Section 1 **- General information about stakeholder**

1. Name of the stakeholder:	
2. Organisation category:	☐ Higher education ☐ research institute
3. Date of establishment:	☐ ≤ 5 years ☐ > 5 years
4. Field of activity (bioeconomy):	
5. Which of these areas do you work on?	☐ Smart and innovative precision farming ☐ Wood sector ☐ Biofuel ☐ Other:
6. Number of employees	☐ 1-10 ☐ 11-50 ☐ 51-250 ☐ > 250
7. Department:	
8. Street:	
9. Town:	
10. Region:	
11. Country:	
12. Website:	
13. Representative's name:	
14. Position:	
15. Email:	
16. Phone:	
17. Date of interview:	
18. Interviewer's name:	

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

19. The questionnaire was administered by:	☐ Personal ☐ Interview ☐ Telephone interview ☐ Mail ☐ Fax ☐ Online

Section 2 **- Technology Transfer Information**

Section 2.1 - General activities	
20. What is the most important project or theme for research at your institution in bioeconomy?	
21. What is the specific bioeconomy topic you focus on in technology transfer?	
22. Is there a member of staff or department at your institution specifically responsible for technology transfer?	☐ Yes ☐ No
23. Does your organisation have an IP strategy?	☐ Yes ☐ No
24. Is your institution legally required to have an IPR procedure or IP management guide?	
25. Is this document public? If not, who has access to it?	
26. Who owns the IP rights of your research outcomes?	
27. Is a model contract available?	
28. The number and focus of new patents developed in the last 5 years:	

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

29. The number and focus of new technologies commercialised in the last 5 years:	
30. The TRL level do you work mostly on:	☐ TRL 1 – basic principles observed ☐ TRL 2 – technology concept formulated ☐ TRL 3 – experimental proof of concept ☐ TRL 4 – technology validated in lab ☐ TRL 5 – technology validated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies) ☐ TRL 6 – technology demonstrated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies) ☐ TRL 7 – system prototype demonstration in operational environment ☐ TRL 8 – system complete and qualified ☐ TRL 9 – actual system proven in operational environment
31. Please list the bottlenecks of academy-industry collaboration.	
32. What is the current technology transfer practice of your institute? What are its main characteristics?	☐ horizontal (technology used in one place, organisation or context is transferred and used in another place, organisation or context) ☐ vertical (information is transmitted from basic research to applied research, from applied research to development, and from development to production. Transfer can occur to both directions)
33. What would be the best tools to improve technology transfer? Please select the 3 most important ones.	☐ Long term strategy for cooperation between industry and public research ☐ Internationalisation ☐ Mentality change of universities or research institutions

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

	☐ Exchange of best practices ☐ Handbook of best practices ☐ Cooperation with stakeholders in industry and public research in European region ☐ Specific approaches for different energy-related technologies ☐ Clear government policy and strategy in your country ☐ More flexible communication with European region ☐ Training for cooperation between industry and public research ☐ Other, please specify:

34. Please rate the importance of these barriers in preventing the success of technology transfer.

	Not at all impor-tant	Very limited impor-tance	Sometimes, it is a barrier	Often, it is a barrier	Regularly, it is a barrier
Lack of financing for projects					
Lack of proper dissemination for R&D facilities					
Lack of knowledge about technology transfer activities					
Lack of communication with authorities					
Lack of communication between research and industry					
Lack of trust between research and industry					
Lack of clear rules and practices					
Lack of Private Public Partnership					
Lack of legislation for innovation & technology transfer					
Lack of innovative thinking at business level					
Lack of entrepreneurial knowledge					
Lack of trained people in the field of bioeconomy					

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

35. To what extent are the following statements true for your organisation? Please rate all of them.

	Entirely false	More or less false	More or less true	Entirely true
Our knowledge is primarily expressed in 'scientific documents' (e.g. journal articles, conference papers and proceedings)				
Our knowledge is primarily expressed in 'grey literature' (e.g. patents, industrial reports, confidential memorandums, discussion lists)				
Our knowledge is mostly embodied in people and is difficult to write down				
Major technological breakthroughs are expected within the next five years				
We often work with systems that have many interdependent parts; changes in one part imply changes in many other parts				

