostering cooperation between the EU and the USA in innovation-related matters through the creation of a knowledge base. This report is aimed at EU and US researchers and policy-makers, but also

⁵ This report had the aim to assess the US industry participation in the Seventh Framework Programme by providing detailed, analytical and comparative data on this participation on the one hand; and gathering the feedback of US industry participants and EU project coordinators involved on the other hand, especially to better understand their barriers and drivers for an enhanced participation in the future. The focus was put on two areas: Health and ICT. The final aim was to help policymakers and the project BILAT USA 2.0 understand which elements make US industry participation rise, provide elements on how to approach US industry and suggest ways to make their participation in EU programmes more attractive, notably in view of the Horizon 2020 Work Programme 2016-2017 and future programmes. The report was submitted to the EC and the EU Delegation in the USA.

anyone interested in getting an overview about the current state of play on innovation policy both in the EU and the US. It analyses the innovation measures and the framework conditions for research and innovation in the US and EU. It further gives an overview of the US national innovation system and presents the latest developments in terms of the broader EU innovation policy and respective policies and performance in the EU Member States and the US

- **Bringing EU and US researchers and innovators together in different workshops and conferences:** By doing so, the project facilitated the exchange between researchers from different continents regarding a particular topic. It could well be that they at those events jointly decided to develop a research project together. By facilitating the cooperation between excellent researchers, the critical mass is likewise increased and one gets access to research results that may not have been achieved without cooperation. Thus, BILAT USA 2.0 with its nine different workshops bringing researchers of one area together supported the increase of the Union's excellence (see also next point "tackling global challenges").

BILAT USA 2.0 has contributed to the **tackling of global societal challenges**. However, here it is important and significant to have in mind that a project instrument such as a Coordination and Support Action does not develop any research in particular. It "solely" facilitates and supports either policy or researchers that aim to tackle societal challenges.

BILAT USA 2.0 was oriented towards the priority areas for EU-US cooperation determined by the JCG, namely: health, NMP, Marine and Arctic research as well as Transport research. All of these are research fields that are highly expensive and require international cooperation to reduce costs and take advantage of progress made elsewhere. With its support in bringing researchers together, BILAT USA 2.0 has also contributed to the tackling of global challenges. A few remarkable examples should be mentioned at this point that were facilitated by BILAT USA 2.0:

- On request of the EC, BILAT USA 2.0 conducted a workshop with European and US-American Nano-medicine scientists. The aim was to establish a Nano-characterization lab in Europe following the already existing US model. As far as BILAT USA 2.0 knows, the consortium that met at that workshop and afterwards handed in a joint proposal for such a lab creation in Europe.
- Three workshops to facilitate the preparation of proposals with EU and US American participation in the area of Marine and Arctic research were supported. The project was approached by the scientists for support which is why the workshops could take place (Plymouth WS on Ocean Literacy, Rome WS on Information Sharing and Tromsø WS "Trilateral EU, US and CAN WS on priority setting in the Arctic research").
- The workshop "Accelerating EU-US Business Collaboration in Health/e-Health Research & Innovation: Opportunities, Barriers and Best Practices" brought together more than 60 participants, representing SMEs and industry from the EU and the USA, as well as clusters and other facilitators for transatlantic business collaboration, and policy-makers, working in the health/e-health field. The workshop was organized as a platform for exchange on collaboration opportunities and good practices for EU and US businesses in health/e-health research and innovation projects. An input paper "Barriers and drivers for US and EU

businesses to collaborate in research, technology, development and innovation (RTDI) projects” notably mentioned and analysed several barriers that EU and US businesses in general might encounter in building and implementing transatlantic RDI projects, based on a literature analysis and interviews, as well as drivers for collaboration. These identified barriers can be taken into account by policy-makers to improve framework conditions and facilitate innovation-related cooperation.

BILAT USA 2.0 **supported the Union’s external policies** by its activities in general and per se. The BILAT-instrument is a tool to provide flexible support to the EC when it comes to increasing the cooperation with an international partner country. As the EC with its targeted international cooperation actions supports the Union’s external policies – as depicted in the Communication from September 2012, the BILAT projects automatically follow this approach.

Project activities performed can be labeled as “science diplomatic” activities. Raising awareness and increasing information on mutual funding programmes and opportunities, bringing researchers and innovators together and providing recommendations based on workshops and comments by scientists is the epitome of Science Diplomacy.

On request of the EC, the project further organized a conference on the subject matter of Science Diplomacy. Due to the high relevance and timeliness of the topic, high level speakers, policy-makers and experts in the field came together to discuss science diplomacy and future possible (or necessary) areas for cooperation⁶.

