

## Summary

- Research is a global enterprise, underpinned by a skilled and mobile workforce. Alongside strong connections with all parts of the world, membership of the EU brings a wide variety of benefits to the UK research base and provides access to a large pool of talented researchers.
- The UK consistently capitalises on its world-class excellence to attract disproportionate levels of EU research funding and talented individuals. If institutions did not have this funding, they would lose a substantial contributor to their income and, at a time of change within the UK research landscape, the stability and scale of EU funding streams has helped bolster the UK community.
- Regulatory harmonisation provides a strong platform for collaboration and commercialisation in health research. Fellows who provided input on this topic broadly felt it was valuable to engage with policy development to ensure that final outcomes were appropriate, and that the burden of this engagement was justified by the benefits. The voice of the UK community carries weight in EU discussions and has a history of achieving its objectives.
- There remain areas for improvement, including greater transparency and a reduction in unnecessary administrative burden within grant application and monitoring processes. Questions remain on whether access to EU funding programmes, and talented individuals, could be achieved through affiliation, rather than membership, and what uncertainties this might introduce.
- The provision of science advice remains a developing topic of interest for the Academy. We continue to support the need for advice to inform EU policymaking, and are actively engaged with the development of the new Science Advice Mechanism.

## Introduction

The Academy of Medical Sciences promotes advances in medical science, and campaigns to ensure that these are translated into healthcare benefits for society. Our elected Fellowship includes experts drawn from a broad and diverse range of research areas.

We welcome the opportunity to respond to the House of Lords Science and Technology Committee inquiry into the influence of EU membership on UK science, and its efforts to evaluate the impact on the UK research environment. We are not advocating any position with respect to UK membership of the EU, but take this opportunity to present views on the current situation, with a focus on the medical sciences.

Our written evidence has been informed by engagement with our Fellows, from across the disciplines and sectors we represent. We would be pleased to provide further evidence, and our previous relevant outputs, if required.

The UK National Academies have previously submitted evidence to the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills Balance of Competencies Review relating to the EU.<sup>1</sup> We stated then, and continue to believe that 'the European Union has not only provided significant and vital funding to the UK for research and innovation, complementing the UK's funding landscape for research (from public, private and philanthropic sources), but has also created and amplified opportunities for international collaboration and has increased the reputation, competitiveness and attractiveness of the UK as a centre of global excellence in research and innovation. National systems that become isolated from the stream of global knowledge exchange lose their vigour and excellence. Working at a European Union level is a vital element of this and adds value to the UK's own national effort to promote and enrich its research base and research excellence, and to leverage its innovative capacity'.

### **Q1. What is the scale of the financial contribution from the EU to UK science and research, and vice versa?**

The UK is disproportionately successful in securing EU research funding, and the figures outlined here are intended as illustrations of this success. We would direct the Committee's attention to a forthcoming report from the Royal Society, 'UK research and the European Union: the role of the EU in funding UK research', which will address the architecture and scale of EU research funding in a more comprehensive manner.

#### ***Resource investment***

Based on the proportional contribution to overall EU finances, the UK contributes around 11% of the EU research budget and receives around 16% of the allocated funding, making it a substantial net beneficiary.<sup>2</sup> Data on allocations under Framework Programme 7 (FP7), which ran from 2007-2013, are almost complete and offer a reliable indication of performance. These interim data suggest the UK received approximately €7bn of research income under FP7 (see Table 1), marginally behind the top recipient, Germany. For the health category, the UK was the top beneficiary, securing a total of €947m and leading approximately 20% of all health-focussed projects.<sup>3</sup>

This success stems from a high number of applications from UK researchers and SMEs, and an above average success rate (see Table 1). Preliminary data suggest a continuation of this trend under the current Horizon 2020 programme (2014-2020), with the UK securing approximately 15% of allocated funding so far, and reporting a higher participation rate than any other member state.<sup>4</sup>

Marie Curie Training networks are now embedded as a core part of the doctoral training landscape within the UK. Although the UK attracted substantially fewer direct awards than comparable nations (see Table 1), data indicate that the UK is a major destination for Fellows from across the EU, and the funding that these mobile, talented individuals bring.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint National Academies, Submission to BIS Review of the Balance of Competences between the United Kingdom and the European Union, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-25961243>

<sup>3</sup> <http://eurpub.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/06/25/eurpub.ckt075.full>

<sup>4</sup> European Commission (2015). *Horizon 2020 first results*.