Section 2.2 - National Cooperation	
36. Does your institution cooperate with other national higher education and research institutes?	☐ Yes ☐ No
37. If yes, with how many national higher education and research institutes?	☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-15 ☐ 16-25 ☐ > 26
38. How many SMEs does your institution cooperate with? (in bioeconomy)	☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-15 ☐ 16-25 ☐ > 26
39. How many big companies does your institution cooperate with? (in bio-economy)	☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-15 ☐ 16-25 ☐ > 26

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

Section 2.3 International cooperation

40. How many partner institutions do you regularly work with in other countries?	
41. How many transnational projects do you participate in?	
42. What are the most important cooperation projects in bioeconomy? Please give the project title and website URL & funding programme.	
43. Which EU RTDI or interregional programmes do you participate in?	☐ Horizon 2020 ☐ 3rd Health Programme ☐ COSME ☐ Promotion of Agricultural Products ☐ Danube TNP ☐ Central Europe ☐ EUREKA ☐ EIP Agri ☐ EIT Food4Future ☐ COST ☐ Other, please specify:
44. How much funding does your institution receive *per year* for international cooperation?	….(Euros)
45. In your opinion, compared to your institute's yearly budget, this amount … (Please continue the sentence by choosing)	☐ is very important, we could not perform research without this amount ☐ is important ☐ is a good complementary amount, but we would manage without this ☐ is unimportant

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

Section 2.4 - Success or failure stories	

46. What percentage of research results were commercialised in the last 3 years at your institution?	
47. How many research results were commercialised in the last 3 years at your institution?	
48. How many spin off companies were started at your institution in the last 3 years? (any scientific field)	
49. Did you have any problem in protecting your IP rights?	
50. Please describe the case and its solution briefly and specifically.	
51. Please describe a case where the innovation to market process was **not successful**. Why did commercialisation fail?	
52. Please describe a case where the innovation to market process was **successful**.	

Section 3 – Open innovation	

53. How would YOU define open innovation? Please define it in a sentence.	

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

54. What are the most relevant innovation partnerships of your organisation? Please choose 3 of them.

End-users	☐
Technology Transfer Centres	☐
Chamber of Commerce	☐
Enterprise Europe Network	☐
Crowd (crowdsourcing)	☐
Higher education and research institutes	☐
Regional Public Authorities	☐
Other (please specify):	

55. Why did you choose to engage with an Open Innovation model? (select more than one response if appropriate)

We didn't have the necessary expertise or capacity in house to carry out the work	☐
We wanted to bring “fresh ideas” to benefit from their different approach	☐
We wanted to become a member of a consortium to obtain eligible status for funding	☐
We believed a multidisciplinary approach would produce more successful output	☐
We wanted to enable exploitation of any IP produced into other non-competing markets	☐
We felt it was our only chance of commercialising our ideas	☐
Our project required someone else's IP	☐
We wanted to save costs	☐
Because of the reputation of partners	☐
Other (please specify):	

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube

56. What are/were the most important factors that prevented you from engaging in Open Innovation? Please tick the relevant box for each of the issues listed.

	Serious barrier	Middle importance barrier	Not really serious barrier	It was not an issue
IP issues				
Costs				
Finding the right people to involve				
Cultural differences between your organisation and those you wished to engage with				
Time constraints				
Project management/administration challenges				

57. From which point of view did Open innovation have a positive impact on your organisation?	☐ Turnover ☐ Profit ☐ Number of new products/services launched ☐ Employees innovation culture ☐ IP ☐ Other, please specify:
58. Has the way you use Open Innovation changed from today compared to 3 - 5 years ago? Why?	
59. Please share a success story you have. What were the key points of success, and which bottlenecks could you overcome?	
60. How do you plan to make use of open innovation in the next 3 -5 years? How could it have the most positive impact on your organisation?	

Save as

Project co-funded by European Union funds (ERDF, IPA)
Project webpage: www.interreg-danube.eu/made-in-danube