

**THE EU FRAMEWORK  
PROGRAMME**

Call for Evidence

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills  
[www.bis.gov.uk](http://www.bis.gov.uk)  
First published October 2010 © Crown Copyright

**URN 10/1177**

1.	Foreword from the Minister of State for Universities and Science .....	5
2.	Executive Summary .....	6
3.	How to respond.....	7
4.	Additional copies.....	7
5.	Confidentiality & Data Protection .....	8
6.	Help with queries .....	8
7.	The EU Framework Programme call for evidence questions.....	9
	i) Framework Programme in Context	
	ii) The Focus for FP8	
	iii) Outcomes and Impacts	
	iv) Participation in FP8	
	v) Administration and Funding	
	vi) UK Support for the Framework Programme	
8.	Overview and Impact Assessment.....	23
9.	What happens next? .....	23
Annex 1:	The Consultation Code of Practice Criteria .....	24
	Comments or complaints.....	24
Annex 2:	List of Individuals/Organisations consulted .....	25
Annex 3:	Impact Assessment (IA) .....	26
	Summary: Intervention and Options.....	26
	Summary: Analysis and Evidence.....	27
	Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts.....	28
	Specific Impact Tests: Checklist.....	28
	Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes .....	29
Annex 4:	EU Framework Programme 8: Call for Evidence response form.....	30
	Do you have any other comments that might aid the consultation process as a whole? .....	39

## The EU Framework Programme: call for evidence

1. This paper sets out details of the background to, and UK participation in, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development and explores areas where we would like to seek further views.
2. **The responses to this call for evidence will inform a Government strategy paper on UK priorities for the future development of the Framework Programme from 2014 (FP8). This will be presented to the European Commission in advance of the publication of their first communication on the next Framework Programme (FP8); sent to other Member States; and published on the BIS web site.**
3. Framework Programme 8 will run from 2014 until 2020 alongside the next EU multiannual financial perspectives. The Commission is expected to set out initial thoughts on FP8 in the first half of 2011.

**Issued:** 13 October 2010

**Respond by:** 4 January 2011

Enquiries 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)

This call for evidence is relevant to: organisations representing the science, engineering and industry communities; representatives from universities, research organisations and research-performing businesses; and individuals who have participated or have considered participating in the Framework Programme.

## **1. Foreword from the Minister of State for Universities and Science**

Europe's dedicated funding mechanism for research is the Seventh Framework programme. The UK does well from the programme with our universities, research centres and businesses having won €1.8 billion since 2004. However we would like to see the programme develop in the future so it becomes less bureaucratic; more attractive to participants, especially businesses; and achieves demonstrable impact in terms of high value goods and service and improved policy-making.

Like the rest of Europe we in the UK are currently considering how we would like to see the next Framework Programme (FP8) develop. We hope this call for evidence will provide us with data from those interested in the programme to inform our views in advance of the European Commission's early proposals for FP8 which we expect to be published next year.

I would welcome feedback on your experiences of the current and past Framework Programmes and what could be improved in the future. In particular the views of those with personal experience of projects – and from those who have until now not participated in the programme - would be most welcome.

**David Willetts MP**

## 2. Executive Summary

1. The Framework Programme is the EU's main programme for funding research, technological development and demonstration. The current iteration is FP7 (2007-2013) with a budget of €50.5 billion. The programme sets out to deliver a number of EU-wide benefits including economies of scale, the development of public goods such as low carbon technologies and the creation of cross-European networks.
2. FP7 currently funds the following broad areas of research:
  - **Cooperation:** collaborative research projects involving universities and businesses from at least three countries
  - **Ideas:** projects driven by a single, highly-regarded "investigator" and funded through the European Research Council. These are often, but not necessarily, highly innovative "blue skies" research projects
  - **People:** a number of projects aimed at boosting researcher skills and mobility under the Marie Curie programme.
  - **Capacities:** a number of programmes aimed at boosting the research capacity of Europe.
  - **The Joint Research Centre** supports EU policy-making and delivery e.g. in nuclear and environmental science through a number of research centres
3. The independent ex-post evaluation of FP6 highlighted a number of areas including the need for further administrative simplification and reduced time-to-contract; and the importance of future evaluations focussing more on results achieved and impacts – especially on business participants. The interim evaluation of FP7 is expected later in 2010.
4. UK performance in FP7 is strong with the UK gaining 14.4% of funding to date. UK academic participation is strong but UK business participation remains lower than France and Germany.
5. There are ongoing concerns about the administrative complexity of the Framework Programme and a number of simplification procedures are under consideration.
6. UK-based organisations interested in taking part in the Framework Programme are supported by the Technology Strategy Board and The UK Research Office in Brussels.