[https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/sites/horizon2020/files/horizon\\_2020\\_first\\_results.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/sites/horizon2020/files/horizon_2020_first_results.pdf)

	<b>Germany<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>UK<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>France<sup>7</sup></b>
Number of applications to EU funding schemes	17950	17379	12463
Total value of secured awards (€m)	7082.37	6880.53	5068.66
Number of SME participants to EU funding schemes	3300	3051	2191
Total value of SME awards secured (€m)	956.01	1098.57	603.23
Number of Marie-Curie fellows awarded per nation	2171	1142	1854
Value of MC awards (€m) per nation	2027.38	802.19	1830.25

**Table 1:** Interim figures from FP7 for UK and comparable nations.

Examples in Box 1 further demonstrate the importance of EU financial contributions to UK institutions, and at a time of real-term decreases in public research funding in the UK, the amount of EU funds dedicated to research have increased substantially. The seven year EU funding cycle also provides a level of stability for the community which is not currently replicated in the UK landscape.

**Box 1: The role and synergies of EU funding for UK institutions**

- EU funds are an increasingly significant source of investment for UK institutions – the EMBL European Bioinformatics Institute (EMBL-EBI), centred in Cambridge, received £5.7m in EU grants in 2014, compared with £3.3m from the UK Research Councils.
- EU funding operates synergistically with UK funding sources – an EU-funded project has developed a technique that identifies tumours via their metabolic profile, based on research done by a former Marie Curie fellowship holder, and hosted by CRUK.<sup>8</sup>

Under FP7, 5 of the top 10 most successful institutions were UK-based, and 13 of the top 25.<sup>9</sup> In 2013/2014, the Russell Group universities received more than £473m of income from EU sources, representing around 13% of their total research income.<sup>10</sup> This performance is driven by the geographical and disciplinary breadth of excellence present across the UK, further reinforcing the value of a broad and interconnected research base.

**Capital investment**

EU capital investments target both individual facilities and distributed infrastructure projects (see Box 2), and membership has anchored many such investments in the UK. Under FP7, 107 EU research infrastructure projects were supported in the UK, of which 69 (64%) were outside the 'golden triangle' of Oxford, Cambridge and London universities.

<sup>5</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/germany/country\\_profile\\_and\\_featured\\_projects.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/germany/country_profile_and_featured_projects.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/united\\_kingdom/country\\_profile\\_and\\_featured\\_projects.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/united_kingdom/country_profile_and_featured_projects.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/france/country\\_profile\\_and\\_featured\\_projects.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/pdf/country-profiles/france/country_profile_and_featured_projects.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/news/saving-time-saving-lives-monitoring-cancer-treatments>

<sup>9</sup> European Commission, Seventh Monitoring Report 2013, March 2015:

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7\\_monitoring\\_reports/7th\\_fp7\\_monitoring\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/fp7_monitoring_reports/7th_fp7_monitoring_report.pdf)

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/uploads/Russell-Group-response-to-Balance-of-competences-Research-and-Development-consultation.pdf>

### **Box 2: The coordinating role of EU funding**

- EU capital investments reduce duplication - the European Mouse Mutant Archive which unites mouse repositories including the MRC Harwell unit, provides a single, standardised source of mouse breeding lines to researchers.<sup>11</sup> This collaboration has reduced duplication and costs, and streamlined access for researchers.
- EU investment leverages further funding - the UK-based ELIXIR project manages and safeguards publicly-funded research data, and was established with EU funds which subsequently leveraged funding from the BBSRC, MRC, NERC and Wellcome Trust.<sup>12</sup>

The EU has also backed resources which the UK has access to, including the European Spallation Source in Sweden (a facility for structural studies, which will support medical science and the pharmaceutical sector), and the BBMRI-ERIC Biobank.