In addition to the objectives raised in the Union’s International Cooperation Strategy, the project has accomplished the four further aspects mentioned in the Work Programme 2012. As described, BILAT USA 2.0 has via its various workshops and conferences **facilitated contacts with partners in third countries** with the aim of providing better access to research carried out elsewhere in the world (in this case the highly relevant USA). **Specific problems of global character** were addressed in the several thematic workshops performed with actors from the EU and the USA. The necessary “mutual interest” and “mutual benefit” was assured by orienting the thematic direction to the priority areas determined by the EU-US Joint Consultative Group. **Recommendations to overcome barriers for cooperation** were proposed at various points, e.g. in D3.2. the Report of the Innovation Conference, in D3.3. Barriers and Drivers for SMEs, in D2.2. the Report on the monitoring and evaluation of the Horizon 2020 activities or in D4.1. the Conclusions and recommendations for future thematic collaborations. Further, a survey to US research organizations and performers has been conducted identifying barriers for cooperation. Several corrective measures have been proposed⁷. The final point in the WP addressed the **assessment of the status-quo and progress of transatlantic cooperation**. Proposals of US researchers have generally increased, however, the signed Grant Agreements have decreased. This information has been acknowledged by the EC and is subject of internal discussions. However, taking measures that could potentially impact the GA need to be taken by the EC, if wanted.

⁶ For a short summary of the Science Diplomacy Conference, check p. 10. The full report can be downloaded on the [project’s website](#).

⁷ Restricted report has been sent to EC.

The first Pilot NCP for legal and financial issues (within the frame of BILAT USA 2.0) will be continued under the next BILAT project for the USA. It already is a contact point for US researchers in the USA and these efforts should be continued.

Lastly, BILAT USA 2.0 also supported the **increased cooperation and exchange with the EU MS and AC**, either through the direct contact with MS institutions or via the Strategic Forum on International S&T Cooperation. It has been a constant endeavor of the EC to augment the exchange with MS / AC and avoid duplication. BILAT USA 2.0 informed the SFIC about strategic and larger events that were of interest to them (in some cases SFIC was actively involved).

The project website, its content (documents such as e.g. the H2020 guide) will remain available for future researchers in the USA and in Europe that are interested in transatlantic cooperation. It serves and will serve in the future as a great source of information.

For a complete list of dissemination activities, please check table A2.

1.5. The address of the project public website and contact details

The website can be found following this link: www.EuUsScienceTechnology.Eu

Project Coordinator:

Dr. Olaf Heilmayer

Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und
Raumfahrt e.V.

International Bureau of BMBF at DLR

Heinrich-Konen-Str. 1

53227 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49-228-3821-1443

Fax: +49-228-3821-1444

E-mail: Olaf.Heilmayer@dlr.de

Scientific Coordinator:

Vera Kammann

Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und
Raumfahrt e.V.

International Bureau of BMBF at DLR

Heinrich-Konen-Str. 1

53227 Bonn, Germany

Tel: +49-228-3821-1917

Fax: +49-228-3821-1444

E-mail: Vera.Kammann@dlr.de

2 Use and dissemination of foreground

2.1 Section A1 (public)

This section includes two templates a list of all scientific (peer reviewed) publications relating to the foreground of the project.

| TEMPLATE A1: LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS, STARTING WITH THE MOST IMPORTANT ONES ⁸ | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|---|---|
| NO. | Title | Main author | Title of the periodical or the series | Number, date or frequency | Publisher | Place of publication | Year of publication | Relevant pages | Permanent identifiers ⁹ (if available) | Is/Will open access ¹⁰ provided to this publication? |
| 1 | Input paper for a better coordination of EU, MS and AC STI initiatives with the USA | Vera Kammann, DLR (with support of WP1 partners) | | | | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 2 | US innovation and technology transfer landscape | Tonia Damvakeraki, IISA (with support of WP3 partners) | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 3 | Input paper based on the outcomes of the EU-US innovation Conference | Elli Stepanovic, FFG (with support of | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |

⁸ A ranking „starting with the most important ones“ is difficult in such a project as this CSA did not produce peer-reviewed scientific publications. However, such a ranking was attempted.

⁹ A permanent identifier should be a persistent link to the published version full text if open access or abstract if article is pay per view) or to the final manuscript accepted for publication (link to article in repository).

¹⁰ Open Access is defined as free of charge access for anyone via Internet. Please answer "yes" if the open access to the publication is already established and also if the embargo period for open access is not yet over but you intend to establish open access afterwards.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|------|---|---|-----|
| | | <i>WP3 partners)</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | European research centres and representations in the USA | <i>Elli Stepanovic, FFG (with support of DLR)</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 5 | Report on monitoring and evaluation of the H2020 activities | <i>Zygmunt Krasinski, IPPT PAN</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 6 | Report on US FP7 participation in collaborative research projects and support actions | <i>Elli Stepanovic, FFG</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 7 | Conclusions and recommendations for future thematic collaborations | <i>Guliz Sutcu, TÜBITAK</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 8 | US programmes for Europeans | <i>Ilter Haliloglu, TÜBITAK</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 9 | Report “Barriers and drivers for SMEs to engage in transatlantic innovation” | <i>Svetlana Klessova, inno TSD</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2014 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 10 | Recommendations for possible joint activities | <i>Zygmunt Krasinski, IPPT PAN</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 11 | Inventory of existing programmes win Europe with the USA | <i>Elli Stepanovic, FFG</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2014 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 12 | Report about awareness raising activities for the EU framework programme | <i>Christine Caly, FIU (with help of WP2 partners)</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2015 | \ | \ | Yes |
| 13 | Information material and dissemination evaluation | <i>Vera Kammann, DLR</i> | \ | \ | \ | www.EuUsScienceTechnology.eu | 2014 | \ | \ | Yes |

