

Public consultation questionnaire - Evaluation of the Innovation Fund

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The [Innovation Fund](#) is one of the world's largest funding programmes supporting the deployment of innovative net-zero technologies. It aims to bring solutions to the market to:

- decarbonise the energy, industry, mobility and building sectors;
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
- support Europe's transition to climate neutrality while promoting competitiveness.

The [EU Emissions Trading System \(EU ETS\)](#) – the world's largest carbon pricing system – provides revenue for the Fund from the sale of about 530 million ETS allowances. The Fund's total budget depends on the carbon price. It may amount to about EUR 40 billion from 2020 to 2030, based on a carbon price of EUR 75/tCO₂.

The Fund supports projects in renewable energies, energy-intensive industries, energy storage, carbon use and storage, net-zero mobility and buildings. It mainly awards support for projects through competitive procedures: [calls for proposals](#) for regular grants, and [auctions](#). The Fund has already awarded about EUR 12 billion for over 200 innovative projects (including projects under grant agreement preparation).

In 2025 and every five years after, the Commission will evaluate how the Innovation Fund is working ([Delegated Act 2019/856](#)).

This evaluation is taking place at the same time as evaluations of the Modernisation Fund and the EU ETS Directive.

Why are we consulting?

The consultation will enable stakeholders to express their views on the Innovation Fund, including its relevance, anticipated benefits, impact, added value, synergies, and alignment with other EU programmes.

Target audience

The consultation is aimed at stakeholders from European Economic Area (EEA) countries and sectors supported by the Innovation Fund (renewable energies, energy-intensive industries, energy storage, carbon use and storage, net-zero mobility, and buildings). In particular it targets industrial stakeholders, financial institutions, beneficiaries, previous applicants, representatives of EEA countries (including National Contact

Points), members of the Innovation Fund's Expert Group, and representatives of the scientific community. It also includes officials from the Commission and other institutional partners, such as the European Investment Bank.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- ☐ Bulgarian
- ☐ Croatian
- ☐ Czech
- ☐ Danish
- ☐ Dutch
- ☒ English
- ☐ Estonian
- ☐ Finnish
- ☐ French
- ☐ German
- ☐ Greek
- ☐ Hungarian
- ☐ Irish
- ☐ Italian
- ☐ Latvian
- ☐ Lithuanian
- ☐ Maltese
- ☐ Polish
- ☐ Portuguese
- ☐ Romanian
- ☐ Slovak
- ☐ Slovenian
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- ☐ Academic/research institution
- ☐ Business association
- ☐ Company/business

- ☐ Consumer organisation
- ☐ EU citizen
- ☐ Environmental organisation
- ☐ Non-EU citizen
- ☒ Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ☐ Public authority
- ☐ Trade union
- ☐ Other

* First name

Eloisa Esther

* Surname

Viloria Rosquete

* Email (this won't be published)

eloisa@carbongap.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Carbon Gap

* Organisation size

- ☐ Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ☒ Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ☐ Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ☐ Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

159208346089-06

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| ☐ Afghanistan | ☐ Djibouti | ☐ Libya | ☐ Saint Martin |
| ☐ Åland Islands | ☐ Dominica | ☐ Liechtenstein | ☐ Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| ☐ Albania | ☐ Dominican Republic | ☐ Lithuania | ☐ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| ☐ Algeria | ☐ Ecuador | ☐ Luxembourg | ☐ Samoa |
| ☐ American Samoa | ☐ Egypt | ☐ Macau | ☐ San Marino |
| ☐ Andorra | ☐ El Salvador | ☐ Madagascar | ☐ São Tomé and Príncipe |
| ☐ Angola | ☐ Equatorial Guinea | ☐ Malawi | ☐ Saudi Arabia |
| ☐ Anguilla | ☐ Eritrea | ☐ Malaysia | ☐ Senegal |
| ☐ Antarctica | ☐ Estonia | ☐ Maldives | ☐ Serbia |
| ☐ Antigua and Barbuda | ☐ Eswatini | ☐ Mali | ☐ Seychelles |
| ☐ Argentina | ☐ Ethiopia | ☐ Malta | ☐ Sierra Leone |
| ☐ Armenia | ☐ Falkland Islands | ☐ Marshall Islands | ☐ Singapore |
| ☐ Aruba | ☐ Faroe Islands | ☐ Martinique | ☐ Sint Maarten |
| ☐ Australia | ☐ Fiji | ☐ Mauritania | ☐ Slovakia |
| ☐ Austria | ☐ Finland | ☐ Mauritius | ☐ Slovenia |
| ☐ Azerbaijan | ☐ France | ☐ Mayotte | ☐ Solomon Islands |
| ☐ Bahamas | ☐ French Guiana | ☐ Mexico | ☐ Somalia |
| ☐ Bahrain | ☐ French Polynesia | ☐ Micronesia | ☐ South Africa |
| ☐ Bangladesh | ☐ French Southern and Antarctic Lands | ☐ Moldova | ☐ South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| ☐ Barbados | ☐ Gabon | ☐ Monaco | ☐ South Korea |
| ☐ Belarus | ☐ Georgia | ☐ Mongolia | ☐ South Sudan |
| ☒ Belgium | ☐ Germany | ☐ Montenegro | ☐ Spain |
| ☐ Belize | ☐ Ghana | ☐ Montserrat | ☐ Sri Lanka |
| ☐ Benin | ☐ Gibraltar | ☐ Morocco | ☐ Sudan |
| ☐ Bermuda | ☐ Greece | ☐ Mozambique | ☐ Suriname |