### **Unresolved issues**

It remains unclear whether access to these resources could be achieved through collaboration, rather than membership, under models such as that used by Switzerland. Although not an EU member state, Switzerland has historically maintained 'affiliated' membership status of EU research funding programmes, providing Swiss researchers with the same access as colleagues from member states.<sup>13</sup>

Switzerland contributes to research budgets at a fixed rate, relative to its GDP.<sup>13</sup> Due to its affiliated membership status, final figures for FP7 have yet to be released but under FP6, Switzerland contributed CHF 775.3m (€718m, as of November 2015) and secured back CHF 794.5m (€735m) in EU funding, giving a net return of CHF 19.2m (€17m).<sup>14</sup>

Significant disruption was introduced in 2014 when Switzerland adopted mass migration legislation which violated the Horizon 2020 terms of agreement.<sup>15</sup> This resulted in a loss of status, and a 'partial affiliation' has now been agreed which restricts Swiss researchers to 'third country' status in many of the funding streams outside Horizon 2020.<sup>13</sup> National measures have been drawn up to temporarily cover funding gaps created by this move, and the Swiss Federal Council has a stated aim of restoring full affiliation status before the expiration of the current status in 2016.<sup>13</sup> There have also been sources of uncertainty for full members, including the disruption and reputational damage created by the withdrawal of allocated Horizon 2020 funds to support the European Fund for Strategic Investment.

There may be value in a proactive discussion around the long-term impact of the UK's disproportionate success in excellence-based schemes, in the context of capacity building across other member states. In this regard, it is important to note that support for research extends beyond the Horizon 2020 budget, and we would direct the Committee to the submission from the Royal Society, which examines the role and allocation of research-directed funds from the EU Structural Funds as part of a capacity-building agenda. Such evidence may be helpful in discussions around the long-term trajectory of European science, and we would welcome greater transparency on EU figures relating to this broader view of research investment.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.emmanet.org/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.elixir-europe.org/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.sbf.admin.ch/h2020/02455/index.html?lang=en>

<sup>14</sup> State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (2013). *Swiss Participation in the EU's Seventh Research Framework Programme Interim Report 2007-2012 Facts and Figures*.

<sup>15</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-hi-swiss-part\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-hi-swiss-part_en.pdf)

## **Q2. How effectively are funds managed in the EU, compared to the management of science funding in the UK?**

The majority of our Fellows were broadly supportive of the management of EU research funding, though grant application and monitoring processes would benefit from greater transparency and reduced administrative burden. Several Fellows reported significant strides towards simplifying application processes in recent years, but were concerned that part of this reduced burden was driven by adaptation within institutions, many of which had taken on dedicated staff to support EU grant applications. Such a trend may be masking continued inefficiencies in the process.

Due to its improved recognition for distinct work packages with identified leaders, the EU grant system is to be highlighted in an upcoming Academy report as a model that encourages and facilitates Team Science.<sup>16</sup> It was also highlighted that UK researchers actively engage in the oversight of EU funding, including the European Research Council, with Professor Dame Janet Thornton DBE FRS FMedSci (EMBL-EBI, UK) recently appointed to the ERC Scientific Council.<sup>17</sup>

## **Q3. What are the benefits to UK science and research in terms of collaboration and funding programmes such as Horizon 2020 and the European Research Council?**

Research is a global enterprise, underpinned by a skilled and mobile workforce. Alongside strong connections with all parts of the world, membership of the EU brings a wide variety of benefits to the UK research base and provides access to a large pool of talented researchers.

The UK is highly collaborative in its participation with EU funding programmes, with a higher level of involvement in successful grant applications than any other EU member state.<sup>18</sup> EU support for collaborative working has simplified the process of establishing large-scale, complex transnational and interdisciplinary collaborations, and it now represents one of the largest funders of international networks globally. Some of our Fellows noted that being awarded EU funding carried significant professional esteem at a global level, and that EU funds provide a significant source of indirect cost recovery (funding paid to host institutions to cover infrastructure costs) currently set at 25%.<sup>19</sup>

Our Fellows also highlighted specific research areas in which EU membership had added value by supporting research at a scale that goes beyond the capabilities of single nations, as reflected by Box 3. This includes the SHARE (Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe) project, which coordinates the critical mass needed across several member states to support research into rare diseases.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Team Science report, Academy of Medical Sciences, due spring 2016.

