



Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding: a response to the European Commission

Advice Paper 11-06

Summary

- EU research and innovation funding is an important element of the European research eco-system but the level of investment is small compared to national spend. Therefore, EU activity must be carefully targeted on where it can add special value.
- It is imperative that the Commission's contribution to the European research effort adds value and is seen to add value to national efforts. Without that there will continue to be national resistance to greater Commission involvement in the European research effort, particularly from Europe's major research players.
- There are three characteristics of EU-level funding and activity that are of significant value: mobility, coordination and solidarity.
- Mobility is a natural driver of collaboration, allowing researchers to fulfil their potential and stimulating the creation of excellent European research groups involving the highest levels of talent.
- Coordinating activity across Europe is one of the most valuable roles the EU fulfils, ensuring the flow of information, supporting collaboration and reducing duplication.
- Designing cohesion policy to support less competitive regions in building capacity and driving entrepreneurship and innovation will ensure solidarity while also developing a high-quality, broad scientific base.
- European research and innovation capability must be involved in tackling major Societal Challenges such as climate change and energy security, but the priority must be to coordinate national efforts, ensuring efficiency, coherence and transparency.
- It is imperative that research in the social sciences and humanities be given equal status to that of other sciences and engineering. We can already start to address many of the key Societal Challenges in technological terms, but need deeper understanding of how to influence attitudes and behaviours.

Introduction

1. The Royal Society of Edinburgh (RSE) welcomes this opportunity to contribute to the on-going discussion on the future of EU research and innovation funding. As Scotland's National Academy, the Fellowship of the RSE brings together many of Scotland's most experienced and highly-respected researchers across all the sciences, technologies, humanities and the arts. The response, prepared by a Working Group of Fellows, builds on this expertise and reflects the multi-disciplinary interests and experiences of the Fellowship.

2. The RSE welcomes the general principles behind the review of current EU research and innovation programmes, including simplifying access, sharpening focus and increasing impact. This response, however, concentrates on the fundamental issue of the role of the EU in the wider context of research and innovation funding and the implications this has for future funding programmes. Answers to the questions posed in the Green Paper are then provided in Appendix I.

The role of the EU in the research and innovation ecosystem

3. The Green Paper, *Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding*, sets out a number of questions that seek to clarify the objectives and priorities for future EU funding programmes. The RSE believes that the direction of such future EU funding must be shaped principally through a comprehensive understanding of the role of the European Union in the wider research and innovation eco-system.
4. European initiatives such as the Framework Programmes are important elements in the research and innovation funding landscape, but it must be recognised that the levels of funds involved, for example a budget of 53.3 billion euros over a seven-year period for FP7, are small compared to aggregate spending at national levels¹. Whilst welcoming the objective of increasing EU spending on R&D to 3% of GDP by 2020, the RSE considers that the imperative must be to identify where the EU adds value to national research spending and activity. It is only by properly and effectively targeting the use of EU funds and EU-level activity that maximum benefits can be gained.
5. It should also be borne in mind that in some sectors, the biggest impact the EU will have on research activity will not result from funding but from legislation.

Adding value at EU level

6. The RSE believes that there are three characteristics of EU-level funding and activity in research and innovation that cannot easily be replicated at national level and which are of significant value: mobility, coordination and solidarity. The RSE strongly urges that a framework for future EU research and innovation funding recognises the added value that it can create by embedding these characteristics in its guiding principles.

Mobility

7. Facilitating mobility among young researchers is one of the major benefits of the European Research Area. Mobility is a natural driver of collaboration, creating synergy where it will be most effective rather than forcing collaboration for its own sake. Continued support for mobility is vital if researchers are to fulfil their potential for creativity and innovation, through providing opportunities for the sharing of expertise and strengthening of links between research institutions, industries and across sectors.

Coordination

8. Equally as important as cash flow, if not more so, is the flow of information. With an overarching view of research and innovation activity being undertaken within its Member States, the EU has a powerful role to play in coordinating this activity, supporting collaboration, and avoiding duplication.

