

Events

Design Survey

Collect Responses

Analyze Results

[View Summary](#)[Default Report](#)[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 44 of 61 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)**Custom Value:**
empty**IP Address:**
86.160.207.62**Response Started:**
Monday, August 5, 2013 10:13:20 AM**Response Modified:**
Monday, August 5, 2013 10:45:30 AM**1. Name:****2. Organisation (if applicable):**

BT

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?

EU research actions allow us to partner with other organisations in a market space in order to agree a common approach to problems that can enable competitive markets if they are overcome. A significant recent example of this is the FP7 QosMos project. This project, which was led by BT, studied the technical challenges of using cognitive radio techniques in the TV Whitespace frequency bands. The project not only developed key technologies, it discussed its findings with a project advisory board that included both competitive users of the spectrum (TV broadcasters and radio mic. companies) and European Regulators. Results from this project have already been tested in a TSB project trialling the use of TV whitespace for rural broadband and will be used in a forthcoming Ofcom trial for M2M networking. These activities are moving the debate on suitable regulatory models for TV Whitespace frequencies and hence forming the future market opportunity for everyone. These EU actions also allow us to partner with organisations with complimentary expertise in order to be able to address multi-disciplinary challenges. FP7 TA2 is a good example of this value. The core of the project was to study and develop an informal group video conferencing experience. A part of the project was the availability of an online game that formed a key part of the shared experience it was essential to have a suitable partner. In this case we were able to include Ravensberger as a partner in the consortium to provide the missing game development expertise.

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?

There is no clear evidence that these EU actions have, in and of themselves, prevented useful research. However, in setting such specific research agendas the programmes focus the research in research institutions across Europe into particular areas. The EU Programmes often reflect research priorities that can produce good research activity as opposed to results that can develop into service or product innovation – possibly because the programme peer review process is driven by academic experts. Two examples from the telecommunications perspective are: - At the beginning of FP7 there was no prioritisation of research in core network technologies and project submissions were rejected with indications that no further research was required in this area. It took the industry a number of years to correct this position and it is only recently that FP7 project Strongest has placed Europe at the forefront of flexi-grid technology for core networks. - Despite the evidence that copper will remain a significant part of Europe's access networks until 2020 and beyond, FP7 has continued to ignore research that is not either mobile or fibre-optic. As a result, research to deliver

higher speed broadband in Europe is not received the funding that is commensurate with achieving the EU Social targets. National funding is independent but often reflects these same implied decisions, possibly because it also relies on an academic peer review.

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 comment

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

As an industry partner the formation of the ERA has had little direct impact on our research activities. However, some minor changes, like placing some emphasis on the benefits of a non-academic research placement in the mobility actions, could achieve more influence and be mutually beneficial.

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?

In the same way that many of the key research challenges require a multi-disciplinary project team some of the key challenges that need to be addressed by research cross multiple areas of EU policy and hence different units within the commission. In order to address this, a number of calls under FP7 involved multiple units. However, this unification was very superficial. Different objectives within these calls were exclusively controlled by one or other of the involved units, and there was no real joint activity in areas between the units. In one case the different objectives in a single call had different closing dates to meet the requirements of the different units involved. If the EU is going to effectively address these challenges that cross unit boundaries it has to be more effective at supporting research activities that address the challenges without segmenting them into separate parts that reflect EU unit boundaries.

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?

In FP7 there is currently a leaning towards research challenges to create scientific knowledge or technology. Creating a more balanced programme which includes more innovation would deliver significantly more value. It is particularly important that the H2020 programme, which includes 'Close to market projects', distinguishes between the expertise required to peer review the different types of projects. We have recently become involved in EIT ICT Labs activities, which will be part of the H2020 programme and focusses on the downstreaming of research results to innovation. This positioning addresses a different part of the research challenge and has the potential to mesh well with other EU research actions. However, in order to achieve the best results it needs to apply genuine industrial discipline to its processes, whereas some participants appear to treat it as more of FP7. Part of the problem is that, in the same way that all academics are not equally suitable to peer review academic activities, so just because a researcher is from industry doesn't mean they are qualified to lead on reviewing innovation & downstreaming activities. - How might a greater or lesser degree of EU competence deliver more in your area? No comment. - How could improvements to existing EU activities make them more effective and efficient? If the EU did not segment their research challenges to reflect their unit structure it could more effectively address those challenges that cross policy areas.

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

There is a tendency to focus on very visible challenges that can be easily expressed when describing the research programme. This can lead to a reduction in focus on the infrastructure technologies that are key enablers to world class solutions to these more visible challenges. Without a credible work-programme that addresses these infrastructure challenges there will be insufficient research focus and Europe may not be able to deliver suitable solutions to the societal challenges.

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

Within ICT the market is international in nature and research results need to be applicable in multiple geographies and to widespread industry sectors. This widely applicable research is best addressed with a research team that includes wide market knowledge, making an EU consortium more appropriate. However, at a later stage innovation research that involves significant customer involvement and addresses country specific challenges delivers significant value for national deployment. In order to deliver best result for this mixed scenario, national programmes should address more of the later stage challenges which are national in nature.

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

Unlike the support of early stage research by RCUK, it is important that the TSB, in funding later stage research, compliments the European programmes as there is little value in the UK diverging in market sectors that are naturally multinational. Examples on how this could be done include: - the use of feasibility studies that allow the formation of UK centered consortia to bid for EU funding; - a focus on supporting projects that apply research results to address UK challenges. In order to deliver best result for such research the TSB funding programme needs to recognise the need for EU partners to be involved. This will allow these projects to better exploit EU project results and reflect the international nature of supply chains in ICT.

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

Based on experience of the last such enlargement, there will be more opportunities to partner with world class expertise (for example BT has successfully partnered with the Jozef Stefan institute, Slovenia, on a number of projects over several years), but there will also be challenges for the new potential partners to become involved in successful projects. Problems will be generated if there are artificial criteria created (e.g. country quotas) in order to artificially increase new state involvement in the programmes. Such quotas generally lead to token partners that satisfy the criteria but add little value to the consortium or the partner involved.

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

Whilst we support the principle of maintaining the quality of the work included in the programmes through peer review, it is essential to ensure that the peers are appropriate. This means not only people with technical expertise in the areas but also appropriate experience in the stage of research being undertaken (e.g. early stage academic research or later stage innovation). In general our experience is that the existing peer review process is overly focussed on academic reviewers. The recent H2020 call for experts continued this in the way it focussed on academic qualifications and published papers in contrast to experience of deploying innovations into products and services. It is not sufficient to distinguish between academic and industry background, it is also important to look into areas of expertise and especially whether this includes deployment of research results into the market – if that is appropriate to the challenge being set.

Community: [Developers](#) [Facebook](#) [Twitter](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Our Blog](#) [Google+](#) [YouTube](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) [Board of Directors](#) [Partners](#) [Newsroom](#) [Contact Us](#) [Jobs](#) [Careers](#) [Help](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) [Privacy Policy](#) [Anti-Spam Policy](#) [Security Statement](#)

Language: [English](#) [Español](#) [Português](#) [Deutsch](#) [Nederlands](#) [Français](#) [Pycckий](#) [Italiano](#) [Česky](#) [Svenska](#) [עברית](#) [日本語](#) [한국어](#) [Türkçe](#) [Norsk](#) [Suomi](#)

Copyright © 1999-2013 SurveyMonkey