### 3. How to respond

1. When responding please state whether you are responding as an individual or representing the views of an organisation.
2. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation please make it clear who the organisation represents and, where applicable, how the views of members were assembled.
3. You can provide evidence using the form in annex 4.
4. This call for evidence presents a series of questions on key topics. Responses which provide an overall response to the document or which focus on only a limited range of questions are most welcome alongside broader responses.
5. You can also join in an on-line discussion via the Technology Strategy Board *\_connect* platform on <https://ktn.innovateuk.org/web/guest> and register for the FP7 UK network and then the FP8 consultation group.
6. Alternatively, you can download a Word document of the questions from the website [www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence](http://www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence). If you decide to respond in this way the form can be submitted by letter or email 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)

7. A list of those organisations invited to present evidence is in annex 2. All other individuals and organisations are welcome to respond. We would also welcome suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this evidence-gathering process.

Guidance for policy:

8. The consultation will open on the 13<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and the last date for responses will be the 4<sup>th</sup> January 2011.

### 4. Additional copies

9. Further printed copies of the consultation document can be obtained from:

BIS Publications Orderline  
ADMAIL 528  
London SW1W 8YT  
Tel: 0845-015 0010  
Fax: 0845-015 0020  
Minicom: 0845-015 0030  
[www.BIS.gov.uk/publications](http://www.BIS.gov.uk/publications)

10. An electronic version of this document can be found at [www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence](http://www.bis.gov.uk/fp8-call-for-evidence). You may make copies of this document without seeking permission. Other

versions of this document can be made available on request in Braille, other languages, large fonts and other formats. Contact the departmental contact above.

## 5. Confidentiality & Data Protection

- 11 It is our intention to publish all responses to this consultation. If there are parts of your response which you wish to keep confidential, these need to be marked and explained. The legal framework relating to information disclosure is set out in the following paragraphs 12 and 13.
- 12 Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or release to other parties or to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). If you want information, including personal data that you provide, to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.
- 13 In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

## 6. Help with queries

14. Questions about the policy issues raised in the document can be addressed 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)

A copy of the Code of Practice on Consultation is in Annex 1.



## 7. The EU Framework Programme call for evidence questions

### i) *The Framework Programme in context*

#### Background

1. The European Union's aspiration to become "the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world by 2010" was set out in the Lisbon strategy, launched at the Lisbon European Council in 2000. The European Council later set a target of spending 3% EU GDP on Research and Development (R&D)<sup>1</sup>.
2. Much of this ambition has been carried over to *Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth* published in March 2010. As part of the smart growth agenda to develop an economy based on knowledge and innovation, the Council agreed to keep the 3% target for R&D and to introduce a flagship initiative *Innovation Union* which was launched on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2010. This aims to "improve conditions and access to finance for research and innovation in Europe, to ensure that innovative ideas can be turned into products and services that create growth and jobs"<sup>2</sup>.
3. The *Science, Technology and Competitiveness key figures report 2008/2009*<sup>3</sup> calls for an increased investment in R&D in Europe because now over 75% of global research investment is made outside the EU. This is almost inevitable as globalization and the opening-up of the world science system mean that the EU (and US) will eventually account for a smaller share of the world's science base. The report stated that the EU's R&D intensity<sup>4</sup> is currently 1.83%, compared to 2.7% in the US, 3.4% in Japan and 3.2% in South Korea, though it acknowledges that much of this can be attributed to proportionately lower levels of business R&D because of the EU's industrial mix.
4. The EU's programme for funding research, technological development and demonstration is the multi-annual Framework Programme. Since its inception in the early 1980s the Framework Programmes have steadily increased in size and scope<sup>5</sup> and spending under FP7 (2007-2013) is now in the order of €6-7 billion per year. The next Framework Programme (FP8) falls under the next EU financial perspectives and will begin in 2014.
5. The Framework Programme currently supports a number of objectives including innovation & competitiveness; policy development; and building scientific excellence through a number of established and emerging instruments. It is also one of the main implementing tools of the European Research Area<sup>6</sup> and delivers the goals set out in Article 179 (ex article 163) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)<sup>7</sup> with respect to competitiveness

---

<sup>1</sup> With 2% from the private sector, 1% from the public sector.

<sup>2</sup> European Commission website for Innovation Union is <http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union>

<sup>3</sup> Available from: [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/key-figures-report2008-2009\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/key-figures-report2008-2009_en.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> A gross domestic expenditure on R&D as a % of GDP

<sup>5</sup> EG FP1 1984-1988 had a budget of €3.75bn; FP5 1998-2002 €14.96bn; FP6 2002-2006 €17.88 bn and FP7 2007-2013 a budget of €50.5 bn

<sup>6</sup> The objective of ERA is to create a single market for R&D which incorporates a number of policy areas: facilitating free movement of researchers; excellent European research infrastructures; easy exchange of knowledge across Europe; best-practice in Intellectual property management for publicly-funded research; coordinated links with countries outside the EU; and moves to coordinate member-state funded research to tackle global issues. It now has a Treaty base under Lisbon (TFEU 179)

<sup>7</sup> The full text of the Treaty can be downloaded from [http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en\\_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=FXAC08115](http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=FXAC08115)

and in “promoting all the research activities deemed necessary by virtue of the other chapters of the Treaty”. This includes areas such as the environment and agriculture.

