

Events

Design Survey Collect Responses **Analyze Results**

View Summary

Default Report ▾

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Displaying 29 of 60 respondents

Response Type:
Normal ResponseCustom Value:
emptyResponse Started:
Monday, July 29, 2013 2:36:41 PMCollector:
Web Link
(Web Link)IP Address:
86.14.191.216Response Modified:
Monday, July 29, 2013 2:59:22 PM

1. Name:

2. Organisation (if applicable):

NMI

3. Email address:

4. Address:

5. In responding, it would be helpful if you could indicate whether you are responding as

a business or business representative body

6. Keeping in touch

Please keep me informed by email of the progress of this review, and other BIS Balance of Competence reviews.

1. 1. Where has EU action had a positive impact for the UK on research, technological development, innovation or space? What evidence is there for this? Has EU action encouraged national action in any areas?

(Ref ESCO Report) For electronics companies that have participated in FP7, there has been an overall positive impact. Not necessarily directly on the research projects involved, but often on the contact and links developed as part of the project.

2. 2. Where has EU action had a negative impact for the UK in these fields? What evidence is there for this? Has EU action prevented potentially useful national action in any areas?

Not a relevant question - the onus is on the UK government institutions to influence and coordinate national policy better with FP7 (now H2020) in particular. Negative EU impact should be viewed as a lack of proper national engagement.

3. 3. How and where has UK engagement with partner countries or international bodies, both within and outside the EU, been helped or hindered by EU involvement?

No Response

4. 4. What benefits or difficulties has the objective of a European research area (ERA) delivered for the UK?

Positive benefits to those who have engaged, but much more engagement and knowledge of what the ERA actually is is important.

5. 5. How has the EU sought to coordinate the policy instruments at its disposal across different policy areas to create an enabling environment for researchers and innovators? How successful has this been?

Speaking as a former UK NCP for FP7, the EU makes significant efforts in tying together different policy instruments. The issue, in the UK in particular is a lack of national government or TSB coordination and engagement.

1. 6. What could the EU most helpfully do to promote scientific and technological progress and innovation (including in the space sector)? - How could the EU use its existing competence differently to deliver more in your area? - How might a greater or lesser degree of EU competence deliver more in your area? - How could improvements to existing EU activities make them more effective and efficient?

Demand better coordination at a UK government level.

2. 7. Where might future EU level action be detrimental to your work in this area?

The new ECSEL JTI may be an issue for the UK if there is little or no UK government commitment to support the programme despite the fact that there is a strong UK competency within the electronics systems focus that the JTI is seeking to support.

3. 8. Where might action at national rather than EU level be more appropriate / effective?

National support to complement and support SME initiatives and pilot lines being developed as part of H2020 will be essential.

4. 9. How could EU and national policies and funding streams interact better?

Much stronger links between UK national initiatives and H2020 / Eureka / JTIs would be very beneficial to UK industry. The problem with the lack of UK involvement in Eureka and JTIs in particular is the lack of matched funding. This does not mean that the UK has to provide more funds. By looking at schemes such as AMSCI for example and making them eligible to supplement schemes such as ECSEL (formerly Eniac and Artemis) would actually mean that MORE support is leveraged by the UK government without the need for additional funds. The issue will be making sure that proper state aids clearances are set and approved by the government prior to the creation of a new scheme to enable such a 'joined up thinking' approach.

5. 10. What impact would any future enlargement of the EU have on this area of competence?

Positive from a UK business perspective in electronics R&D - it is a global market by nature, and so the broader the range of potential partners and markets opened up the better.

6. 11. Are there any other points you wish to make which are not captured above?

Joined up UK thinking is essential if UK industry is to make the most out of H2020. At the moment, TSB and BIS links seem to be tenuous and a potential block to a coordinated government support approach to European R&D. More and more matched funds from a UK level will be required for companies to make the most of EU R&D initiatives such as ECSEL, Eurostars etc.. If there is a coherent approach from the UK (tying in BIS, TSB and the Research Councils), this can be possible without necessarily increasing public funding levels. Very happy to share these ideas in detail.

Community: Developers · Facebook · Twitter · LinkedIn · Our Blog · Google+ · YouTube

About Us: Management Team · Board of Directors · Partners · Newsletter · Contact Us · Jobs · Sitemap · Help

Policies: Terms of Use · Privacy Policy · Anti-Spam Policy · Security Statement

Language: English · Español · Português · Deutsch · Nederlands · Français · Русский · Italiano · Dansk · Svenska · Türkçe · Suomi · Norsk

Copyright © 1999-2013 SurveyMonkey