Solidarity

9. The RSE supports the principle that excellence is the key criteria in decision-making around funding awards. However, recognising that the research bases of EU Member States vary widely in terms of scale and stage of development, it is important that cohesion funding recognises the crucial importance of research and innovation funding. Ensuring that funds available to less competitive regions are used to build capacity and

¹ See, for example, statistics published in February 2011 by the UK Government's Department for Business, Innovation and Skills that show UK Government spend of almost £10 billion in Science, Engineering and Technology Research & Development in 2008-2009.
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/science/docs/s/10-499a-set-statistics-2010>.

drive entrepreneurship and innovation is essential to developing a high-quality broad scientific base. An important measure of success is the ability to retain talented entrepreneurs and researchers.

Priorities for future EU research and innovation funding

Societal Challenges

10. It is clear that the European research and innovation capability must be engaged in the major societal challenges of climate change, energy and food security and the ageing population. However, national efforts will dwarf the Commission efforts so the priority must be to ensure efficiency, coherence and transparency to these national efforts. Only then can Europe as a whole engage effectively with other continental scale efforts. EU funding can assist this effort but greater weight must be given to employing all efforts to ensure this European research coherence and transparency.
11. The RSE highlights however that for some of these key challenges, research and innovation have already produced scientific and technological developments that could be employed to tackle the problems. The real barriers now lie in influencing individual and societal attitudes and behaviour. For this reason it is imperative that research in social sciences and humanities, aimed at tackling these societal challenges, is given equal status to the natural sciences, engineering etc. The RSE is concerned that this reality is not adequately reflected in the Green Paper.

Curiosity-driven vs. agenda-driven research

12. Further, by linking EU funding more closely to agenda-driven objectives, the question of striking the right balance with curiosity-driven research is raised. It must be recognised that curiosity-driven research is vital to developing ideas and creative skills in the long-term, with the potential to bring to light novel solutions not only to the challenges we are aware of today but those that may arise in an unknown future.
13. Where research is agenda-driven, a creative intersection with curiosity-driven research can be achieved. For example, in the US, much research is agenda-driven but on sufficiently long timescales and with less restrictive milestones that allow a high degree of flexibility in the pathways taken to achieve an objective. Follow-up resources are also provided in areas where research throws up unexpected results and opportunities. This approach encourages the creativity and cross-disciplinary working that can bring significant benefits and is one from which the EU can learn.

Conclusion

14. The aim of bringing together the various EU programmes for research and innovation into a Common Strategic Framework that will provide improved coherence and direction is very much welcomed. Achieving this aim will require a radical rethink on the current approach and practices. Comments on a number of issues raised in the Green Paper are provided in Appendix 1.
15. However, underlying this review must be a shared understanding of the role of the EU in the wider research and innovation ecosystem. The RSE emphasises that focus must be firmly placed on the added value the EU can create, rather than merely seeking to relocate national programmes to the EU level. This is best done by focussing on mobility, coordination and solidarity. There is also a need to have a clear sense of what EU funding has achieved beyond the generalities of mobility and collaboration, particularly through the Framework programmes, and the extent to which the quality and level of innovation have been commensurate with what is required of high level science and the funds committed. Notwithstanding the positive reviews that have followed individual Framework Programmes, we are sceptical that these always conform to reality.

16. The RSE recognises that there are a number of key challenges facing Europe, and the wider world, which urgently require to be addressed. While highlighting that a balance between curiosity-driven and agenda-driven research must be maintained, the RSE would also suggest that, where appropriate, agenda-driven programmes be designed with sufficiently long timescales and with a high degree of flexibility that will allow creativity in how objectives are achieved.

Appendix I: Responses to questions posed in the Green Paper

1. How should the Common Strategic Framework make EU research and innovation funding more attractive and easy to access for participants? What is needed in addition to a single entry point with common IT tools, a one stop shop for support, a streamlined set of funding instruments covering the full innovation chain and further steps towards administrative simplification?

Any action that simplifies access to EU research and innovation funding, including those suggested above, will improve the number and quality of applicants. The best scientists are already well funded nationally. They do not need to engage with over-bureaucratic, time consuming processes. Having a layer of people just to navigate through EC contracts is an unnecessary waste of resources. The level of administration must be in line with the level of the award if it is to be attractive to potential participants.

2. How should EU funding best cover the full innovation cycle from research to market uptake?

The EU should not attempt to cover the full innovation cycle, but recognise that it is part of a much wider ecosystem (which includes national funding, funding agencies, industry and others). It is important to recognise that in most business sectors, commercial value is realised regionally. The EU should identify how it can best add value to that system, rather than duplicate efforts. There may be points in the 'cycle' where others hesitate, for example at early stage commercialisation, where the EU can be most effective. The shape of the innovation 'cycle' and what is needed at European level vary from sector to sector.