6. Principles of EU value-added and subsidiary underpin the Framework Programme i.e. there should be clear additional benefits from collective efforts compared to action solely by individual member-states. The Framework Programme sets out to achieve economies of scale through enabling a ‘critical mass’ of technical / capital equipment or knowledge; developing knowledge that allows the development of ‘EU public goods’ (such as new low-carbon technologies); the creation of networks and systems across businesses, universities and research centres across Europe; and the development of a common evidence base across Europe to facilitate policy development.

**Question 1: What should the UK’s high-level objectives be for FP8?**

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

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

7. The Framework Programme has traditionally focused on supporting trans-national research collaborations in industrially relevant areas and underpinning EU policy-making - although support to researcher mobility, trans-national access to research infrastructures and coordination of national programmes have been added over the years. The 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme (2007-13), “FP7”, has a number of new elements, including the establishment of a European Research Council (ERC) focused on scientific excellence, Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs) and support from the EIB for a Risk Sharing Finance Facility.

#### Benefits of the Framework Programme

8. The UK continues to do well in relation to other member states in respect of securing FP funding. During FP6 UK organisations received over 14% of the budget allocated which was exceeded only by Germany. The annual average of over €500m to UK participants over the four year cycle of FP6 indicates the significant contribution EU funding makes to R&D spending in the UK. Based on current trends this contribution is estimated to increase to €7bn over the seven years of FP7.
9. A recent study *Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK*<sup>8</sup> has shown a high degree of strategic alignment with UK national research priorities with clear impacts on research, business and international relationships.

**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?**

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

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

---

<sup>8</sup> Technopolis (2010) *The Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK*. Available from <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/science/docs/i/10-1158-impact-eu-rtd-framework>

ii) **The Focus for FP8**


Structure of the current Framework Programme

1. FP7 is currently structured in the following way:

- **Cooperation:** collaborative research projects involving universities and businesses from at least three countries
- **Ideas:** projects driven by a single, highly-regarded “investigator” and funded through the European Research Council. These are often, but not necessarily, highly innovative “blue skies” research projects
- **People:** a number of projects aimed at boosting researcher skills and mobility under the Marie Curie programme.
- **Capacities:** a number of programmes aimed at boosting the research capacity of Europe.
- **The Joint Research Centre** supports EU policy-making and delivery e.g. in nuclear and environmental science through a number of research centres

2. There is additionally a Euratom Framework programme covering nuclear fusion and fission with a budget of €2.75 bn. This programme is relevant to a specialist stakeholder base and is not included within this call for evidence.

## Budget breakdown



- FP7 (EC) worth €50.5bn over 7 years
- Annual spending in 2013, 75% higher than 2006

### Projected spend at outset of programme

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

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

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

3. The largest component of FP7 is the cooperation specific programme with an indicative budget of €32 bn. This funds research activities involving trans-national cooperation in ten thematic areas which include a number of key enabling technologies and *grand challenges*<sup>9</sup> facing Europe:

- Health
- Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Biotechnology
- Information and Communication Technologies
- Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new Production Technologies
- Energy
- Environment (including climate change)
- Transport (including aeronautics)
- Socio-Economic sciences and the humanities
- Space
- Security

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

**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?**

**Question 12: How should FP8 engage with countries outside the EU or associated to the Framework Programme in addressing global challenges?<sup>10</sup>**

**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 re-visited over the course of FP8 – and if so, how?**

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

**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?**


The budget breakdown amongst themes is as follows.

---

<sup>9</sup> “Certain issues related to, for example, climate change, the ageing of the population, energy, water or food supplies; banking finances and security are now of such a magnitude that Europe needs to elaborate a stronger, better-coordinated, more coherent and more global response to these challenges.” Council of the European Union Conclusions adopted 1-2 December 2008. See [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/104458.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/104458.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> FP7 participants can in principle be based anywhere, there are different categories of country which may have varying eligibility for different specific and 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.

# Budget breakdown amongst themes



**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?**

- The *Ideas* programme gives funding to investigator-driven research projects across all fields, carried out by individual teams in European competition and managed by a European Research Council (ERC). Projects are evaluated solely on the basis of excellence, as judged by peer review.
- The ERC is run separately from the Commission, consisting of an independent Scientific Council (to plan scientific strategy, establish the work programme, quality control and information activities) and an executive agency (dealing with administration, support for applicants, proposal eligibility, grant management and practical organisation).
- The UK has done well to date in securing funding from the European Research Council. For example in the 2009 advanced grants the UK was the most successful country in terms of Host Institution with 61 (25%) of the proposals selected for funding, which compares to 58 grants (21%) in the previous Call. The UK is followed by France (34), Germany (33) and Switzerland (29).

