

1 Executive summary

This report prepared by COWI presents the findings and recommendations of the "Second mid-term evaluation of the SESAR Joint Undertaking."

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the functioning of the SESAR Joint Undertaking (SJU) from January 2010 to December 2012, as required by the "SJU Regulation¹."

Methodology

The overall conclusion is derived from eleven questions that were formulated to address the four main evaluation objects:

- > Implementation of the SJU regulation
- > The working methods of the SJU
- > Results obtained by the SJU
- > The general financial situation of the SJU.

To answer the evaluation questions, a triangulation process was used combining document review and interviews and surveys involving DG MOVE staff, SJU Staff, SJU members, EU Member States and other stakeholders.

Overall conclusion

This second mid-term evaluation concludes that the SJU carried out the tasks assigned to it during the evaluation period (2010-2012). The organisation operated effectively, thus contributing to the objectives of the SESAR Programme. The SJU has also proven to be a structure that can adapt to specific needs and changes, while still operating under the rules and procedures governing it. Finally, the SJU complied with the principles of sound financial management.

It was also found that the SJU took the recommendations of the first midterm evaluation into account and addressed them adequately during the 2010-2012 period.

¹ Article 7 of Regulation 219/2007

The evaluation resulted in two recommendations; one for the working methods of the SJU, and one for the results obtained by the SJU.

1.1.1 Implementation of the SJU regulation

The first evaluation object explored whether the SJU operates according to the requirements of the SJU Regulation and Statutes.

The information examined confirmed that the SJU complied with the SJU Regulation. It was found that, to a certain degree, the SJU Regulation is flexible allowing the SJU to adapt to changes in the R&D and ATM environments. The SJU also demonstrated its ability to adapt to changing legal requirements and procedures (e.g. staff provisions, internal audit function, and implementation of Regulation 1049/2011).

In conclusion, it is found that the SJU set-up and operations are relevant and in accordance with the legal framework conditions.

1.1.2 The working methods of the SJU

The second evaluation object concerned the working methods of the SJU, in particular procedures, governance and stakeholder involvement.

The evaluation confirmed that the SJU organisation was in line with the tasks entrusted to it. The organisation has set up an appropriate management structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the Administrative Board and the Executive Director.

The SJU demonstrated its effectiveness by setting up the administrative arrangements needed to manage 336 research projects. The evaluation found that the SJU was able to optimise the utilisation of resources and that the procedures and processes in place enhanced effectiveness. The project management procedures allowed the SJU to focus on project monitoring in a systematic manner.

As an organisation, the SJU also demonstrated its ability to adapt its structure to the changes in needs as the SESAR project evolves and it addressed the recommendations of the previous evaluation.

The SJU's work programme supported the preparation for deployment and was aligned with the European ATM Master Plan.

The evaluation found that coordination and communication with SJU members were based on a comprehensive communication plan. SJU members assessed coordination and communication efforts to be adequate and satisfactory. However, the communication is of technical nature targeting a specialised audience. The evaluation found that EU Member States have information needs that go beyond the specialised information provided by the SJU. In this respect, it is **recommended** that the SJU and DG MOVE identify and address the specific information needs of the EU Member States. More specifically, this concerns communication on the SJU

aims and activities and on the achievement of objectives. Often, Member States find that the presented information on these issues is of too technical nature.

The SJU respected the objectives and principles of FP7 and TEN-T. In terms of project management, the SJU carries out extensive project monitoring and project follow-up beyond the basic requirements of FP7 and TEN-T. The funds received by the SJU were allocated in line with the SJU Regulation and the FP7 and TEN-T requirements. This was also confirmed by the Court of Auditors.

In conclusion, it is found that the SJU has developed efficient and appropriate work structures and procedures.

1.1.3 Results obtained by the SJU

The third evaluation object assessed to which extent the SJU had achieved intended outputs, results and impacts.

It was found that the SJU had achieved most of its mid-term objectives under the framework of the SESAR programme. The SJU improved the delivery of Annual Work Programmes during the reference period from approximately 60% in 2010 to 82% by the end of 2012. In this context, it is **recommended** that the SJU continue its efforts to improve the rate of completion of its annual, stated goals.

The SJU effectively supported the deployment phase through the definition of requirements and through the revision of the European ATM Master Plan. As such, the SJU activities were integrated with and supported the other SES pillars, particularly through the European ATM Master Plan.

The initial steps were taken to establish a framework to enhance collaboration with the US FAA. This framework laid the foundation for ensuring programme interoperability between NextGen and SESAR.

It was found that the PPP structure of the SJU allowed it to strike a proper balance between enhancing cooperation among its members and retaining the advantages of a competitive and innovative environment. The SJU added value by avoiding duplication and lack of coordination in the European ATM research and development sector. This is consistent with the SJU mandate.

There are indications that the project management approach of the SJU achieved economies of scale, especially through the introduction of the project management plan (PMP) and the “Tiger Team” processes. The overall added value of the SJU will not be realised until all SESAR projects have been implemented.

The evaluation did not identify any unintended impacts of the operations of the SJU.

In conclusion, it is found that the SJU is on the right track towards achieving the targets set.

1.1.4 The general financial situation of the SJU

The final evaluation object of the evaluation focused on the general financial situation of the SJU.

The SJU has established a transparent set of procedures and accounting standards and has performed according to the EU's financial requirements, as was confirmed by the Court of Auditors. The SJU has developed a well-functioning two-tier internal audit capacity consisting of the IAS of the Commission and the IAC of the SJU. The SJU has introduced a Risk Management System meeting the requirements of the European Commission during the period under evaluation.

In conclusion, it is found that the SJU complied with the principles of sound financial management during the period under review.