3. What are the characteristics of EU funding that maximise the benefit of acting at the EU level? Should there be a strong emphasis on leveraging other sources of funding?

As discussed in greater detail in the body of this response, the most important characteristics of EU funding are improved mobility, which acts as a natural driver of collaboration; coordination, which reduces duplication and supports collaboration; and solidarity, which builds capacity across Europe. EU funding also allows the creation of excellent research groups, bringing together the highest levels of talent from across Europe and enabling greater levels of excellence for both institutions and individuals.

4. How should EU research and innovation funding be used to pool Member States' research and innovation resources? Should Joint Programming Initiatives between groups of Member States be supported?

It is important to have a variety of funding mechanisms, at both European and national levels. Each Member State will also have its own research priorities, interests and strengths. However, as discussed earlier in this response, the EU should be involved in major European- or global-level challenges, for example in energy security, climate change and health. National governments will engage on these issues where a joint approach will bring Europe-wide benefits and to take advantage of EU-level resources.

Rather than focusing on pooling Member States' research and innovation resources, the RSE emphasises the valuable role of the EU in providing an accurate picture of what research activity is being undertaken across Europe in order to avoid duplication, improve integration and support collaboration.

Further, the RSE supports the principle of more opportunities for nationals of any Member State to apply for national funding across Europe, for example through bilateral agreements. This should not be restricted to EU nationals.

5. What should be the balance between smaller, targeted projects and larger, strategic ones?

The balance between smaller, targeted projects and larger, strategic ones must be tailored to the area of research and the objectives of specific projects. A Framework for EU funding must be designed to facilitate both.

6. How could the Commission ensure the balance between a unique set of rules allowing for radical simplification and the necessity to keep a certain degree of flexibility and diversity to achieve objectives of different instruments, and respond to the needs of different beneficiaries, in particular SMEs?

Both the complexity and inflexibility of rules and processes governing EU research funding act as significant entry barriers for potential participants and for beneficiaries. Finding the balance between simplifying rules and increasing flexibility will be challenging. The RSE strongly encourages a move from the current system, which focuses too much on narrowly defined deliverables, to a lighter-touch assessment based on trust combined with appropriate governance structures for research institutions. This is the approach of the UK Research Council and has proved effective in Britain in ensuring that as much research funding as possible is targeted on active research rather than on administration and management processes. It is recognised that effective governance will vary across Member States and this is something that should be addressed through capacity building under cohesion policy.

7. What should be the measures of success for EU research and innovation funding? Which performance indicators could be used?

Traditional measures of success, including outputs such as publications, citations, patents etc, continue to be useful as indicators of how effectively research funding is being used. They have the advantage of being both outputs and being easy to measure. Input measures such as numbers of applications and levels of grants need to be used with care. Connecting efficiency measures to funding have had a salutary effect on UK universities. Measurement is not enough.

In the UK there is increasing recognition of the need to have some understanding of the impacts of funded research activity and the Research Excellence Framework, the new system for assessing research quality, reflects this with 20% of weighting given to the assessment of societal, economic and scientific impacts. This development has been subject to significant debate on how 'impact' can be meaningfully measured. In March 2011, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) published its decisions on assessing research impact which may be of interest².

8. How should EU research and innovation funding relate to regional and national funding? How should this funding complement funds from the future Cohesion policy, designed to help the less developed regions of the EU, and the rural development funds?

² http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/2011/01_11/01_11.pdf

As emphasised above and in the main body of this text, EU research and innovation must be targeted very specifically on where it can add value. One of the most important roles of the EU will be to provide a clear picture of what is being done at all levels across Europe which will allow researchers to coordinate and collaborate, reduce duplication, and also identify gaps in funding where the EU can focus its support. These gaps and pressure points will vary between sectors and areas of research.

EU research and innovation funding should always be allocated on the basis of excellence. However, it is important that proper consideration is given to how Cohesion Policy, and the funds available to support less developed regions, can be used to build research capacity and drive entrepreneurship and innovation, so that all regions can bid for research funding from a level playing field.

Tackling Societal Challenges

9. How should a stronger focus on societal challenges affect the balance between curiosity-driven research and agenda-driven activities?