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

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

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

- The *people* programme – the "Marie Curie" actions are aimed at the mobility and skills of researchers. The budget is currently greater than previous Framework Programmes and more emphasis is given to industry/academic transfers. The UK is the most popular choice of country for Marie Curie fellows.

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

8. The *capacities* programme addresses key aspects of European research and innovation capacities in the following areas:

- Infrastructures – supporting feasibility studies for new European research infrastructures in the main. This does not cover the capital costs of building new infrastructures nor running costs.
- Science in Society
- Research done for benefit of SMEs – supporting SMEs who have little or no research capacity of their own.
- Regions of Knowledge and Research Potential – aimed at involving regional authorities in FP7 and enabling excellent researchers from convergence regions to achieve higher visibility (helping participation in collaborative projects).
- International cooperation - building the capacity of selected third countries and providing opportunities to take part in research not covered under the Cooperation specific programme.
- Co-ordination of national programmes and international cooperation, including initial set-up costs for Joint Programming Initiatives

**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?**

9. FP7 also funds the Joint Research Centre, a Directorate-General of the European Commission which comprises seven research Institutes in Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Spain. The JRC is allocated an annual budget of €320 million for direct scientific and technical support to EU institutions FP7 and earns up to a further 15% from competitive activities.

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

10. FP7 (via a budget drawn from the *Cooperation* specific programme) also supports COST, which is an inter-governmental framework supporting the coordination and networking of existing nationally-funded research activities.

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

Funding instruments

11. There is currently a move within the EU to link up at European level the three sides of the ‘knowledge triangle’ (education, research and innovation). The main instrument is the recently launched (and Barroso-driven) European Institute for Innovation and Technology (EIT)<sup>11</sup>, which is implemented via Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs) bringing together academic and business organisations in regional clusters (“co-location centres”) around defined themes including climate change, ICT and energy. Currently the EIT’s core

<sup>11</sup> See <http://eit.europa.eu/> for more information



EU funding comes from outside the Framework Programme. Further support for innovation-related activity is available from the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme.

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

12. FP7 has seen the use of several funding instruments including:

- Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs), long-term public-private partnerships, based on Article 185 of the TFEU (former Article 171) have also been created to implement aspects of the Strategic Research Agendas developed by the European Technology Platforms (ETPs)<sup>12</sup> that cannot be implemented through current FP7 instruments. JTIs combine private sector investment with European public funding, including grant funding from FP7, loan finance from the European Investment Bank and in some cases member state funding. There are currently JTIs on:
  - innovative medicines;
  - nanoelectronics;
  - embedded systems;
  - aeronautics and air transport; and
  - hydrogen and fuel cells
- Additionally there are three PPPs that were announced as part of the European Recovery Plan<sup>13</sup> covering factories of the future, energy-efficient building and green cars. A fourth PPP has been launched in the area of “Future Internet”.
- Article 185 (formerly 169) initiatives are mechanisms established by Member States to carry out transnational collaborative R&D with EU participation and funding. The underlying idea is to provide open, flexible support for proposals making an effective contribution to closer coordination of the research activities conducted within different frameworks in Europe. The current Article 185 initiatives are:
  - **Eurostars**, for projects in support of research-performing SMEs; and
  - **Ambient Assisted Living (AAL)** for projects that use ICT to enhance the quality of life of older people.
  - **European Metrology Research Programme**, a cross-cutting programme in the field of metrology
  - **BONUS** covering research on the Baltic Area
  - **EDCTP** (clinical trials)
- FP7 and the European Investment Bank have each contributed €1 billion to set up the Risk Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF). RSFF is an innovative scheme to improve access to debt financing for private companies or public institutions involved in research and innovation. RSFF is built on the principle of credit risk sharing between the European Community and the EIB and extends therefore the ability of the Bank to provide loans or guarantees for investment with a higher risk and reward profile.

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

<sup>12</sup> European Technology Platforms (ETPs) have been set up in areas where Europe's competitiveness, economic growth and welfare depend on important research and technological progress in the medium to long term. They bring together stakeholders, under industrial leadership, to define and implement a Strategic Research Agenda. The ETPs have contributed to the definition of the themes of the Cooperation programme, in particular in research areas of special industrial relevance. ETPs are not funding mechanisms.