◉ Bhutan	◉ Greenland	◉ Myanmar/Burma	◉ Svalbard and Jan Mayen
◉ Bolivia	◉ Grenada	◉ Namibia	◉ Sweden
◉ Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	◉ Guadeloupe	◉ Nauru	◉ Switzerland
◉ Bosnia and Herzegovina	◉ Guam	◉ Nepal	◉ Syria
◉ Botswana	◉ Guatemala	◉ Netherlands	◉ Taiwan
◉ Bouvet Island	◉ Guernsey	◉ New Caledonia	◉ Tajikistan
◉ Brazil	◉ Guinea	◉ New Zealand	◉ Tanzania
◉ British Indian Ocean Territory	◉ Guinea-Bissau	◉ Nicaragua	◉ Thailand
◉ British Virgin Islands	◉ Guyana	◉ Niger	◉ The Gambia
◉ Brunei	◉ Haiti	◉ Nigeria	◉ Timor-Leste
◉ Bulgaria	◉ Heard Island and McDonald Islands	◉ Niue	◉ Togo
◉ Burkina Faso	◉ Honduras	◉ Norfolk Island	◉ Tokelau
◉ Burundi	◉ Hong Kong	◉ Northern Mariana Islands	◉ Tonga
◉ Cambodia	◉ Hungary	◉ North Korea	◉ Trinidad and Tobago
◉ Cameroon	◉ Iceland	◉ North Macedonia	◉ Tunisia
◉ Canada	◉ India	◉ Norway	◉ Türkiye
◉ Cape Verde	◉ Indonesia	◉ Oman	◉ Turkmenistan
◉ Cayman Islands	◉ Iran	◉ Pakistan	◉ Turks and Caicos Islands
◉ Central African Republic	◉ Iraq	◉ Palau	◉ Tuvalu
◉ Chad	◉ Ireland	◉ Palestine	◉ Uganda
◉ Chile	◉ Isle of Man	◉ Panama	◉ Ukraine
◉ China	◉ Israel	◉ Papua New Guinea	◉ United Arab Emirates
◉ Christmas Island	◉ Italy	◉ Paraguay	◉ United Kingdom

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| ☐ Clipperton | ☐ Jamaica | ☐ Peru | ☐ United States |
| ☐ Cocos (Keeling) Islands | ☐ Japan | ☐ Philippines | ☐ United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| ☐ Colombia | ☐ Jersey | ☐ Pitcairn Islands | ☐ Uruguay |
| ☐ Comoros | ☐ Jordan | ☐ Poland | ☐ US Virgin Islands |
| ☐ Congo | ☐ Kazakhstan | ☐ Portugal | ☐ Uzbekistan |
| ☐ Cook Islands | ☐ Kenya | ☐ Puerto Rico | ☐ Vanuatu |
| ☐ Costa Rica | ☐ Kiribati | ☐ Qatar | ☐ Vatican City |
| ☐ Côte d'Ivoire | ☐ Kosovo | ☐ Réunion | ☐ Venezuela |
| ☐ Croatia | ☐ Kuwait | ☐ Romania | ☐ Vietnam |
| ☐ Cuba | ☐ Kyrgyzstan | ☐ Russia | ☐ Wallis and Futuna |
| ☐ Curaçao | ☐ Laos | ☐ Rwanda | ☐ Western Sahara |
| ☐ Cyprus | ☐ Latvia | ☐ Saint Barthélemy | ☐ Yemen |
| ☐ Czechia | ☐ Lebanon | ☐ Saint Helena
Ascension and
Tristan da Cunha | ☐ Zambia |
| ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo | ☐ Lesotho | ☐ Saint Kitts and Nevis | ☐ Zimbabwe |
| ☐ Denmark | ☐ Liberia | ☐ Saint Lucia | |

