

## EU Framework Programme: Call for Evidence response form

This form is available to download from [www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence](http://www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence).

URN: 10/1177RF

The Department may, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, make available, on public request, individual responses.

**The closing date for this call for evidence is 4 January 2011**

Name: Jonathan Flint

Organisation (if applicable): Oxford Instruments plc

Address: Tubney Woods, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX13 5QX

Please return completed forms to:

Amy Ackroyd

International Science and Innovation Unit

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills

1 Victoria Street

London SW1H 0ET

Tel: 020 7215 1211

Email: [Amy.Ackroyd@bis.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Amy.Ackroyd@bis.gsi.gov.uk)

Please indicate your affiliation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Government Department or Agency
<input type="checkbox"/>	Research Councils and the UK Research Office
<input type="checkbox"/>	Research Institute
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public and Private Research Bodies
<input type="checkbox"/>	Devolved Administration
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regionally-based special interest group
<input type="checkbox"/>	Funding Council University representative organisation
<input type="checkbox"/>	National Academy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Professional Institute

<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade Association
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Research Charities
<input type="checkbox"/>	Universities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry
<input type="checkbox"/>	SMEs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual researcher from a university
<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual researcher from industry
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe):

**Question1: What should the UK's high-level objectives be for FP8?**

**From the perspective of Oxford Instruments, the EU framework programmes should have three deliverables: to support overall wealth creation, enable technology development and provide trained individuals as both users of the technology and potential employees.**

**Question 2: How can FP8 help deliver economic growth throughout the life of the programme and beyond?**

**To deliver economic growth during the programme the individual projects will need to be highly focused, with economic deliverables treated as the key outcome from the start. In larger and longer projects there should be quantified deliverables at stages during the programme to gain the maximum economic benefit and value from any generated IP. Beyond the programme, economic benefit is related to the suitability of the project to the market and the ability for it to be marketed, through licencing etc.**

**Question 3: How should FP8 support the wider European context including Europe 2020 and the European Research Area?**

The interface between the Framework programmes, ERA and EU 2020 is unclear. Where the EU 2020 defines in part the % GDP to be spent on R&D across the EU, other than the climate change target it is unclear how this drills down in to either the Framework or to the ERA's targets.

**Question 4: The study *Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK* has indicated a number of broad benefits to the UK of the programme. Are these benefits identified appropriately and there other impacts that should be considered in addition?**

No comment

**Question 5: How can FP8 make a positive contribution to the UK economy – and the low-carbon economy in particular?**

**The greatest contribution will be achieved through clear definition of the targets and then the generation of clear roadmaps outlining the opportunities for technological development and commercialisation.**

**Question 6: How can FP8 support innovation in the UK?**

FP 8 needs to offer a flexible framework to facilitate innovation and therefore economic growth. A change from FP7 should be in the distribution of funds from thematic programmes to non-thematic ones: The basis of thematic calls is clear as it provides to the EU visibility in the development of technologies and projects in strategic areas such as Energy etc, However, non-thematic calls allow for a higher level of flexibility for industry to respond to new ideas and technology developments.

**Question 7: What are your views on the split of the FP7 budget between these specific programmes? Should this change in FP8?**

**No comment**

**Question 8: Which areas of Framework Programme funding provide the most EU added-value (see paragraph 6)? And which the least?**

**No comment**

**Question 9: Can efficiencies be found in the Framework Programme because of overlaps between different areas of funding?**

**No comment**

**Question 10: What are the arguments for and against FP8 moving towards funding research and development which addresses grand challenges?**

**Clarity is required to define whether the Framework programme is defined as a mechanism to deliver enhanced economic growth to the EU and over what period. If consistent economic growth is required within the framework period the attractiveness of addressing grand challenges would be lower.**

**Question 11: Which grand challenges (see above) are best tackled on an EU-wide rather than a national level? Within these areas which particular aspects would benefit from an interdisciplinary focus?**

**No comment**

**Question 12: How should FP8 engage with countries outside the EU or associated to the Framework Programme in addressing global challenges?<sup>1</sup>**

**FP8 needs to be supportive of projects (including with funding) that involve partners from outside of the EU, if it can be determined that part or all of the economic benefit will remain in the EU. This would allow competitive issues within the EU, or where unique processes or IP for a given project lie outside of the EU. An area of particular interest to OI is in superconducting material development.**

**Question 13: Should FP8 still provide some thematic focus e.g. in areas such as space and transport? Should any of the current themes be revisited over the course of FP8 – and if so, how?**

**No comment**

**Question 14: What should be the role of key enabling technologies e.g. ICT and nanotechnology in FP8?**

**Enabling technologies such as nanotechnology & ICT are clearly important. However in FP8 greater effort should be made in providing a mechanism for these enabling tools to be integrated in products and services to facilitate their timely exploitation.**

**Question 15: Services form a crucial part of the UK economy. Should research into services be addressed specifically in the Framework Programme, and if so, how?**

**No comment**

**Question 16: What are your views on how the Framework Programme allocation for collaborative research should be apportioned between themes; enabling technologies and underpinning areas of research e.g. social sciences and humanities?**

**No comment**

**Question 17: To what extent should ERC funding focus on supporting frontier research? Are there other areas in which ERC could add value?**

**No comment**

---

<sup>1</sup> FP7 participants can in principle be based anywhere. There are different categories of country which may have varying eligibility for different specific work programmes: the EU-27; associated countries – with science and technology cooperation agreements that involve contributing to the framework programme budget; EU accession candidate countries; and third countries whose participation is justified in terms of the enhanced contribution to the objectives of FP7.