<sup>13</sup> See <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/08/1771>

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

**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?**

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



### **iii) Outcomes and Impacts**

#### Evaluations of the Framework Programme

1. The independent ex-post evaluation of FP6 was published in February 2009<sup>14</sup>. Amongst the issues raised were the continuing decline in industrial participation; the need for further administrative simplification to reduce procedural complexity and time-to-contract (currently an average of just under one year), which has been identified as a significant disincentive to participate; and importance of future evaluations giving greater focus to results achieved and to impacts (particularly on business participants).
2. However it also concluded that FP6 had contributed to increased industrial competitiveness generated extended networks and strengthened the knowledge infrastructure in Europe. It included first-rate projects with top-quality researchers, contributing to improved researcher mobility, internationalisation of research teams, and to Europe performing internationally-competitive research at the frontiers of science and technology in areas of social and industrial importance.
3. The interim evaluation of FP7 is expected to be published later in 2010. The third FP7 Monitoring Report<sup>15</sup> covering 2007-2009 published in July 2010 showed that participation patterns have remained stable throughout the course of FP7. More than 55,000 proposals were received for 170 calls and more than 9000 proposals were finally retained for negotiations with a corresponding requested Community funding of €15 billion. 14.5% of all participants in signed grant agreements were SMEs.

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

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

---

<sup>14</sup> Available from [http://ec.europa.eu/research/reports/2009/pdf/fp6\\_evaluation\\_final\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/reports/2009/pdf/fp6_evaluation_final_report_en.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Available from <http://ec.europa.eu/research/index.cfm?pg=reports>

#### iv) Participation in FP8

1. The UK is considered to do well in the Framework Programme. FP6 was worth €2.3bn to the UK<sup>16</sup>.

	Number of participations	Value (€m)	% of FP6 funding
Germany	10,430	3,022	18.13
<b>UK</b>	<b>8,791</b>	<b>2,369</b>	<b>14.22</b>
France	7,911	2,173	13.03
All countries	74,440	16,665	

Overall performance to date in FP7 is similar.

	Number of participations	Value (€m)	% of FP7 funding
Germany	5,506	2,101	16.6
<b>UK</b>	<b>4,867</b>	<b>1,834*</b>	<b>14.4</b>
France	3,963	1,540	12.1
All countries	40,729	12,701	

The value of EU financial contribution per year to the UK is as follows:

year	EU financial contribution (€m)
2007	953.1
2008	569.3
2009	311.8
TOTAL	1,834
ALL YEARS	1,834

... with an especially high number of grant agreements compared to France and Germany.

	Number of grant agreements in FP7	% of total
Germany	2,680	39.2
<b>UK</b>	<b>2,899</b>	<b>42.4</b>
France	2,256	33.0
All countries	6,833	

2. UK academic participation is exceptionally strong in FP7

Participation by type (%)	Private Commercial organisations	Secondary and Higher education	Research organisations	Public bodies/Non-profit
Germany	32.8	34.6	28.2	4.4
<b>UK</b>	<b>23.5</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>5.4</b>
France	34.0	16.7	41.5	7.8

3. It should be noted that more than 60% of UK Framework Programme funding goes to UK universities. In 2008/9 the EU provided £325m of research grant funding to UK universities (up 16% from the previous year) – or 7.8% of total research grants. This

<sup>16</sup> Source: EC FP7 Grant Agreements and Participants Database released 1 May 2010

compares to £706m from Government departments, £895m from charities and £1,531m from research councils<sup>17</sup>.

4. Most universities take part in the Framework Programme but funding is concentrated in a small number of Russell Group universities (Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial College and UCL are the largest recipients in absolute terms<sup>18</sup>). However, these universities have a lower reliance on EU grants as a percentage of overall research grant and contract income than the university sector as a whole.<sup>19</sup>
5. UK business participation in the programme remains lower than for the France and Germany. The bureaucracy of the Framework Programme is often cited as a major deterrent for industry (more so than for academia). There is an expectation that the recently adopted Commission communication on simplification, and the forthcoming communication on the Financial Regulations, will pave the way to a simpler and more participant-friendly programme – to some degree in the remainder of FP7, and more so in FP8.
6. The recent report *The Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK*<sup>20</sup> concluded that, running somewhat counter to current perceptions, the aggregate statistics show that **UK business is as extensively involved in the FP as are its counterparts elsewhere in Europe**, however the **intensity of engagement is somewhat lower on average**.

**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?**

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

---

<sup>17</sup> Source: HESA

<sup>18</sup> Source HESA 2008/2009 total grant income for UK universities from EU government bodies £ 324,832m. Oxford £19,825m; Cambridge £18,387m; Imperial College £15,254m; UCL £16,162m

<sup>19</sup> The university sector as a whole receives 7.8% of its research grant income from EU sources. The figure for Cambridge is 7.1%, UCL 6.5%, Oxford 5.8% and Imperial College 5.3% Source HESA

<sup>20</sup> Technopolis (2010) *The Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK*. Available from [<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/science/docs/i/10-1158-impact-eu-rtd-framework>]