2.2. Section A2

List of all dissemination activities (publications, conferences, workshops, web sites/applications, press releases, flyers, articles published in the popular press, videos, media briefings, presentations, exhibitions, thesis, interviews, films, TV clips, posters).

| TEMPLATE A2: LIST OF DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|
| N O. | Type of activities ¹¹ | Main leader | Title | Date/Period | Place | Type of audience ¹² | Size of audience | Countries addressed |
| 1 | Conference | DLR | <i>New Frontiers in Science Diplomacy – Opportunities for US –EU Cooperation</i> | 28 September 2015 | Washington D.C., USA | Policy-makers and Diplomats, researchers, experts, interested public | 100-150 | EU and USA |
| 2 | Conference | FFG | <i>EU-US Innovation Conference – How to integrate the innovation dimension into the S&T Agreement</i> | 14 January 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Policy-makers, innovators and researchers, experts, interested public | 100-150 | EU and USA |
| 3 | Thematic Workshop | TUBITAK | <i>BILAT USA 2.0 workshop during EuroNanoForum</i> | 20 June 2014 | Dublin, Ireland | Nanotechnology researchers and experts, | 30 | EU and USA |

¹¹ A drop down list allows choosing the dissemination activity: publications, conferences, workshops, web, press releases, flyers, articles published in the popular press, videos, media briefings, presentations, exhibitions, thesis, interviews, films, TV clips, posters, Other.

¹² A drop down list allows choosing the type of public: Scientific Community (higher education, Research), Industry, Civil Society, Policy makers, Medias, Other ('multiple choices' is possible).