**Question 18: Should ERC's current emphasis on funding a single investigator continue into FP8?**

**No comment**

**Question 19: Are there any options that could better link ERC activities with private sector interests?**

**No comment.**

**Question 20: What priority should researcher mobility and skills development have in FP8? What is the best way to address this?**

**High**

**Question 21: The capacities specific programme currently covers several policy initiatives relating to capacity-building. Which of these are of most value? Are there other areas which would merit funding?**

**Research done for the benefit of SMEs. However it should be noted that, 1) Large entities (LE's) can provide enormous support to SME's in the delivery to market of a product concept. LE's have the benefits of knowledge of how to design products (DFM) for efficient and consistent manufacturing. Other benefits include using a LE to support the S&M process provide sales channels etc and therefore a route to market. The understandable focus on SME support with lower levels of support for LE's, in particular in the non-thematic calls may reduce the commercial return for the SME and for the EU as a whole.**

**Question 22: What should the relative priority be for the Joint Research Centre under FP8? On which activities should it focus?**

**In its capacity of The JRC provides independent scientific and technical advice to the European Commission and Member States of the European Union (EU) in support of EU policies, and it should function to advise on technology trend and requirements.**

**Question 23: Please comment on the COST framework and its links with the Framework Programme**

**No comment**

**Question 24: Should FP8 directly support activities aimed at integrating the three sides of the knowledge triangle e.g. KICs?**

**The concept of the Knowledge and Innovation Communities to bring business and academics together sounds reasonable however we have no experience of these groups nor of their effectiveness and value.**

**Question 25: Which instruments (e.g. JTIs, article 185 initiatives) should be retained for FP8? Are any new instruments required?**

**We consider that the Eurostars concept is particularly well suited to technology development and proliferation and should be greatly expanded. Eurostars is a good model of EU collaboration with direct relationship to commercial product development, i.e. partners from two countries, a typical 2-3 year project lifetime and a defined period to develop a prototype. However, in the case of Eurostars the funding pools are relatively small compared to the normal EU programmes and there is little harmony in funding amounts or policy in the participating countries.**

**Question 26: Please comment on the Risk Sharing Finance Facility. Should a scheme of this kind be included within FP8?**

**No comment**

**Question 27: What should the balance be between funding large-scale programmes e.g. the article 185 *programmes* above and smaller *projects* individually administered by the Commission?**

**No comment**

**Question 28: What should be the role of public-private partnerships in FP8?**

**No comment**

**Question 29: What lessons from evaluations of previous framework programmes can help with the development of FP8?**

**a) Consortia: A strength of FP7 is the reliance on consortia to synergistically provide new and innovative solutions. However, in some cases the requirement for numbers of members and the bureaucracy associated with the management of the consortium can be overwhelming and act as a barrier to entry to some projects.**

**b) SME's vs LE's: A large proportion of support funding for technology development is directed towards SME's as they have been recognised as a key element for growth going forward. However has the preferential status of SMEs swung too far to the detriment of LE's and now impact their ability to access new technologies and deliver them to market.**

**Question 30: What steps could be taken to ensure that knowledge gained from FP8 is disseminated and exploited – and remains easily accessible over time?**

**An efficient KTN system, like that operated through the TSB would be useful if it does not already exist.**

**Question 31: Would any proactive effort to alter the current balance of funding between universities, research organisations and businesses be appropriate or effective? If so, what might be involved?**

No comment.

**Question 32: What could be done at EU level to encourage more businesses – especially SMEs - to apply?**

A strength of FP7 is the reliance on consortia, to synergistically provide new and innovative solutions. However, in some cases the requirements for numbers of members and the bureaucracy associated with the management of the consortium can be overwhelming, and act as a barrier to entry.

**Question 33: What could the Commission do to reduce bureaucracy of FP8 over and above the current simplification proposals (including changes to the Financial Regulations and Implementing Rules)?**

The Commission should review areas which act as barriers to entry for interested participants. There is a widely held view that unless you are an expert in completing the EU application paperwork that the ability to succeed with a project is greatly reduced.

**Question 34: Is there a role for a two-stage applications process analogous to that used by the Technology Strategy Board<sup>2</sup>?**

Yes, but not if it results in longer periods between call announcement and funding.

**Question 35: Should the programme move away from a cost/input-based funding model to one based more on results/outcomes/performance?**

Yes

**Question 36: Should the rules on intellectual property in FP7 be changed for FP8?**

We are not aware of any issues with the current arrangements

**Question 37: Is the proportion of overheads funded by FP7 appropriate? Should this be adapted in FP8 to create more consistency with other sources of funding?**

Existing policies seem reasonable

---

<sup>2</sup> For details of Technology Strategy Board processes see [www.innovateuk.org](http://www.innovateuk.org)

**Question 38: Within the current UK public expenditure constraints<sup>3</sup>, could the UK do more on a cost-neutral basis to encourage participation in FP generally?**

**No comment**

**Question 39: How effective are the current UK support services?**

**They seem effective**

**Question 40: What could be done at UK level to encourage more businesses – especially SMEs - to apply?**

**Greater promotion of the benefits of participation. Provision of clear advice on the application process.**

**Question 41: Are there any lessons from other countries that could help raise UK participation?**

**No comment**

**Question 42: Please add additional comments here in relation to UK interests in the Framework Programme.**

**A large proportion of support funding for technology development is directed towards SME's as they have been recognised as a key element for growth going forward. However has the preferential status of SMEs swung too far to the detriment of LE's and now impact their ability to access new technologies and deliver them to market.**

**Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole?**

**No**

Please use this space for any general comments that you may have, comments on the layout of this consultation would also be welcomed.

Thank you for your views on this consultation.

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge receipt of individual responses unless you tick the box below.

Please acknowledge this reply

---

<sup>3</sup> See [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm)

At BIS we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, would it be okay if we were to contact you again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

Yes

No