The focus on societal challenges and the balance between curiosity-driven and agenda-driven research activities is addressed in more detail in the body of this response. There are at present a number of key challenges that require to be addressed as a matter of urgency, but it is also important that curiosity-driven research continues to be supported if Europe is to be well-positioned to remain competitive in the long-term and to face up to challenges that will arise in an unknowable future.

Where research is agenda-driven, a middle-ground that also sustains curiosity-driven research can still be found if there is a sufficiently long timeframe to meet objectives, a high degree of flexibility, resources available to follow up on new opportunities as they arise and an absence of excessively prescriptive deliverable targets. However, the right balance will depend on the area of research, how specific the problem to be addressed is and how quickly it needs to be addressed, together with the level of our current understanding. For example, particular health problems may provide both a naturally short timescale for implementation of existing knowledge and a long-term fundamental research agenda.

It is important to recognise that in some cases, for example in facing up to the issues of obesity or some options for lowering carbon emissions, the scientific or technological solutions already exist. The biggest barrier to tackling these problems now lies in changing individual and societal behaviour. This clearly demonstrates the vital role of social sciences and humanities in rising to many of the challenges we face and there should be explicit recognition of this in a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding.

10. Should there be more room for bottom-up activities?

Please see comments in response to Question 9.

11. How should EU research and innovation funding best support policy-making and forward-looking activities?

Knowledge is vital to the development of sound policy across all levels of government and all departments. This requires a two-way process in which governments and policy-makers define what it is they need and researchers communicate data in a meaningful way. At present communication between policy makers and researchers is often weak and fragmented which leads to the absence of expertise in shaping policy, for example as is the case with GM crops. The populist inclinations of politicians are often the greatest barrier to the realisation of evidence-based policy. It should be recognised that policies not based on evidence, and which often run counter to the evidence, represent both a failure of leadership and a waste of scarce resources.

The EU must ensure that its own Directorates take account of the most up-to-date research when developing policy and legislative frameworks. But further, it has a vital part to play in

providing a clear picture of what research is being undertaken across Europe in order that governments can easily access that which is relevant to their policies. The Commission must ensure that its internal advice structures are well designed to ensure that rigorous advice reaches policy makers. We shall watch with interest how the structures and processes associated with the appointment of a Chief Scientific Adviser are implemented.

12. How should the role of the Commission's Joint Research Centre be improved in supporting policy-making and forward-looking activities?

The role of the Joint Research Centre could be improved in line with the comments set out above in response to Q. 11. The JRC operates at a level of a medium-scale Research University, and is of questionable utility. Policy support requires a much wider and deeper base. The Commission needs to think more clearly how this might be achieved by using the profound capacities that already exist in Europe beyond the confines of the Commission or its institutions.

13. How could EU research and innovation activities attract greater interest and involvement of citizens and civil society?

Attracting interest and improving engagement with individuals will have a number of benefits; not only will citizens have a better understanding of how their money is being spent, but they will also be more able to understand the implications of research on their own lives. Indeed, individuals and bloggers are increasingly using Freedom of Information requests to access data which could, in fact, be published proactively. Making more data publicly available will allow more people to use it creatively. We recommend that the Commission should engage with inquiry recently launched by the Royal Society of London (*Science as a public enterprise: opening up scientific information*), which is likely to make major recommendations in this domain.

In order to reach individuals who are not currently engaged in the research agenda, information must be presented in a form that is interpretable, sensible, meaningful, and relevant to people's lives. Technology and social media channels are becoming increasingly wide spread and effective as a means of getting information to individuals in a way that is interesting, interactive and engaging. When planning for dissemination and engagement activity, consideration should be given to budgeting for this kind of activity.

There are examples, such as NASA and CERN, where significant amounts have been spent on professional PR advice that has proved very successful in raising the profile of the brands involved and understanding of their work. There is certainly scope for this level of spend in the overall EU research and innovation budget, but careful consideration should be given to the benefits and cost effectiveness of this approach. For example, would it be possible, or desirable, to develop an EU 'brand' when most of its research funding is combined with national activity and funding?

Strengthening competitiveness

14. How should EU funding best take account of the broad nature of innovation, including non-technological innovation, eco-innovation and social innovation?

Recognising the broad nature of innovation, the RSE again emphasises that EU research and innovation funding must be equally open to the social sciences and humanities as to physical sciences, life sciences, engineering etc.