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association', 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

☐ **Anonymous**

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

☒ **Public**

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

☒ I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Your experience with the Innovation Fund

* How familiar are you with the Innovation Fund?

- ☒ I have a detailed knowledge of its objectives and activities.
- ☐ I know the Fund exists but have no detailed knowledge of its objectives and priorities.
- ☐ I am unfamiliar with the Fund, its objectives and priorities.

* Where do you get information about the Innovation Fund?

- ☒ Innovation Fund's website
- ☐ DG CLIMA and/or CINEA press releases or articles
- ☐ Colleagues or partners
- ☐ Innovation Fund's National Contact Points
- ☐ Social media
- ☐ I do not look for information about the Fund
- ☐ Elsewhere

* Has your organisation benefited from the Innovation Fund?

- ☐ Yes, we have received financial support (e.g. grants or other funding instruments)

- ☐ Yes, we have received non-financial support (e.g. knowledge sharing, guidance tools and materials, project development assistance, technical assistance)
- ☐ No, but we have applied
- ☐ No, we have not applied
- ☒ Not applicable / Unsure

* If your organisation has received support from the Innovation Fund, please specify all the types of support received:

- ☐ Grants through regular calls
- ☐ Grants through auctions
- ☐ Grants combined with loans or equity investments (e.g. blending operations between Innovation Fund and InvestEU)
- ☐ Support provided by DG CLIMA and/or CINEA (helpdesk, info day, tutorial, etc.)
- ☐ Support provided by National Contact Points (guidance, info day, etc.)
- ☐ Project development assistance (PDA)
- ☐ National funding through the 'Auctions-as-a-Service' scheme
- ☒ Not applicable / Unsure

* Did you apply to an Innovation Fund call for proposal or auction?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

* Beyond the application process, is participating in the Innovation Fund burdensome (reporting requirements, resources needed, etc.)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Somewhat

* Please explain your answer:

Participating in the Innovation Fund is resource-intensive, especially for first-time applicants, and novel actors in the CDR space. In addition to a complex application process, the reporting and compliance requirements are administratively heavy and often not well-suited to early-stage or small-scale projects. For engineered carbon removal in particular, fitting within existing CCS reporting categories can create confusion and impose additional burdens that don't reflect the specific nature of CDR.

In practice, many companies, particularly start-ups, must hire consultants just to navigate the process. This not only requires awareness of the opportunity and its administrative demands, but also the financial capacity to secure external support. These barriers disproportionately affect newer and smaller players, limiting the diversity of applicants and excluding promising projects.

Tailored guidance, simplified reporting requirements, and better-aligned categories would reduce the burden on smaller actors and improve accessibility. Lowering participation barriers is essential to ensure that the Innovation Fund reaches the full spectrum of climate solutions, including emerging, high-impact CDR pathways critical to the EU's net-zero pathway.

* Are you a National Contact Point and/or representing a national authority?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

Objectives of the Innovation Fund

The overall objectives of the Innovation Fund are:

- to support projects that demonstrate highly innovative technologies, processes or products, are sufficiently mature, have significant potential for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and are aimed at scaling up these technologies, processes or products to achieve broad commercial roll-out across the EU;
- to offer financial support tailored to market needs and risk profiles of eligible projects while attracting additional public and private resources;
- to ensure that the revenues of the Innovation Fund are managed in accordance with the objectives of EU ETS.

* In your view, how relevant are the objectives of the Innovation Fund compared to current societal, technological and environmental challenges?

- ☐ Not relevant
☐ Somewhat relevant
☐ Relevant
☒ Very relevant

* Are there any additional objectives the Innovation Fund should pursue to maximise its impact?