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.ukro.ac.uk/aboutukro/Documents/150624\\_2015\\_annual\\_report.pdf](https://www.ukro.ac.uk/aboutukro/Documents/150624_2015_annual_report.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> Universities UK (2013). *Briefing on the EU's Horizon 2020 programme and its importance to UK universities in the context of negotiations on the EU Multiannual Financial Framework.*

<http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/highereducation/Documents/2013/BriefingHorizon2020Budget.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/press/fact\\_sheet\\_on\\_rules\\_under\\_horizon\\_2020.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/press/fact_sheet_on_rules_under_horizon_2020.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.share-project.org/home0.html>

**Box 3: EU as a platform for funding and facilitating multi-national research**

- GRACE (Genomics to combat Resistance against Antibiotics in Community-acquired LRTI in Europe) consortium at University of Oxford, which is conducting research into antibiotic resistance.<sup>21</sup>
- HURAPRIM (Human Resources for Primary Health Care in Africa) consortium, which is conducting research on human resources to deliver primary care in Africa.<sup>22</sup>
- European and Developing Countries Clinical Trial Partnership, which is linking the EU and African nations to develop treatments for poverty-related diseases.<sup>23</sup>

These funding streams also play a major role in identifying and networking regional excellence, providing capacity-building across EU member nations. An example of such pan-EU collaboration benefiting the UK is the NABATIVI (Novel Approaches to Bacterial Target Identification Validation and Inhibition) initiative to discover new antibiotics, which draws on regional pools of talent in the UK such as the University of Nottingham.<sup>24</sup>

**Q4. How is private investment in UK science and research influenced by EU membership?**

This is an important issue. Published data demonstrate that UK SMEs are active participants in EU research programmes – the UK ranks third for total SME applications to Horizon 2020, with a success rate of 11% against a 7.3% average.<sup>25</sup> These data indicate that EU funding sources are important for UK SMEs, and if proposed changes to UK innovation funding go ahead, these may be the major source of grant-based, rather than loan-based, public investment available to private partners.

**Industrial Collaborations**

A number of Fellows reported mixed views on whether EU membership had altered the course of their industrial collaborations, but broadly supported the prominence that industrial collaboration was given in the structure of EU funding mechanisms. This was particularly important for small and dispersed pockets of excellence across Member States, which benefitted from working cooperatively (see Box 4). It was felt that this drive to link research-intensive SMEs with the research community would deliver positive economic impacts in the long-term by connecting basic research to organisations with expertise and capacity for translation.

**Box 4: EU programmes network UK researchers and businesses**

- EU funding and harmonisation has helped network the UK hearing implant research community with EU business, such as MED-EL, a manufacturer based in Austria.<sup>26</sup> Across several framework programmes, MED-EL has built up research collaborations with UK-based centres of excellence, including Southampton and Manchester.

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.grace-lrti.org/portal/en-GB/homepage>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.phc.ox.ac.uk/research/pcdw/projects/huraprim>

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.edctp.org/>

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.nabativi.org/>

<sup>25</sup> European Commission (2015). *Horizon 2020 first results*.

[https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/sites/horizon2020/files/horizon\\_2020\\_first\\_results.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/sites/horizon2020/files/horizon_2020_first_results.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.medel.com/uk/>

Some Fellows highlighted the value of the €3.3bn Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI), a major public-private initiative which aims to foster collaboration among universities, industry, patients, and medical regulators to accelerate the development of medicines.<sup>27</sup>

### **Broader research environment**

A number of Fellows felt that EU membership brings significant benefits to the UK's research environment, creating favourable conditions for industries of all sizes and sectors. The value of harmonised market regulations has been noted by industry representatives as 'a key reason for global biopharmaceutical companies deciding to establish their European HQ in the UK and invest in R&D activities'.<sup>28</sup> If the regulation of health research (e.g. clinical trials) and of medicinal products and diagnostics were not harmonised, the significant additional administrative burden could be a major disincentive for such industries to base themselves within the UK.

