

Events

Design Survey

Collect Responses

Analyze Results

View Summary

Default Report ▾

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Displaying 8 of 60 respondents

Response Type:
Normal ResponseCustom Value:
emptyResponse Started:
Monday, June 17, 2013 2:54:53 PMCollector:
Web Link
(Web Link)IP Address:
31.221.15.133Response Modified:
Monday, June 17, 2013 3:16:57 PM

1. Name:

2. Organisation (if applicable):

SCISYS

3. Email address:

4. Address:

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

Other (please specify) - Industry

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?

Space Robotics part of EU programme has been positively affected by Framework 7. ESA is reluctant to address such "research driven" technologies due to the long timescales before missions but they are drivers for mission selection and can influence non-space counterparts (deep sea, nuclear etc). ProvisScout, Provis-G projects were particularly useful ways to mix academic and industrial interests and align the space technologies derived from these studies with the wider non-space commercial RTD activities in Robotics and Autonomy.

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?

No obvious negative action for Space Robotics.

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?

Many EU RTD projects encourage European Industry to team with UK academics (who generally have more market oriented approaches to such programmes vs their European academic counterparts). This puts UK Industry in a difficult position (European teams generally "satisfy" the UK partner with just the academic/institute). Evidence suggests UK generally does well thanks to these institutes rather than Industry.

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

No comment

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?

No comment

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?

EU needs to coordinate user exploitation of Space Assets and in particular foster operational communities who will eventually fund space systems (like Meteorology). This should NOT be ESA/ESRIN etc etc. They need to develop RTD that can underpin such operational systems and/or their needs. EU also need to link space to non-space technology engagements since ESA does not do this well (ie take space technology and develop non-space extensions). ESA try this but need better domain champions from non-space technology sectors than they currently offer. EU should support the forstoring of industries to compete on a global scale but also act as an alternative to Prime Industry consolidations which block competition. Galileo was a successful example of this approach. GMES/Copernicus was not.

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

If the 50:50 funding goes too far then it prices SME/smaller industrial concerns out of the market for RTD so that only bigger groups (who can play faster and looser with the auditing process) will tend to be the winners.

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

Technologies that address the local market, demonstrators and prototypes that require collocations with partners (expensive across Europe); genuine innovation where idea resides in fewer partners (and mainly of one nation) vs geo-spread of teaming in more typical EU projects.

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

National funding should be able to support/augment (not run foul of additionality-type arguments)

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

Uncertain -generally diluting and so not positive.

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

No thanks

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

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

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

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

Copyright © 1999-2013 SurveyMonkey