- ☒ Yes

- ☐ No
- ☐ I am not sure

*** Please specify:**

The Innovation Fund should explicitly include support for carbon dioxide removal (CDR) solutions, alongside emissions reductions, and other forms of carbon management, including CCS and CCU, as a core objective. Carbon dioxide removal (CDR) is not optional. According to the IPCC, it's essential for climate neutrality – and it's also a strategic enabler of Europe's long-term industrial leadership. However, CDR remains severely underfunded, receiving less than 0.1% of the EU's projected climate budget for 2021-2027, and lacks the proper recognition as a standalone strategic objective, including under the Innovation Fund. Existing objectives can be extended to CDR, for example:

"to support projects that demonstrate highly innovative technologies, processes or products, are sufficiently mature, have significant potential for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, or removing carbon, and are aimed at scaling up these technologies, processes or products to achieve broad commercial roll-out across the EU"

Relevant resources:

1. IPCC, AR6 Synthesis Report (2023): <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-cycle/>
2. Carbon Gap, Rising to the challenge: Funding CDR research, development & innovation for a net zero competitive EU (2025): <https://carbongap.org/rising-to-the-challenge-funding-cdr-research-development-innovation-for-a-net-zero-competitive-eu/>

*** In your view, which areas should the Innovation Fund focus on?**

Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.

☐ Pilots

☐ Large-scale technology demonstration

☐ Small technology demonstration

☐ Scaling-up technology

☐ First of a kind

☐ Research and development

In your view, how relevant is the Innovation Fund in terms of supporting the following sectors?

	Not relevant	Somewhat relevant	Relevant	Very relevant	No opinion / I am not sure
* Aviation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Cement & lime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

* Chemicals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Geothermal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Glass, ceramics & construction material	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Hydro/ocean energy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Hydrogen	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Intra-day electricity storage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Iron & steel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for energy-intensive industries	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for energy storage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for the production of renewable energy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Maritime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Non-ferrous metals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Other energy storage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Pulp & paper	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Refineries	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Road transport	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Solar energy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Use of renewable energy outside Annex I of the EU ETS Directive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Wind energy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Other	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

* If other, please specify which sector(s):

Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR)

The Innovation Fund in depth

* Which type of support do you believe is most effective for achieving the Innovation Fund's objectives?

Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.



Project development assistance (PDA)

- ⋮ Grants combined with loans or equity investments (e.g. blending operations between Innovation Fund and InvestEU)
- ⋮ Grants through regular calls for proposals
- ⋮ National funding through the 'Auctions-as-a-Service' scheme or upcoming 'Grants-as-a-Service' scheme
- ⋮ Grants through auctions
- ⋮ Support provided by National Contact Points (guidance, info day, etc.)
- ⋮ Support provided by DG CLIMA and/or CINEA (helpdesk, info day, tutorial, etc.)

***What other type of support (financial or other) currently not available would you consider relevant and why?**

To meet the EU's legally binding climate targets, carbon dioxide removal (CDR) must become a core pillar of the Innovation Fund. The Fund currently lacks dedicated design features to accommodate CDR. The most urgent gap is the absence of a dedicated CDR window or stream within regular calls for proposals. Without this, CDR projects are forced to compete with mitigation projects on unequal terms and unfit criteria, despite playing a fundamentally different role in the EU climate architecture.

In addition, we recommend preparing the ground for future tailored mechanisms such as:

- CDR-specific auctions, once durable removal pathways and MRV standards mature. The Innovation Fund has implemented auctions for other technologies in the past, such as for Hydrogen;
- Auctions-as-a-Service and Grants-as-a-Service models that allow Member States to co-fund CDR through EU-run frameworks, particularly useful for scaling national CDR markets and infrastructure;
- Advance market commitments (AMCs) or carbon removal contracts-for-difference (CfDs) to stimulate demand and derisk investment in permanent removals. CfDs have been implemented in the past for other technologies, such as renewable energy in the UK. The UK has also explicitly committed to exploring CfDs for engineered CDR in the second half of the 2020s, the EU should not lag behind.

Embedding CDR in the Innovation Fund is foundational. Without clear eligibility, dedicated funding, and appropriate tools, the EU risks underdelivering on net-zero while missing a strategic opportunity to lead in carbon removal innovation.

***What criteria should the EU prioritise when selecting Innovation Fund projects?**

Use drag&drop or the up/down buttons to change the order or accept the initial order.