## v) **Administration and Funding**

### Simplification of programmes

1. There are well-documented concerns about the administration of the Framework Programme from the initial application process to post-completion audit. The Commission's Simplification Communication published in April 2010 assesses the current state of play with simplification of FP7, and considers further simplification options in the context of the 'Europe 2020' strategy, the forthcoming European Plan for Research and Innovation (the "Innovation Union" flagship initiative), and the triennial review of the Financial Regulations. The document presents options for further simplification under three categories:
2. Strand 1 proposes options (for FP7) aimed at improving processes and tools, with a view to reducing the time-to-grant and time-to-pay. These include:
  - improving guidance and IT support tools;
  - more consistent interpretation and application of rules across Commission DGs;
  - more flexibility in defining topics and indicating preferred consortia size in work programmes and setting call deadlines (possibly allowing for open calls);
  - more use of prizes.
3. Strand 2 proposals aim to:
  - improve acceptance of beneficiaries' usual accounting practices (including the methodology for calculating average personnel costs);
  - limit the variety of rules introduced to address different activities and types of participant;
  - remove the burden on project coordinators of having to open interest-bearing bank accounts to hold pre-financing;
  - increase use of lump sum payments in respect of personnel cost accounting and where it can assist SME owner-managers;
  - accelerating project selection by removing the legal requirement for FP programme committees to provide opinions on the selection of projects.
4. Strand 3 proposes to go further in removing the administrative effort associated with cost reporting and financial auditing by moving from the current cost-based system focused on input to a system of funding based on prior definition and acceptance of output/results. Three options are suggested for taking this forward:
  - establishing a project-specific lump sum on the basis of estimated total eligible costs against agreed outputs/results;
  - publishing calls with pre-defined lump sums per project in a given subject area, with selection of proposals based on the highest promise of scientific output for the specified lump sum; and
  - the 'high-trust' approach where the Commission would surrender control to the beneficiaries, who would be required to assure maximum transparency on the use of the pre-defined lump sum funds and the results achieved towards their peers and to the general public.

**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)?**

**Question 34: Is there a role for a two-stage applications process analogous to that used by the Technology Strategy Board<sup>21</sup>?**

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

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

#### Reimbursement of costs

5. One potential issue for the UK is the proposal to restrict reimbursement of indirect costs to one flat rate. This would work against the principle of financial sustainability and could stall efforts to encourage universities across Europe to move to a full economic cost basis. There is a strong case for the need for choice with reimbursement of indirect costs (actual costs or flat rate) for beneficiaries. Council conclusions<sup>22</sup> agreed in May 2010 included, under the “Flexibility” principle, the line: “beneficiaries should be allowed to choose between different forms of grants in the Framework Programmes. This corresponds to the need to have more compatibility with the usual accounting practices of the participants.”

**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?**

---

<sup>21</sup> Under these arrangements applications complete an initial summary application. If successful at this stage they then complete the rest of the application procedure

<sup>22</sup> Available from [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/114640.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/114640.pdf)

**vi) UK Support for the Framework Programme**

1. The Technology Strategy Board and Government Departments fund a support service for UK-based organisations interested in exploiting the opportunities provided by FP7 including a website, helpline and a network of National Contact Points (NCPs)<sup>23</sup>.
2. Additionally a number of web discussions under the Technology Strategy Board's *Connect* web forum allow those with an interest in the Framework Programme to share information.
3. The UK Research Office (UKRO) also offers an information and advice service on European Union funding for research and higher education. Established in Brussels in 1984, UKRO is jointly funded by all seven UK Research Councils and receives subscriptions from over 140 research organisations, principally in the UK.

**Question 38: Within the current UK public expenditure constraints<sup>24</sup>, could the UK do more on a cost-neutral basis to encourage participation in FP generally?**

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

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

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

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

<sup>23</sup> <https://ktn.innovateuk.org/web/fp7uk>

<sup>24</sup> See [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm)

## **8. Overview and Impact Assessment**

1. The initial stage 1A impact assessment is appended as annex 3.

## **9. What happens next?**

1. Responses to this consultation will be considered closely and will inform the continuing development of UK policy on the Framework Programme, especially in relation to FP8. The Government will publish a UK position paper on FP8 in early 2011 which will be sent to the European Commission and other Member States. This position paper will form the official response to the consultation.
2. This will be accompanied by an updated impact assessment which will take account of the views received from the call for evidence.
3. FP8 will begin in 2014 under the next EU financial perspectives.

## **Annex 1: The Consultation Code of Practice Criteria**

1. Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence policy outcome.
2. Consultation should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.
3. Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.
4. Consultation exercise should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.
5. Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees buy-in to the process is to be obtained.
6. Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.
7. Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

### **Comments or complaints**

If you wish to comment on the conduct of this consultation or make a complaint about the way this consultation has been conducted, please write to:

Tunde Idowu,  
BIS Consultation Co-ordinator,  
1 Victoria Street,  
London  
SW1H 0ET

Telephone Tunde on 020 7215 0412  
or e-mail to: [Babatunde.Idowu@BIS.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Babatunde.Idowu@BIS.gsi.gov.uk)



## **Annex 2: List of Individuals/Organisations consulted**

We have directly consulted over 100 people representing a cross-section of stakeholder groups in the development of this document.