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|------------------|--|--------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | scientists in general | | |
| 4 | Thematic Workshop | DMI (and NCURA) | <i>TRB 2014 – BILAT USA 2.0 H2020 Information Booth</i> | 12-16 January 2014 | Washington D.C. USA | Transport researchers and policy makers | Many passing customers | EU and USA |
| 5 | Thematic Workshop | DMI (and FIU) | <i>BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop – Enhancing EU-US research cooperation in Marine & Ocean sciences</i> | 23-28 April 2014 | Honolulu, Hawaii, USA | Marine and ocean scientists and policy makers | 35 | EU and USA |
| 6 | Thematic Workshop | BIOCAT | <i>BILAT USA 2.0 Workshop with European Technology Platform on Nano-medicine</i> | 3-4 April 2014 | Frederick, USA | Nano-medicine scientists | 30 | EU and USA |
| 7 | Thematic Workshop | inno TSD | <i>Accelerating EU-US business collaboration in health/e-health research and Innovation: Opportunities, Barriers and Best Practice</i> | 20 June 2014 | Boston, USA | Researchers and Innovators in Health area | 60 | EU and USA |
| 8 | Thematic Workshop | DMI with IISA | <i>ICT – Internet of Things Meeting during 4th International Conference on the Internet of Things</i> | 6-8 October 2014 | Cambridge MA, USA | IoT researchers | 40 | EU and USA |
| 9 | Thematic Workshop | DMI (and NCURA) | <i>TRB 2015 – BILAT USA 2.0 H2020 Information Booth</i> | 11-15 January 2014 | Washington D.C. USA | Transport researchers and policy makers | Many passing customers | EU and USA |
| 10 | Thematic Workshop | inno TSD | <i>Towards enhanced EU-US innovation collaboration through policy measures</i> | 14 January 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Researchers and innovators | 60 | EU and USA |
| 11 | Thematic Workshop | inno TSD | <i>Seabed Mapping Workshop (Follow-up of Atlantic Seabed Mapping Workshop in Dublin)</i> | 23-24 January 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Marine and Arctic researchers and policy-makers | 40 | EU and USA |
| 12 | Thematic Workshop | inno TSD and AKA | <i>Atlantic – our Shared Resource / Making the vision reality</i> | 16-17 April 2015 | Brussels, Belgium | Marine and Arctic researchers and policy-makers | 100 | EU and USA |
| 13 | Thematic Workshop | BIOCAT | <i>Innovating in Medtech, Experiences from the EU and USA</i> | 21 July 2015 | Barcelona Spain | Researchers and | 60 | EU and USA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------|--|-----|------------|
| | | | | | | Innovators in Medtech Science | | |
| 14 | Thematic Workshop | FFG | <i>EU-US and international cooperation at the EU Brokerage event on KET</i> | 1 October 2015 | Strasbourg, France | Researchers and Innovators in nano-technology | 40 | EU and USA |
| 15 | Thematic Workshop | BIOCAT | <i>Brain Health Workshop</i> | 6-7 October 2015 | Barcelona, Spain | Researchers and Innovators in Brain sciences | 50 | EU and USA |
| 16 | EC requested Workshop | DLR | <i>Meeting between SFIC Task Force and coordinator</i> | 15 November 2012 | Brussels, Belgium | SFIC Members | 25 | EU and USA |
| 17 | EC requested Workshop | DLR | <i>Attendance at Meeting for the Signature of the Galway Agreement</i> | 23-25 May 2013 | Galway, Ireland | High-level policy-makers and researchers | 300 | EU and USA |
| 18 | EC requested Workshop | DLR | <i>Transatlantic Ocean Literacy Workshop</i> | 4-9 September 2013 | Plymouth, UK | Ocean Literacy scientists | 35 | EU and USA |
| 19 | EC requested Workshop | DLR (with IPPT PAN) | <i>WS on Marine and Arctic Research and Information sharing</i> | 5-7 October 2014 | Rome, Italy | Marine and Arctic scientists and Policy-makers | 45 | EU and USA |
| 20 | EC requested Workshop | DLR | <i>Trilateral EU, US and CAN WS on priority setting in Arctic research</i> | 21 January 2015 | Tromsø, Norway | Arctic scientists and Policy-makers | 45 | EU and USA |
| 21 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>Presentation of BILAT USA 2.0 and presentation of BILAT USA project at NCURA Annual Meeting</i> | 4-7 November 2012 | Washington D.C., USA | Research managers / administrators | 25 | EU and USA |
| 22 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>BILAT USA 2.0-Practical Workshop on recent developments concerning the Framework Programme incl. tentative changes in H2020</i> | 7 August 2013 | Washington D.C., USA | Research managers / administrators | 45 | EU and USA |
| 23 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>Network Workshop on H2020</i> | 25 September 2013 | Miami, FL, USA | University faculty and | 25 | EU and USA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | researchers | | |
| 24 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>WS on H2020 and possibilities of research funding for US scientists and faculty</i> | 25 September 2013 | Miami, FL, USA | University faculty and researchers | 25 | EU and USA |
| 25 | Awareness raising Workshop | FFG and NCURA | <i>NCURA 8th Pre-award Research Administration Conference, H2020: an overview – management of collaborative research grants and projects</i> | 19 March 2014 | San Francisco, CA, USA | Research managers / administrators | 50 | EU and USA |
| 26 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>Training Session on H2020 (with EURAXESS links)</i> | 22 March 2014 | Miami, USA | University faculty and researchers | 25 | EU and USA |
| 27 | Awareness raising Workshop | FFG | <i>Going global: fostering innovation and strengthening synergies</i> | 9 April 2014 | Washington, D.C. USA | US and international Research managers | 30 | EU and USA |
| 28 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>Practical workshop on EU research and innovation funding</i> | 9 April 2014 | Miami, FL, USA | University faculty and researchers | 25 | EU and USA |
| 29 | Awareness raising Workshop | NCURA and DLR | <i>INORMS meeting – Promotion H2020 and BILAT USA 2.0</i> | 10-13 April 2014 | Washington D.C. USA | US and international Research managers | 45 | EU and USA |
| 30 | Awareness raising Workshop | FFG | <i>NCURA 8th research administration conference - BILAT USA 2.0 practical workshop on H2020</i> | 18-20 May 2014 | San Francisco | Research managers / administrators | 50 | EU and USA |
| 31 | Awareness raising Workshop | NCURA | <i>Introduction to the US funding Environment</i> | 9 June 2014 | Blackpool, UK | EU Research managers / administrators | 50 | EU and USA |
| 32 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR, TUBITAK, NCURA, RCN | <i>EU information tour on US funding programmes</i> | 27-31 October 2014 | Brussels, Oslo, Berlin | EU scientists and grants offices | 50-100 (per session) | EU and USA |
| 33 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR, FFG | <i>PRA and FRA conference, awareness raising on H2020 and administrative issues</i> | 4 March 2015 | Orlando, FL, USA | US research administrators | 75 | EU and USA |
| 34 | Awareness raising Workshop | FIU, DLR | <i>eMerge Conference 2015 with H2020 information booth</i> | 3-6 May 2015 | Miami, FL, USA | US scientists and public | Many passing customers | EU and USA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------|