- ⋮ Potential for market replication and scale-up
- ⋮ Degree of innovation
- ⋮ Potential for emissions reduction
- ⋮ Contribution to broader societal challenges (resilience, competitiveness, etc.)
- ⋮ Cost-effectiveness and return on investment

Team expertise and consortium strength

Geographical balance

*What other criterion currently not used would you consider relevant and why?

The current selection criteria risk systematically disadvantaging engineered carbon removal solutions such as DACCS, BECCS, and other permanent CDR methods such as Enhanced Rock Weathering, and marine CDR. These projects are typically high-cost, high-risk, and led by smaller or newer teams, yet they are essential for meeting the EU's net-zero and net-negative targets.

To address this, the Innovation Fund should:

- Introduce a specific criterion for carbon removal and storage durability, reflecting the distinct contribution of CDR alongside emissions reductions.
- Ensure “degree of innovation” covers not only technical novelty, but also first-of-a-kind deployment, robust MRV systems, and integration of capture, transport, and storage.
- Apply cost-effectiveness with flexibility, recognising that early-stage CDR in comparison will have higher upfront costs but is necessary to unlock long-term, scalable climate impact.

Without these changes, the Innovation Fund risks excluding the very technologies that will be needed to deliver the EU's long-term climate objectives.

*In your view, are there any particular barriers that could limit the effectiveness of support provided by the Innovation Fund? (Pick the three most relevant)

- ☒ Complex, long or unclear application procedures (e.g. administrative burden, confusing guidelines)
- ☒ Eligibility requirements that are too restrictive or difficult to meet
- ☐ Insufficient communication or outreach about available funding opportunities
- ☐ Insufficient support for applicants and beneficiaries (e.g. from the European Commission and/or National Contact Points)
- ☐ Coordination and synergies with other European/national programmes are lacking
- ☒ Limited technical or financial capacity among applicants (e.g. small businesses, start-ups)
- ☐ Delays in funding disbursement or project approvals
- ☐ Inadequate feedback on unsuccessful applications
- ☐ High competition (available funds oversubscribed)
- ☐ Difficulties during project implementation (e.g. delays, technical challenges, market developments)
- ☐ Other

*What would your recommendations be for simplifying access to the Innovation Fund for interested organisations?

To simplify access to the Innovation Fund and enhance its impact, Carbon Gap recommends:

1. Explicitly recognising Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) as a distinct category eligible for Innovation Fund support.

At present, CDR methods are only eligible if they include a CCS component, which excludes many promising approaches. Evaluation under the CCS category also fails to account for the specificities of CDR. Recognising CDR as a targeted area — with its own criteria — would ensure fairer assessment and unlock more diverse climate solutions.

2. Strengthening coordination with earlier-stage programmes like Horizon Europe.

The Innovation Fund is a key lever for scaling climate technologies, but the current lack of synergy with upstream programmes fragments support. Enhanced coordination is essential to ensure that early-stage CDR innovations can transition smoothly from research to deployment — and ultimately reach market scale.

3. Simplifying the application process and improving accessibility for novel actors.

Current procedures are complex, administratively heavy, and unclear — particularly for start-ups, SMEs, and first-time applicants. Clearer guidance, lighter documentation requirements, and tailored support (especially for CDR actors navigating ill-fitting CCS categories) would significantly improve access and effectiveness. The Innovation Fund is a critical test case for whether the EU will back industrial-scale carbon removal — or risk falling behind.

With its significant resources and strategic positioning, the Fund should seize the opportunity to help Europe lead in a growing €220 billion CDR market, create quality jobs, and deliver on its climate neutrality goals. Dedicated Innovation Fund support for CDR is not only a climate imperative — it's an industrial strategy.

Expected benefits, impacts and added value of the Innovation Fund

To what extent is the Innovation Fund helping achieve the following impacts?

	Great extent	Some extent	Very limited extent	Not at all	No opinion / I am not sure
* Emissions avoided	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* De-risked innovation (e. greater confidence that riskier endeavours will meet the conditions for success)	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Increased renewable energy production, energy storage and carbon capture, utilisation and storage	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Improved EU competitiveness and growth	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Job creation and skill acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Other	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

* If other, please specify which impact(s):

Support for permanent carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies

* To what extent does financial support from the Innovation Fund enable sectors to meet decarbonisation requirements under the EU ETS Directive?

- ☐ Great extent
- ☐ Some extent
- ☐ Very limited extent
- ☐ Not at all
- ☒ No opinion/I am not sure

In your view, could projects in the following sectors have been carried out without the Innovation Fund's support?