In addition we expect this call-for-evidence to be of interest to the following groups:

- Government Departments and Agencies
- Research Councils and the UK Research Office
- Research Institutes
- Public and Private Research Bodies
- Devolved Administrations
- Regional special interest groups
- Funding Councils
- National Academies
- Professional Institutes
- Universities UK
- University representative groups
- Confederation of British Industry
- Trade Associations
- Major Research Charities
- Universities
- Industry
- SMEs
- Individual researchers from universities, research institutes or industry

All other individuals and organisations are welcome to respond. We would also welcome suggestions of others who may wish to be involved in this evidence-gathering process.

### Annex 3: Impact Assessment – initial stage 1A

<b>Title:</b> <b>The Eighth Framework Programme (FP8)</b> <b>Lead department or agency:</b> BIS <b>Other departments or agencies:</b> Significant interest from research councils, and departments including Defra, DECC, DT, HMT	<b>Impact Assessment (IA)</b>
	<b>IA No:</b> BIS0140
	<b>Date:</b> 30 Sept 2010
	<b>Stage:</b> Development/Options
	<b>Source of intervention:</b> EU
	<b>Type of measure:</b> Other
<b>Contact for enquiries:</b> Lucia Costanzo, research base x 1343	

### Summary: Intervention and Options

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**  
 Establishing the evidence and policy base for influencing the design of the next Framework Programme, the EU's principal Treaty-based instrument for funding transnational research, innovation and technological development.  
 The current programme (FP7) has a seven-year budget of €50.5 bn and ends in 2013. FP8 will start in 2014, alongside the next EU financial perspectives. The Commission is expected to publish an initial communication on the likely shape and structure of FP8 in the first half of 2011, followed by a formal proposal in 2012. Government intervention is necessary so as to influence the development of FP8 in line with UK strategic priorities and the strengths of the UK's research and industrial base.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**  
 Influence shape and structure of FP8 based on a detailed evidence base from:  
 - published quantitative data (e.g. on participation in FP7)  
 - commissioned research on UK impacts of FP7  
 - evidence on how the Framework programme impacts in practice provided from a wider group of stakeholders  
 To ensure a greater success rate for UK based applications for funding from FP8.

**What policy options have been considered? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)**  
 i) Do nothing: this is not a viable option. This would be a missed opportunity for the UK to influence a Programme worth billions of Euros to UK researchers.  
 ii) Inform UK negotiating lines on FP8 through public consultation and research. This will help shape the key priorities for FP8. UK already has mechanism in place for implementing FPs as part of the EU budget (financial perspective). This is the Government's preferred option that is being taken forward. Specific options will be developed at a later stage of this Impact Assessment.

<b>When will the policy be reviewed to establish its impact and the extent to which the policy objectives have been achieved?</b>	It will be updated 02/2011 to accompany Position Paper. Mid-term evaluation 2017.
<b>Are there arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review?</b>	Yes

**Chair's Sign-off** For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

***I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.***

Signed by the responsible

Chair: Keith Smith

Date: 11/10/2010

# Summary: Analysis and Evidence

# Policy Option 1

## Description:

An indicative look at the costs and benefits of funding under the EU Framework Programmes. Further development of alternative options will follow this call for evidence.

Price Base Year2010	PV Base Year2010	Time Period Years7	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low:	High:	Best Estimate: tbc

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low			
High			
Best Estimate	tbc	tbc	tbc

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There will be a cost (varying) to the preparation of applications by universities and industry to the programme for funding. Based on current success rates, only about 20% of applications will be successful. It is currently the UK's position to seek more use of a two-stage application process that would reduce the cost of initial application for those with limited opportunity for success, and improve the success rate associated with full second-stage application.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low			
High			
Best Estimate		£500m	£500m UK estimate

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Access to around 14% of programme budget of €50.5bn (based on current take-up from FP7 spanning seven years). This has had the following effects: provision of research grant funding for universities, research establishments and businesses; establishment of cross-European networks; funding of EU researchers to work in the UK; support for research coordination activities.

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Improved networking with collaborative research partners (EU and international); improved access to new tools and methodologies (businesses); improved ability to attract leading researchers from outside the UK (universities), innovation and research generated and disseminated in universities and industry.

### Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5

Risks: Policy is still at the early stages as the priorities and budget allocation have UK participation and funding (in percentage terms) could significantly change in relation to other member states, prioritisation of the next EU budget (to be determined following negotiations over the financial perspective), due to public sector budget cuts and the general economic situation.