| 35 | Awareness raising Workshop | FFG | <i>Joint Region IV and VIII Spring Meeting 2015 – Research administration going global</i> | 26-29 April 2015 | Chicago, IL, USA | US and international research managers and administrators | 50 | EU and USA |
| 36 | Awareness raising Workshop | NCURA, DLR, IPPT PAN | <i>H2020 at NCURA Annual Meeting</i> | 4-6 August 2015 | Washington D.C, USA | US and international research managers and administrators | 75 | EU and USA |
| 37 | Awareness raising Workshop | DLR | <i>(Altogether) four information sessions on H2020</i> | 24-25 September 2015 | Miami and Jupiter, FL, USA | Researchers and university faculty | 20-25 | EU and USA |
| 38 | Awareness raising Workshop | IPPT PAN, NCURA, DLR | <i>EU information tour on US funding opportunities</i> | 5-9 October 2015 | Warsaw, Rome, Lisbon | EU Researchers and grants offices | 50-100 (each session) | EU and USA |
| 39 | External Event | IPPT PAN | <i>Conference “The EU Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases Research (JPND): a Potential Platform for Enhanced US - EU Research Collaboration”</i> | 3 November 2012 | Washington D.C., USA | JPND Members | 30 | EU and USA |
| 40 | External Event | inno TSD | <i>EU - US SME Dialogue: exchange of best practices</i> | 7-8 October 2013 | Brussels, Belgium | EU COM and US counterparts | 20 | EU and USA |
| 41 | External Event | DLR | <i>Workshop on EU-US research collaboration at EARMA conference</i> | 1-4 July 2014 | Vienna, Austria | EU and USA research managers | 50 | EU and USA |
| 42 | External Event | DMI | <i>EURAXESS Science Slam attendance</i> | 24 September 2013 | Washington D.C., USA | US Researchers | 50 | EU and USA |
| 43 | External Event | DLR | <i>Destination Europe San Francisco – General information dissemination (no particular presentation)</i> | 13 December 2013 | San Francisco, USA | US researchers | 50-100 | EU and USA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| 44 | External Event | DMI | <i>SESAR Conference (“EU rendezvous”)</i> | 25 June 2013 | Washington D.C, USA | US researchers and policy makers | 35 | USA |
| 45 | Webinar | DLR | <i>Funding opportunities for US researchers within H2020</i> | 22 January 2014 | Online | US researchers and managers | 210 | USA |
| 46 | Webinar | FFG | <i>ERC for US researchers</i> | 19 February 2014 | Online | US researchers and managers | 61 | USA (and EU) |
| 47 | Webinar | IPPT PAN | <i>Funding Possibilities for US researchers in Horizon 2020 (special focus on Transport Research)</i> | 10 April 2014 | Online | US Transport researchers and managers | 50 | USA (and EU) |
| 48 | Webinar | DLR | <i>Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions in EU Horizon 2020 opportunities for US researchers and organisations</i> | 18 May 2014 | Online | US researchers | 100 | USA and EU |
| 49 | Webinar | DLR | <i>Webinar on Legal and financial issues in H2020</i> | 17 March 2015 | Online | US researchers | 75 | USA |
| 50 | Press Release | DLR | <i>Press release on BILAT USA 2.0 launch of the project</i> | November 2012 | Online (Project Website) | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |
| 51 | Press Release | IPPT PAN, TUBITA K + EURAXESS links | <i>EURAXESS Newsletter “US Participation in the Seventh Framework Program (FP7)”</i> | November 2012 | Online | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |
| 52 | Article | IPPT PAN | <i>US Participation in the Seventh Framework Program (FP7)</i> | December 2012 | Online | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |
| 53 | Article | FFG | <i>“From collaboration to coordination”</i> | April 2013 | Online | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |
| 54 | Article | FFG | <i>“From collaboration to coordination”</i> | July 2013 | Online | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| 55 | Article | FIU | Working to strengthen EU-US Cooperation through BILAT USA 2.0 | September 2013 | Newsletter online | EU and US audience in general | Various | EU and USA |
| 56 | Article | DLR and NCURA | BILAT USA 2.0 – EU-US Research & Innovation Cooperation | December 2013 | Online and printed Magazine | US and international audience | Various | EU and USA and international |
| 57 | Article | DLR and NCURA | Article on H2020 in NCURA magazine in “Research across borders” | December 2013 | Online and printed Magazine | US and international audience | Various | EU and USA and international |
| 58 | News section | DLR | Info notice on BILAT USA 2.0 Webinar | January 2014 | Online | EU (and US researchers) | Various | EU |
| 59 | Article | DLR | Contribution regarding US research landscape on Inco-wiki website | January 2014 | Online | EU (and international researchers) | Various | EU |
| 60 | Article | DLR | Press release on BILAT USA 2.0 periodic meeting | April 2014 | Online | EU (and US researchers) | Various | EU |
| 61 | Article | DLR | Press release on BILAT USA 2.0 H 2020 Workshop | April 2014 | Online | EU (and US researchers) | Various | EU |
| 62 | Article | DLR | “BILAT USA 2.0” | Issue 127 | Online and printed Magazine | EU and international audience | Various | EU and USA and international |
| 63 | Short articles | DLR | Several announcements with regard to launch of H2020 | Throughout 2013/beginning of 2014 | Online | EU and US researchers | Various | EU |
| 64 | Article | FIU | News release on “Sunshine State Horizon” | Issue 1 | Online | US and EU researchers | Various | USA |
| 65 | Article | DLR | <i>“Science Diplomacy: New Opportunities for EU-US Cooperation”, International Research Update</i> | Issue 60, October 2015 | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |
| 66 | Article | DLR | <i>EU-US Innovation Conference in International Research Update</i> | Issue 53, February 2015 | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |
| 67 | Article | DLR | <i>Bilat USA 2.0 webinar</i> | Issue 60, October 2014 | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |
| 68 | Article | DLR | <i>BILAT USA 2.0 Highlights EU-US Marine Research & Transatlantic Cooperation at the 2014 Ocean Sciences</i> | Issue 44, April 2014 | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-------|---|-------------------------|--------|----------------|---------|------------------------------|
| | | | <i>Meeting</i> | | | | | |
| 69 | News release | DLR | BILAT USA 2.0 <i>EU-US Innovation Conference “How to integrate the innovation dimension in the EU-US S&T Agreement?”</i> | December 2014 | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |
| 70 | News release | DLR | BILAT USA 2.0 | Website EC, permanent | Online | EU researchers | Various | EU and international |
| 71 | Web-presence | DMI | http://diplomacymatters.org/programs/bilat.php | Since project beginning | Online | US public | Various | EU and international |
| 72 | Web-presence | FIU | https://miamieuc.fiu.edu/events/general/2014/meuce-bilat-usa-20-meeting-fiu/ | Since project beginning | Online | US public | Various | EU and international |
| 73 | Web-presence | NCURA | http://www.ncura.edu/Global.aspx | Since project beginning | Online | US public | Various | EU and international |
| 74 | Web-presence | DLR | http://www.internationales-buero.de/de/6102.php | Since project beginning | Online | US public | Various | EU and international |
| 75 | Website | IISA | BILAT USA 2.0 website | Since January 2013 | Online | EU and USA | Various | EU and US, and international |