It is crucial that the EU takes a broad approach to innovation through supporting entrepreneurship and stimulating markets. The RSE has organised highly successful training for potential entrepreneurs, creating a mutually supportive network of skilled entrepreneurs so that their companies have a much greater than normal chance of success. We are therefore strong supporters of the idea that entrepreneurs, particularly in technical areas, need

encouragement, training and a supportive environment comparable to that provided to researchers by the best universities³.

15. How should industrial participation in EU research and innovation programmes be strengthened? How should Joint Technology Initiatives (such as those launched in the current Framework Programmes) or different forms of 'public private partnership' be supported? What should be the role of European Technology Platforms?

It must be recognised that industry will participate only where there is clear current or future commercial benefit. Programmes should be designed in order to maximise their attractiveness to business, focusing on simplicity and transparency, with clearly articulated benefits.

16. How and what types of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SME) should be supported at EU level; how should this complement national and regional level schemes? What kind of measures should be taken to decisively facilitate the participation of SMEs in EU research and innovation programmes?

As noted above, SMEs will participate in EU research and innovation programmes where there is clear benefit in doing so, and when the process is simple and transparent with minimal hurdles.

In many circumstances SMEs are interested in commercial opportunities arising from the results of research, rather than getting involved in the research itself. The EU approach, and European legislation, should encourage the exploitation of Intellectual Property for maximum impact. This will include developing further initiatives to make IP available to SMEs. The University of Glasgow, for example, has launched a range of Intellectual Property that is available free of charge to businesses and individuals who think they can exploit the technology and are interested in working with the University and this is proving very popular⁴.

17. How should open, light and fast implementation schemes (e.g. building on the current FET actions and CIP eco-innovation market replication projects) be designed to allow flexible exploration and commercialisation of novel ideas, in particular by SMEs?

Please see comments in response to Question 16,

18. How should EU-level financial instruments (equity and debt based) be used more extensively?

When considering the use of financial instruments, the RSE would urge that decision makers should not be scared of failure. The current approach is largely risk averse. As a result, it is too restrictive and lacks ambition.

19. Should new approaches to supporting research and innovation be introduced, in particular through public procurement, including through rules on pre-commercial procurement, and/or inducement prizes?

The RSE would welcome the use of public procurement as a powerful tool to support research and innovation and urge that rules and actions needed to make this possible and effective be thoroughly considered. But the underlying requirement is to loosen public procurement priorities away from the low-cost and established towards potential future gain. This will be hard to evaluate for individual purchasers so an integrated strategy and clear targets are needed.

20. How should intellectual property rules governing EU funding strike the right balance between competitiveness aspects and the need for access to and dissemination of scientific results?

³ http://www.royalsoced.org.uk/research_fellowships/enterprise.htm

⁴ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/businessandindustry/technology/>

Please see comments in response to Q. 16. There is a tipping point between open access and when it makes commercial sense to close off access. It is important that the system be nimble, responsive and that it support commercialisation.

Strengthening Europe's science base and the European Research Area

21. How should the role of the European Research Council be strengthened in supporting world class excellence ?

The RSE recognises the European Research Council as a major EU success. Its great strength lies in its simplicity, providing funding for research based on excellence, allocated through a competitive process focused on individuals. This work should continue, with the ERC being given resources to expand its programmes. It is important that its current clarity of purpose is maintained and that it is not burdened by additional responsibilities that dilute its vision and role.

In particular, the RSE welcomes the support available to researchers at an early stage of their career, with the "ERC Starting Independent Researcher Grant". This recognition of and support for talent at the early career stage is important for the development of the next generation of excellent researchers and opportunities for widening such support should be considered.

There is scope for the ERC to encourage partners to work together but the RSE would have concerns over any move to shift focus from supporting individuals to supporting collaboration. There is a risk that by focusing primarily on collaboration this will become an end in itself rather than the means to facilitate excellent research.

22. How should EU support assist Member States in building up excellence?

Please see comments in the main body of the text and in response to Q. 8. EU research and innovation funding must be allocated based on excellence. However, this approach clearly favours well-established research institutions, which also attract the most talented researchers away from their home nations.

It is, therefore, crucially important that Cohesion Policy is designed to support less well-developed Member States to build excellence in research, enabling them compete for funding and to retain their young researchers and attract talent from elsewhere.