Impact on admin burden (AB) (£m): New AB: £0	ABSavings:£0	Net:£0	Impact on policy cost savings (£m): Policy cost savings:	In scope Yes
---	--------------	--------	---	-----------------

## Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		EU			
From what date will the policy be implemented?		01/01/2014			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?					
What is the annual change in enforcement cost (£m)?					
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes/No			
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		Yes/No			
What is the CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)		Traded:		Non-traded:	
Does the proposal have an impact on competition?		Yes/No			
What proportion (%) of Total PV costs/benefits is directly attributable to primary legislation, if applicable?		Costs:		Benefits:	
Annual cost (£m) per organisation (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Micro	< 20	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

### Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Set out in the table below where information on any SITs undertaken as part of the analysis of the policy options can be found in the evidence base. For guidance on how to complete each test, double-click on the link for the guidance provided by the relevant department. Please note this checklist is not intended to list each and every statutory consideration that departments should take into account when deciding which policy option to follow. It is the responsibility of departments to make sure that their duties are complied with.

Does your policy option/proposal have an impact on...?	Impact	Page ref within IA
<b>Statutory equality duties</b> <sup>25</sup> <a href="#">Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test guidance</a>	Yes/No	
<b>Economic impacts</b> Competition <a href="#">Competition Assessment Impact Test guidance</a> Small firms <a href="#">Small Firms Impact Test guidance</a>	Yes/No	
	Yes/No	
<b>Environmental impacts</b> Greenhouse gas assessment Wider environmental issues <a href="#">Wider Environmental Issues Impact Test guidance</a>	Yes/No	
	Yes/No	
<b>Social impacts</b> Health and well-being <a href="#">Health and Well-being Impact Test guidance</a> Human rights <a href="#">Human Rights Impact Test guidance</a> Justice system <a href="#">Justice Impact Test guidance</a> Rural proofing <a href="#">Rural Proofing Impact Test guidance</a>	Yes/No	
	Yes/No	
	Yes/No	
	Yes/No	
<b>Sustainable development</b> <a href="#">Sustainable Development Impact Test guidance</a>	Yes/No	

<sup>25</sup> Race, disability and gender Impact assessments are statutory requirements for relevant policies. Equality statutory requirements will be expanded 2011, once the Equality Bill comes into force. Statutory equality duties part of the Equality Bill apply to GB only. The Toolkit provides advice on statutory equality duties for public authorities with a remit in Northern Ireland.

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes

Use this space to set out the relevant references, evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Please fill in **References** section.

### References

Include the links to relevant legislation and publications, such as public impact assessment of earlier stages (e.g. Consultation, Final, Enactment).

No.	Legislation or publication
1	Technopolis (2010) <i>The Impact of the EU RTD Framework Programme on the UK</i> .
2	
3	
4	

+ Add another row

### Evidence Base

Ensure that the information in this section provides clear evidence of the information provided in the summary pages of this form (recommended maximum of 30 pages). Complete the **Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits** (transition and recurring) below over the life of the preferred policy (use the spreadsheet attached if the period is longer than 10 years).

The spreadsheet also contains an emission changes table that you will need to fill in if your measure has an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits\* - (£m) constant prices

	Y <sub>0</sub>	Y <sub>1</sub>	Y <sub>2</sub>	Y <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>4</sub>	Y <sub>5</sub>	Y <sub>6</sub>	Y <sub>7</sub>	Y <sub>8</sub>	Y <sub>9</sub>
<b>Transition costs</b>										
<b>Annual recurring cost</b>										
<b>Total annual costs</b>										
<b>Transition benefits</b>										
<b>Annual recurring benefits</b>										
<b>Total annual benefits</b>										

\* For non-monetised benefits please see summary pages and main evidence base section

## Annex 4: EU Framework Programme 8: 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).

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 consultation is 4 January 2011**

Name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Address:

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

	Government Department or Agency
	Research Councils and the UK Research Office
	Research Institute
	Public and Private Research Bodies
	Devolved Administration
	Regionally-based special interest group
	Funding Council University representative organisation
	National Academy
	Professional Institute
	Trade Association
	Major Research Charities

	Universities
	Industry
	SMEs
	Individual researcher from a university
	Individual researcher from industry
	Other (please describe):

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

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

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

**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?**

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

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

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

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

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

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



**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?**

**Question 12: How should FP8 engage with countries outside the EU or associated to the Framework Programme in addressing global challenges?<sup>26</sup>**

**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?**

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

---

<sup>26</sup> FP7 participants can in principle be based anywhere. There are different categories of country which may have varying eligibility for different specific and 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 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?**

**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?**

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

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

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

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

**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?**

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

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

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

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

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

**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?**

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

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

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

**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?**

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

**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)?**

**Question 34: Is there a role for a two-stage applications process analogous to that used by the Technology Strategy Board<sup>27</sup>?**

---

<sup>27</sup> For details of Technology Strategy Board processes see [www.innovateuk.org](http://www.innovateuk.org)

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

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

**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?**

**Question 38: Within the current UK public expenditure constraints<sup>28</sup>, could the UK do more on a cost-neutral basis to encourage participation in FP generally?**

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

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

---

<sup>28</sup> See [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm)

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

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

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

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

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