

Events

Design Survey

Collect Responses

Analyze Results

View Summary

Default Report ▾

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Displaying 23 of 60 respondents

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Response Type:  
Normal ResponseCollector:  
Web Link  
(Web Link)Custom Value:  
emptyIP Address:  
129.31.200.53Response Started:  
Thursday, July 25, 2013 1:55:30 PMResponse Modified:  
Thursday, July 25, 2013 3:03:33 PM

1. Name:

Daniel Sykes

2. Organisation (if applicable):

No Response

3. Email address:

4. Address:

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

an individual

6. Keeping in touch

No Response

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?

The EU has made it significantly easier for EU students and skilled post-graduates to take up positions in academic research. In my own field, software engineering, we especially benefit from the presence of Greeks and Italians (although they are often fleeing the economic situation in the eurozone). However, I am not convinced that many British people take advantage of moving to positions in continental Europe, instead of Australia or the United States (where remuneration is significantly better). The EU is a useful backup for funding research projects considering that the UK (nationally) spends rather less as a proportion of GDP than France, Germany, the United States and Japan.

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?

In my personal experience, the EU model for funding research projects (FP7) is cumbersome and a major drain on the time researchers can devote to research. It is quite inferior to the UK's national process. The major issues come from the excess of bureaucratic requirements (principally reporting), and the emphasis on working in a highly integrated manner across multiple countries, including industrial partners. This means that a significant amount of time (and money) is spent producing deliverable reports and having meetings (in multiple countries) to organise the production of said reports. When a formal review meeting is expected, there may be multiple preparatory meetings, each time requiring the collaborators to fly to the chosen place in Europe. The expended time and effort is not beneficial to the careers of most participants (unlike scientific publications) and the byzantine nature of the process means the reports are only subject to cursory assessment. There also seems to be --- again in my own experience --- no distinction between industrial partners and the rest, meaning that companies are paid to take part in the project. This seems to me to be entirely backwards. The companies should be taking part in the hope that the research benefits their commercial concerns and profit. Consequently they should be expected to pay for the privilege. The current system instead gives an incentive for companies to take the money and then do the absolute minimum.

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?

I have no personal experience in this area.

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

See above.

**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?**

I cannot 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?**

Transfer of the funds from the EU funding bodies to the UK's national bodies would mean that researchers employed with those funds spend more time engaged in research. A compromise scheme could have the EU offering a "bolt-on" grant to an otherwise ordinary national grant to aid international collaboration (covering travel costs for example). A similar scheme could be established with Australia, the USA and Japan.

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

The complete loss of a UK national funding body would be disastrous.

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

Project funding.

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

By reducing the role of the EU.

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

Negligible.

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

No Response

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 العربية Türkçe  
 Hindi Suomi

Copyright © 1999-2013 SurveyMonkey