In addition to the conferences, webinars, articles, reports mentioned above, the project disseminated a lot of information via social media such as Twitter, Facebook and LinkedIn. These kinds of dissemination channels work very well for such a project and for a quick and efficient dissemination spreading. However, to mention all activities that happened via social media would go beyond the scope of this report as they were very detailed and too many.

3 Section B (Confidential¹³ or public: confidential information to be marked clearly)

Part B of the reporting template is not applicable in this project.

¹³ Note to be confused with the "EU CONFIDENTIAL" classification for some security research projects.

4 Report on societal implications

Replies to the following questions will assist the Commission to obtain statistics and indicators on societal and socio-economic issues addressed by projects. The questions are arranged in a number of key themes. As well as producing certain statistics, the replies will also help identify those projects that have shown a real engagement with wider societal issues, and thereby identify interesting approaches to these issues and best practices. The replies for individual projects will not be made public.

A General Information *(completed automatically when Grant Agreement number is entered).*

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Grant Agreement Number: | 312081 |
| Title of Project: | BILAT USA 2.0 |
| Name and Title of Coordinator: | Dr. Olaf Heilmayer |

| B Ethics | |
|--|-----------|
| <p>1. Did your project undergo an Ethics Review (and/or Screening)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Yes: have you described the progress of compliance with the relevant Ethics Review/Screening Requirements in the frame of the periodic/final project reports? <p>Special Reminder: the progress of compliance with the Ethics Review/Screening Requirements should be described in the Period/Final Project Reports under the Section 3.2.2 'Work Progress and Achievements'</p> | No |
| <p>2. Please indicate whether your project involved any of the following issues (tick box) :</p> | |
| RESEARCH ON HUMANS | |
| • Did the project involve children? | No |
| • Did the project involve patients? | No |
| • Did the project involve persons not able to give consent? | No |
| • Did the project involve adult healthy volunteers? | No |
| • Did the project involve Human genetic material? | No |
| • Did the project involve Human biological samples? | No |
| • Did the project involve Human data collection? | No |
| RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYO/FOETUS | |
| • Did the project involve Human Embryos? | No |
| • Did the project involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells? | No |
| • Did the project involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)? | No |
| • Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture? | No |
| • Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos? | No |
| PRIVACY | |
| • Did the project involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)? | No |
| • Did the project involve tracking the location or observation of people? | No |
| RESEARCH ON ANIMALS | |
| • Did the project involve research on animals? | No |
| • Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals? | No |
| • Were those animals transgenic farm animals? | No |

| | |
|---|----|
| • Were those animals cloned farm animals? | No |
| • Were those animals non-human primates? | No |
| RESEARCH INVOLVING DEVELOPING COUNTRIES | |
| • Did the project involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)? | No |
| • Was the project of benefit to local community (capacity building, access to healthcare, education etc)? | No |
| DUAL USE | |
| • Research having direct military use | No |
| • Research having the potential for terrorist abuse | No |

C Workforce Statistics

3. Workforce statistics for the project: Please indicate in the table below the number of people who worked on the project (on a headcount basis).