National governments can use levers such as tax policies to attract researchers to the country, or force commitments from their young researchers to return home for a period where they have received public funding for education and training. However, every Member State must also ensure that its own research communities and systems are based on merit and achievement, open to talented young people and responsive to their needs.

23. How should the role of Marie Curie Actions be strengthened in promoting researcher mobility and developing attractive careers?

Marie Curie Actions have been highly successful in encouraging researcher mobility and strengthening networks across Europe. The RSE would welcome enlargement of the programme.

24. What actions should be taken at EU level to further strengthen the role of women in science and innovation?

The RSE has established a Working Group to devise a strategy for Scotland to address the underrepresentation of women in science and innovation, and therefore is well placed to

recommend a number of specific actions to be taken forward by the European Commission in this area:

- That it invests in a programme similar to the ADVANCE⁵ programme in the US, to promote structural and cultural change in universities and research institutes on women and science.
- That it retains and builds up its own Women and Science Unit in DG R&I
- That it encourages member states to have such national centres for advice and expertise on women and science;
- That it insists on gender mainstreaming in all EU funded research, ensuring, inter alia, that attention is paid to the gender dimension of research projects; and
- That it strengthens its Directives on gender equality, such as equal pay.

In the UK we have been extremely impressed by the manner in which initiatives such as the Athena SWAN⁶ awards have forced institutions to look at hidden barriers and presumptions. The use of external expert visiting panels has, in our experience, been stimulating and welcome.

25. How should research infrastructures (including EU-wide e-Infrastructures) be supported at EU level?

As previously emphasised, the RSE suggests that EU activity be focused on where it can add value. EU research and innovation funding should be focused on coordination and collaboration and building networks. Major facilities will continue to be funded by decisions at national level. The comparison between European decision-making in areas where there are European level Institutions such as CERN, ESA, ESA and the lack of progress on the ESFRI list is stark. External agencies such as the US DOE complain bitterly about having no clear European point of contact except in the above examples.

26. How should international cooperation with non-EU countries be supported e.g. in terms of priority areas of strategic interest, instruments, reciprocity (including on IPR aspects) or cooperation with Member States?

Strong international research links, with countries such as the USA, Arab countries, China and India should be supported. Where a country can bring skills and/or funds to an EU-led project they should be able to participate equally.

In spite of contrary moves in immigration law, a long-term aim of the European Research system must be to attract the most talented scientists and entrepreneurs from around the world as students, post docs and staff. These contacts are crucial in building later collaboration. This requires consistent long-term efforts.

One issue that should be addressed in respect to international collaboration is who will act as a central point of contact in Europe for enquiries and collaboration proposals (see response to Q. 25). Science Europe's plans to have authoritative high-level science committees may provide the scientific contacts. At the funding level this should be a requirement on Science Europe.

27 Which key issues and obstacles concerning the ERA should EU funding instruments seek to overcome, and which should be addressed by other (e.g. legislative) measures?

A priority must be for EU funding to be simplified. This will call for significant reduction in bureaucracy and complexity; the minimising of contractual delays; and ensuring that the process is more transparent.

Additional Information and References

⁵ http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5383

⁶ www.athenaswan.org.uk,

The Royal Society of Edinburgh, Scotland's National Academy, is Scottish Charity No. SC000470

Advice Papers are produced on behalf of RSE Council by an appropriately diverse working group in whose expertise and judgement the Council has confidence. This Advice Paper has been signed off by the General Secretary.

In preparing this Advice Paper we would like to draw attention to the following RSE responses which are relevant to this subject:

- The Royal Society of Edinburgh's response to the Higher Education Funding Council for England on the *Research Excellence Framework* (December 2009)
- The Royal Society of Edinburgh's response to the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee on Setting Science and Technology Research Funding Priorities (September 2009).
- The Royal Society of Edinburgh's response to the UK Parliament's IUSS Committee on *Putting Science and Engineering at the Heart of Government Policy* (January 2009).

Any enquiries about this Advice Paper should be addressed to the RSE's Consultations Officer, Susan Lennox (Email: evidenceadvice@royalsoced.org.uk)

Responses are published on the RSE website (www.royalsoced.org.uk).

The Royal Society of Edinburgh (RSE) is Scotland's National Academy. It is an independent body with a multidisciplinary fellowship of men and women of international standing which makes it uniquely placed to offer informed, independent comment on matters of national interest.

The Royal Society of Edinburgh, Scotland's National Academy, is Scottish Charity No. SC000470