It was also noted that EU patent and regulatory centres (e.g. the European Medicines Agency and EU patent appeals court with responsibility for life sciences) had chosen to locate in London, providing a level of proximity which was valued by industry and the academic community.<sup>28</sup> For commercialisation, the combined weight of EU markets was a major factor in securing trade settlements which open up new markets for UK research outputs (outlined in Box 5).

#### **Box 5: EU membership opens new markets for the UK**

- EU trade deals have provided UK business with greater access to over 50 foreign markets, including a recent EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement, which has led to significantly increased levels of trade.<sup>29</sup>

## **Q5. What contribution does EU membership make to the quality of UK science and research through the free movement of people?**

The joint National Academies statement, Building a Stronger Future, called for Government to proactively promote the UK as a destination for researchers and students and minimise unnecessary barriers to the flow of talented researchers.<sup>30</sup> We continue to support this message, and believe that research is an international endeavour and the UK's research base benefits from being connected to the international pool of talent.

Fellows broadly felt that freedom of movement for researchers greatly benefited the UK research community, and data demonstrates that the UK is an extremely attractive working environment for both fellowship awardees and employed researchers. The UK currently acts as a hub for global researchers, attracting more university-educated EU citizens than any other member state, and resulting in 20% of the UK academic community being made up of EU nationals.<sup>31,32</sup> These talented and motivated individuals frequently come with externally funded salaries, and continue to attract further

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.imi.europa.eu/>

<sup>28</sup> BioIndustry Association, UK Life Sciences Manifesto 2015-20 (2014)

<sup>29</sup> CBI, Choosing our Future, October 2015

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/joint-academies-statement-building-a-stronger-future/>

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/nov/05/uk-magnet-highly-educated-migrants-research>

<sup>32</sup> [https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=1898&Itemid=634](https://www.hesa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1898&Itemid=634)



resources after arrival, with >30% of 2014 ERC grantees in the UK being non-UK EU nationals.<sup>33</sup> This exchange is also an important source of future global collaborations.

The low administrative barriers to entry provided by EU membership generate a zero-cost advantage for UK institutions competing for talent against American counterparts. This is particularly critical for emerging research areas where expertise is scarce, and provides a level of agility which helps to minimise skills shortages (see Box 6).

**Box 6: Freedom of movement supports the recruitment of valuable researchers**

- In 2014, the UK EMBL-EBI site had 512 members of staff of which approximately 200 were from EU nations besides the UK, many with highly sought-after skills.

**Q6. Does EU membership inhibit collaborations with countries outside the EU?**

We did not receive any reports from our Fellows that EU membership had inhibited their ability to establish or maintain non-EU collaborations; with American and Australian research partners extremely common. Non-EU nations are able to participate broadly within Horizon 2020, a situation which has improved significantly in recent years. As such, EU funds are a significant source of support for global networks which extended beyond solely EU nations, and the main inhibition for further non-EU collaborations was the availability of specific funding for this purpose.

**Q7. Which EU regulatory mechanisms greatly affect the science and research community in the UK, and how? What would be the impact of no longer being bound by them?**

In the previously referenced joint Balance of Competencies submission, the National Academies stated that: 'the introduction of EU legislation and regulation across the 28 Member States can also help to foster cross-border collaborations by harmonising the procedures under which research is conducted. Directives and Regulations can help to improve and harmonise research conduct across the EU as long as they are carefully designed so as not to be unnecessarily prohibitive for research'.<sup>34</sup>

Several of our Fellows felt that the collaborative potential created by harmonisation, including its support for the exchange of people, ideas and data, warrants the burden of engaging with regulatory processes. However, many Fellows acknowledged the complexity of achieving consensus across diverse member states, citing several examples of recent policy topics with which the Academy has engaged:

- EU General Data Protection Regulation aims to provide greater clarity around data protection, a principle welcomed by the Academy for its support for research using personal data to improve our understanding of society, health and disease.<sup>35</sup> However, amendments introduced by the European Parliament in 2014 put established uses of research data at risk (e.g. biobanks and disease registries). The Academy has warned of the potential damage to several research areas, and

<sup>33</sup> [http://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/erc\\_2014\\_cog\\_statistics.pdf](http://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/erc_2014_cog_statistics.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> Available from: <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/viewFile/5395d8ad94d4e.doc>