| Type of Position | Number of Women | Number of Men |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Scientific Coordinator | 7 | 3 |
| Work package leaders | 21 | 16 |
| Experienced researchers (i.e. PhD holders) | 6 | 3 |
| PhD Students | no | no |
| Other | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| 4. How many additional researchers (in companies and universities) were recruited specifically for this project? | 1 |
| Of which, indicate the number of men: | 0 |

| D Gender Aspects | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---|----|
| 5. | Did you carry out specific Gender Equality Actions under the project? | No | | | | |
| 6. | Which of the following actions did you carry out and how effective were they? | | | | | |
| | | <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">Not at all effective</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">Very effective</td> </tr> </table> | Not at all effective | Very effective | | |
| Not at all effective | Very effective | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Design and implement an equal opportunity policy | ○ ○ ○ ○ x | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Set targets to achieve a gender balance in the workforce | ○ ○ ○ x ○ | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Organise conferences and workshops on gender | ○ x ○ ○ ○ | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Actions to improve work-life balance | ○ x ○ ○ ○ | | | | |
| <input type="radio"/> | Other: <input style="width: 300px;" type="text"/> | | | | | |
| 7. | Was there a gender dimension associated with the research content – i.e. wherever people were the focus of the research as, for example, consumers, users, patients or in trials, was the issue of gender considered and addressed? | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Yes- please specify | | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No, what we promoted was valid for both genders equally. | | | | | |
| E Synergies with Science Education | | | | | | |
| 8. | Did your project involve working with students and/or school pupils (e.g. open days, participation in science festivals and events, prizes/competitions or joint projects)? | | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes- please specify e.g. the EURAXESS Science Slam | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> No | | | | | |
| 9. | Did the project generate any science education material (e.g. kits, websites, explanatory booklets, DVDs)? | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Yes- please specify <input style="width: 200px;" type="text"/> | | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No (Depends on what is meant here. BILAT USA produced H2020 guide which “educates” US researchers.) | | | | | |
| F Interdisciplinarity | | | | | | |
| 10. | Which disciplines (see list below) are involved in your project? | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Main discipline ¹⁴ : | | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Associated discipline ¹⁴ : 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.0 | <input type="radio"/> Associated discipline ¹⁴ : | | | | |
| G Engaging with Civil society and policy makers | | | | | | |
| 11a | Did your project engage with societal actors beyond the research community? (if 'No', go to Question 14) | <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">x</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">○</td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 0 10px;">No</td> </tr> </table> | x | Yes | ○ | No |
| x | Yes | | | | | |
| ○ | No | | | | | |
| 11b | If yes, did you engage with citizens (citizens' panels / juries) or organised civil society (NGOs, patients' groups etc.)? | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> No | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Yes- in determining what research should be performed | | | | | |
| | <input type="radio"/> Yes - in implementing the research | | | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project | | | | | |

¹⁴ Insert number from list below (Frascati Manual).

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| 11c In doing so, did your project involve actors whose role is mainly to organise the dialogue with citizens and organised civil society (e.g. professional mediator; communication company, science museums)? | | <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> | Yes No |
| 12. Did you engage with government / public bodies or policy makers (including international organisations) | | | |
| <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes- in framing the research agenda <input type="radio"/> Yes - in implementing the research agenda <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project | | | |
| 13a Will the project generate outputs (expertise or scientific advice) which could be used by policy makers? | | | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes – as a primary objective (please indicate areas below- multiple answers possible) <input type="radio"/> Yes – as a secondary objective (please indicate areas below - multiple answer possible) <input type="radio"/> No | | | |
| 13b If Yes, in which fields? | | | |
| Agriculture Audiovisual and Media Budget Competition Consumers Culture Customs Development Economic and Monetary Affairs Education, Training, Youth Employment and Social Affairs | | Energy Enlargement Enterprise Environment External Relations External Trade Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Food Safety Foreign and Security Policy Fraud Humanitarian aid | Human rights Information Society Institutional affairs Internal Market Justice, freedom and security Public Health Regional Policy Research and Innovation Space Taxation Transport |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 13c If Yes, at which level? <input type="radio"/> Local / regional levels <input checked="" type="radio"/> National level <input checked="" type="radio"/> European level <input type="radio"/> International level | | |
| H Use and dissemination | | |
| 14. How many Articles were published/accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals? | None | |
| To how many of these is open access¹⁵ provided? | \ | |
| How many of these are published in open access journals? | \ | |
| How many of these are published in open repositories? | \ | |
| To how many of these is open access not provided? | \ | |
| Please check all applicable reasons for not providing open access: | \ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> publisher's licensing agreement would not permit publishing in a repository <input type="checkbox"/> no suitable repository available <input type="checkbox"/> no suitable open access journal available <input type="checkbox"/> no funds available to publish in an open access journal <input type="checkbox"/> lack of time and resources <input type="checkbox"/> lack of information on open access <input type="checkbox"/> other ¹⁶ : | | |
| 15. How many new patent applications ('priority filings') have been made? <i>("Technologically unique": multiple applications for the same invention in different jurisdictions should be counted as just one application of grant).</i> | None | |
| 16. Indicate how many of the following Intellectual Property Rights were applied for (give number in each box). | Trademark | \ |
| | Registered design | \ |
| | Other | \ |
| 17. How many spin-off companies were created / are planned as a direct result of the project? | \ | |
| <i>Indicate the approximate number of additional jobs in these companies:</i> | | |
| 18. Please indicate whether your project has a potential impact on employment, in comparison with the situation before your project: | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase in employment, or <input type="checkbox"/> Safeguard employment, or <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease in employment, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify | <input type="checkbox"/> In small & medium-sized enterprises <input type="checkbox"/> In large companies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None of the above / not relevant to the project | |
| 19. For your project partnership please estimate the employment effect resulting directly from your participation in Full Time Equivalent (FTE = one person working fulltime for a year) jobs: | <i>Indicate figure:</i> 189,21PM /1Months/3 Years = 5,25 FTE Jobs | |