	Unlikely	Likely	No opinion/I am not sure
* Aviation	☐	☐	☒
* Cement & lime	☐	☐	☒
* Chemicals	☐	☐	☒
* Geothermal	☐	☐	☒
* Glass, ceramics & construction material	☐	☐	☒
* Hydro/ocean energy	☐	☐	☒
* Hydrogen	☐	☐	☒
* Intra-day electricity storage	☐	☐	☒
* Iron & steel	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for energy-intensive industries	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for energy storage	☐	☐	☒
* Manufacturing of components for the production of renewable energy	☐	☐	☒
* Maritime	☐	☐	☒
* Non-ferrous metals	☐	☐	☒
* Other energy storage	☐	☐	☒
* Pulp & paper	☐	☐	☒
* Refineries	☐	☐	☒
* Road transport	☐	☐	☒
* Solar energy	☐	☐	☒

* Use of renewable energy outside Annex I of the EU ETS Directive	☐	☐	☒
* Wind energy	☐	☐	☒
* Other	☐	☐	☒

* Which of the following benefits will be most significant for your sector/ organisation if supported by the Innovation Fund?

- ☒ Access to new markets or customer segments
- ☒ Financial support
- ☒ Opportunity to collaborate with top-tier research institutions or industry partners
- ☒ Risk reduction through shared investment or partnership
- ☒ Training and upskilling of staff
- ☒ Improved brand and reputation (e.g. 'green' credentials, innovation leadership)
- ☐ Not applicable/No opinion/I am not sure
- ☐ Other

* In your view, are more sector-specific calls and/or auctions needed (such as for sectors included under the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion/I am not sure

* In your view, what is the main added value of the Innovation Fund compared to other European or national funding programmes in the field of innovation, energy and climate?

- ☒ Higher funding amounts (e.g. suitable for large-scale demonstration projects)
- ☐ Calls are not too prescriptive
- ☒ Single beneficiaries can apply
- ☒ Focus on transformative, high-risk innovations near to deployment
- ☒ Integration of environmental and economic objectives
- ☒ Closer alignment with EU strategic goals (e.g. climate targets, industrial leadership)
- ☐ Enhanced networking and collaboration opportunities
- ☐ Increased visibility/improved reputation
- ☐ No opinion/I am not sure
- ☐ Other

Synergies and consistency with other funding instruments, legislation and policy strategies and initiatives

The Innovation Fund is designed to complement to and provide synergies with national funding opportunities/instruments in the field of innovation, energy and climate, working coherently with them while avoiding overlaps.

* In your view, is the Innovation Fund consistent (i.e. shares similar objectives and is compatible) with national funding opportunities/instruments?

- ☐ Fully consistent
- ☐ Partially consistent
- ☐ Not consistent
- ☒ No opinion/I am not sure

* Which EU programme(s) do you think have the most complementarities (e.g. facilitating a follow-through from innovation to scale-up) with the Innovation Fund?

- ☒ Horizon Europe and Horizon 2020
- ☐ Connecting Europe Facility
- ☒ InvestEU
- ☒ European Investment Bank lending
- ☐ Modernisation Fund
- ☒ LIFE programme
- ☐ Important Projects of Common European Interest (IPCEIs)
- ☒ European Innovation Council (Pillar III of Horizon Europe)
- ☐ Other

* Was your project previously supported by the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (including Horizon Europe and Horizon 2020)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ I am not sure

In your view, how consistent is the Innovation Fund with the objectives of the following legislation?

	Very consistent	Somewhat consistent	Only slightly consistent	Not at all consistent	No opinion/I am not sure
* EU ETS Directive	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

* European Climate Law	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Batteries Regulation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* REPowerEU	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Renewable Energy Directive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* ReFuelEU Aviation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* FuelEU Maritime	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

In your view, how consistent is the Innovation Fund with the following EU policies /strategies?

	Very consistent	Somewhat consistent	Only slightly consistent	Not at all consistent	No opinion/I am not sure
* European hydrogen strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Net-Zero Industry Act	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Strategic Technologies for Europe Platform	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Integrated SET plan	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* ERA industrial technology roadmaps	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* New industrial strategy for Europe	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Green Deal industrial plan	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
* Circular economy action plan	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Industrial carbon management strategy	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
* Offshore energy strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* EU solar strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
* Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Contact

Alice.FRANCHI@ec.europa.eu