Displaying **15** of **60** respondents

Response Type:
Normal Response

Collector:
Web Link
(Web Link)

Custom Value:
empty

IP Address:
194.80.235.253

Response Started:
Wednesday, July 10, 2013 4:41:05 PM

Response Modified:
Wednesday, July 10, 2013 6:09:01 PM

1. Name:

Prof Terence A Wilkins

2. Organisation (if applicable):

University of Leeds

3. Email address:

4. Address:

University of Leeds Nanomanufacturing Institute

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

a research or educational 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?

In the field of nanotechnology, my analysis of UK performance in the EU framework programme 7 (FP7) presented to the BIS/DEFRA Nanotechnology Strategy Forum 25 June 2013, co-chaired by the Mr Willetts and Lord De Mauley demonstrated the UK academia, research and industry participated in 45% of all projects in this important industrial technology field. Its secured 10% of all EU grant income equivalent to 355Mn Euros. 20 of its Russell Group universities dominated both research and and innovation projects and would lose a substantial source of income and international research collaborations if such 7-year programmes were not available with a serious and negative impact on translational research for UK high-value manufacturing industry.

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?

None. EU action in nanotechnology has not prevented useful national action

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?

UK engagement with partner countries and international bodies has been enhanced by EU involvement. Good examples of this are: graphene research; safety of nanomaterials, metrology and international standardisation (NPL, CEN, ISO).

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

Benefits have been: substantial increase in research capacities in the Russell group of Universities; development of innovation ecosystems around the best universities providing product and manufacturing options to SMEs with global customer bases. The UK is the dominant player in ERC research and Marie Curie researcher mobility programmes. The only difficulties occur in EC programmes co-funded by public: public ; private sources (i.e. Member state: EC: industry). Finding the UK public funding is often difficult

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?

Within the EC, there are high-level inter-service committees operating across policy areas to coordinate activities. For the next 7 year programme, Horizon 2020, this is well mapped out into 3 pillars (Research Excellence, Industrial Competitivity and Societal Challenges) which form a research->innovation-> socioeconomic impact value chain. Whilst SMEs have been active players in FP7 and received better funding than UK national scheme, the EU was a less good environment for raising funding to create and grow SMEs. However in the next 7-year programme Horizon 2020 there are substantially increased sources of regional funding with much lower administration burdens to support SME growth than in the UK

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?

Targeted funding on pilot plants and manufacturing demonstrators in high-value manufacturing

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

None

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

Greater support for management research and training in emergent technology manufacturing. Investment in centres of excellence in strategic S&T where the UK might become EU and world leading (e.g. following the graphene model. Investing in regional smart technology specialisation clusters to encourage them to grow, support SMEs and compete internationally Patent procedures are far more effective at the EU level than at the national level. Continued pressure on the UK to simplify and reduce costs will pay real dividends

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

EU policy making structures and continuous and evolutionary. Also the funds at its disposal are larger than the UK and inevitable have an impact on national counterparts. Sufficient resources within relevant ministeries are needed to both monitor and integrate policy. Also encourage greater numbers of UK industrial and academic leaders to participate in EC policy advisory groups

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

The ERA mechanisms have been well honed over 37 years. The impact of enlargement will be minimal. Whilst new member states will increase competition from new research organisations, the latter will bring diversity and new capabilities into the ERA mix

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

The tone of the survey and its questions are a little negative. It might be instructive to study what the UK research and innovation community would gain or lose if the UK no longer had access to the EU. Gains: very few Losses: Large amount of income to the Russell Group. Much less favorable access to innovation ideas, customers and R&I funds for UK SMEs