¹⁵ Open Access is defined as free of charge access for anyone via Internet.

¹⁶ For instance: classification for security project.

Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify

I Media and Communication to the general public

20. As part of the project, were any of the beneficiaries professionals in communication or media relations?

Yes No

21. As part of the project, have any beneficiaries received professional media / communication training / advice to improve communication with the general public?

Yes No As we had professionals

22 Which of the following have been used to communicate information about your project to the general public, or have resulted from your project?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Press Release | <input type="checkbox"/> Coverage in specialist press |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Media briefing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in general (non-specialist) press |
| <input type="checkbox"/> TV coverage / report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in national press |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Radio coverage / report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coverage in international press |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brochures /posters / flyers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Website for the general public / internet |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DVD /Film /Multimedia | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café) |

23 In which languages are the information products for the general public produced?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Language of the coordinator | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> English |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other language(s) | |

Question F-10: Classification of Scientific Disciplines according to the Frascati Manual 2002 (Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, OECD 2002):

FIELDS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. NATURAL SCIENCES

- 1.1 Mathematics and computer sciences [mathematics and other allied fields: computer sciences and other allied subjects (software development only; hardware development should be classified in the engineering fields)]
- 1.2 Physical sciences (astronomy and space sciences, physics and other allied subjects)
- 1.3 Chemical sciences (chemistry, other allied subjects)
- 1.4 Earth and related environmental sciences (geology, geophysics, mineralogy, physical geography and other geosciences, meteorology and other atmospheric sciences including climatic research, oceanography, vulcanology, palaeoecology, other allied sciences)
- 1.5 Biological sciences (biology, botany, bacteriology, microbiology, zoology, entomology, genetics, biochemistry, biophysics, other allied sciences, excluding clinical and veterinary sciences)

2. ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

- 2.1 Civil engineering (architecture engineering, building science and engineering, construction engineering, municipal and structural engineering and other allied subjects)
- 2.2 Electrical engineering, electronics [electrical engineering, electronics, communication engineering and systems, computer engineering (hardware only) and other allied subjects]
- 2.3 Other engineering sciences (such as chemical, aeronautical and space, mechanical, metallurgical and materials engineering, and their specialised subdivisions; forest products; applied sciences such as

geodesy, industrial chemistry, etc.; the science and technology of food production; specialised technologies of interdisciplinary fields, e.g. systems analysis, metallurgy, mining, textile technology and other applied subjects)

3. MEDICAL SCIENCES

- 3.1 Basic medicine (anatomy, cytology, physiology, genetics, pharmacy, pharmacology, toxicology, immunology and immunohaematology, clinical chemistry, clinical microbiology, pathology)
- 3.2 Clinical medicine (anaesthesiology, paediatrics, obstetrics and gynaecology, internal medicine, surgery, dentistry, neurology, psychiatry, radiology, therapeutics, otorhinolaryngology, ophthalmology)
- 3.3 Health sciences (public health services, social medicine, hygiene, nursing, epidemiology)

4. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

- 4.1 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and allied sciences (agronomy, animal husbandry, fisheries, forestry, horticulture, other allied subjects)
- 4.2 Veterinary medicine

5. SOCIAL SCIENCES

- 5.1 Psychology
- 5.2 Economics
- 5.3 Educational sciences (education and training and other allied subjects)
- 5.4 Other social sciences [anthropology (social and cultural) and ethnology, demography, geography (human, economic and social), town and country planning, management, law, linguistics, political sciences, sociology, organisation and methods, miscellaneous social sciences and interdisciplinary, methodological and historical S1T activities relating to subjects in this group. Physical anthropology, physical geography and psychophysiology should normally be classified with the natural sciences].

6. HUMANITIES

- 6.1 History (history, prehistory and history, together with auxiliary historical disciplines such as archaeology, numismatics, palaeography, genealogy, etc.)
- 6.2 Languages and literature (ancient and modern)
- 6.3 Other humanities [philosophy (including the history of science and technology) arts, history of art, art criticism, painting, sculpture, musicology, dramatic art excluding artistic "research" of any kind, religion, theology, other fields and subjects pertaining to the humanities, methodological, historical and other S1T activities relating to the subjects in this group]