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/european-data-protection-regulation/>



supports the 'Personal Data Saves Lives' campaign, alongside our European network, the Federation of European Academies of Medicine, among other partners.<sup>36</sup>

- EU Regulation on Clinical Trials on Medicinal Products for Human Use, which seeks to further harmonise the approval and monitoring of clinical trials. This provided an opportunity to improve on the preceding clinical trials Directive, which had several weaknesses and complexities that had concerned the medical research community. The Academy worked alongside UK and EU partners to inform the new Regulation and address key issues such as streamlining approval for multi-centre trials and administrative burden which may have been causing a decrease in trial initiation.<sup>37</sup>
- EU Directive on Animals Used for Scientific Purposes, which aimed to harmonise animal research standards and practices across Europe. The directive received a broadly positive reception following substantial efforts across the sector to inform its development and transposition into UK law. A number of Fellows noted the leadership shown by the UK on this issue, and the wider impact it had on animal welfare across the EU.

Other EU-level policy processes which impact the UK include European Citizens' Initiatives, popular petitions to raise EU Parliamentary debates, and judicial outputs from European Court of Justice cases, such as *Brustle vs. Greenpeace*, which recommended that certain inventions relating to human embryonic stem cells should not be patentable.<sup>38</sup> There are also ongoing debates in the UK around tax rules on joint public-private research buildings, which are partly restricted by European-level legislation, preventing the wider zero-rating tax status called for by the research community.

Fellows who responded to this question broadly felt it was valuable to engage with these policy-making processes to ensure the final outcomes were appropriate. They felt the burden of this was justified and has stemmed, in part, from the high level of UK engagement with such issues, and it was noted that the UK voice carried weight within EU discussions and had a history of achieving its objectives. Many Fellows remained highly engaged with regulatory issues, particularly those associated with their own fields, and felt able to channel their voice via institutions including the National Academies, learned societies and charities.

A number of Fellows cited examples where EU scientific advice had driven positive policy changes within underserved areas of the UK environment, including the establishment of a UK policy on rare disease research which was pioneered at EU level.

### **Agenda setting**

Several Fellows discussed the value of a 'seat at the table' on EU regulatory matters, noting that non-member affiliates, such as Norway, were required to align to such regulations as a condition of access, but without full access to the development processes of legislation. Membership also amplified the UK's voice on an international level – the Carnegie Group of G8+05 Science Advisers includes both UK and EU representation, lending extra weight to UK influence.

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.datasaveslives.eu/>

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/test-clinical-trials-regulation/>

<sup>38</sup> <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?language=en&num=C-34/10>

## **Q8. How does the quality and effectiveness of scientific advice on matters of public policy compare between the EU and the UK?**

The appointment of a Chief Scientific Adviser by the previous President of the European Commission was welcomed by the research community as a way of improving the status of evidence-based advice within European policy-making. However, the new Commission President has not retained this post and concerns were expressed in a joint letter from the European Academy networks, which noted the value of the role in providing independent, high-quality and transparent advice.<sup>39</sup> The post is to be replaced by a Scientific Advice Mechanism (SAM) based around a High Level Group of experts, alongside input from networked Academies from member states. This mechanism remains at an early stage of development, and the Academy continues to engage to ensure the final structure is able to operate effectively to inform policy-making.

It was recognised that establishing a broadly supported mechanism against a background of diverse capabilities and approaches within Member States presents a challenge. However, a number of Fellows welcomed the transparency of the current development process for the SAM, and hoped the success of the mechanism would be evaluated at regular intervals.

### **Declaration of interests**

The Academy has not received any direct funding from EU sources, however, many of the Academy's Fellows who contributed to this response have received benefit, either directly or indirectly, from EU research funding programmes. Further details are available on request.

---

This response was prepared by Dr Ben Bleasdale (Policy Officer) and informed by members of the Academy's Fellowship. For further information, please contact: ben.bleasdale@acmedsci.ac.uk; +44(0)20 3176 2158.

### **Academy of Medical Sciences**

41 Portland Place

London, W1B 1QH

+44(0)20 3176 2150

info@acmedsci.ac.uk

Registered Charity No. 1070618 Registered Company No. 35202

---

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/download.php?f=file&i=29923>