



House of Commons  
Committee of Public Accounts

---

# Research and Development funding across government

---

**Thirty-Third Report of Session 2017–19**

*Report, together with formal minutes relating  
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons  
to be printed 28 March 2018*

## The Committee of Public Accounts

The Committee of Public Accounts is appointed by the House of Commons to examine “the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit” (Standing Order No. 148).

### Current membership

[Meg Hillier MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Hackney South and Shoreditch*) (Chair)

[Bim Afolami MP](#) (*Conservative, Hitchin and Harpenden*)

[Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP](#) (*Conservative, The Cotswolds*)

[Martyn Day MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Linlithgow and East Falkirk*)

[Chris Evans MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Islwyn*)

[Caroline Flint MP](#) (*Labour, Don Valley*)

[Luke Graham MP](#) (*Conservative, Ochil and South Perthshire*)

[Robert Jenrick MP](#) (*Conservative, Newark*)

[Gillian Keegan MP](#) (*Conservative, Chichester*)

[Shabana Mahmood MP](#) (*Labour, Birmingham, Ladywood*)

[Layla Moran MP](#) (*Liberal Democrat, Oxford West and Abingdon*)

[Stephen Morgan MP](#) (*Labour, Portsmouth South*)

[Anne Marie Morris MP](#) (*Conservative, Newton Abbot*)

[Bridget Phillipson MP](#) (*Labour, Houghton and Sunderland South*)

[Lee Rowley MP](#) (*Conservative, North East Derbyshire*)

[Gareth Snell MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Stoke-on-Trent Central*)

### Powers

Powers of the Committee of Public Accounts are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 148. These are available on the Internet via [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

### Publication

Committee reports are published on the [Committee’s website](#) and in print by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee’s website.

### Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Richard Cooke (Clerk), Dominic Stockbridge (Second Clerk), Hannah Wentworth (Chair Support), Ruby Radley (Senior Committee Assistant), Carolyn Bowes and Kutumya Kibedi (Committee Assistants), and Tim Bowden (Media Officer).

### Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Committee of Public Accounts, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6593; the Committee’s email address is [pubaccom@parliament.uk](mailto:pubaccom@parliament.uk).

# Contents

---

<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Government's strategy for research and development</b>	<b>8</b>
Increasing total UK research expenditure	8
Leadership of government research and development	9
Safeguarding intellectual property	10
<b>2 Improving performance in key sectors</b>	<b>12</b>
Strengthening leadership in weaker areas of research	12
Identifying and addressing skills gaps in research and development	12
Improving coordination	13
Quality of information sharing	14
<b>Formal minutes</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Witnesses</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Published written evidence</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament</b>	<b>17</b>



## Summary

---

The Government aims to increase total UK investment in research from 1.68% in 2015 to 2.4% of GDP in 2027 but it lacks an ambitious plan for how it will achieve this. The Government has already committed to spending an additional £7 billion on research over five years. However, without more investment by the private sector there is a risk that the Government may need to spend even more to meet its target. Research in the health sector is well-coordinated but the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy has not done enough to identify where other areas of research are lagging behind. Without effective leadership in key emerging technologies such as robotics, the UK will not develop the skills it needs in the future, and productivity and economic growth could suffer. The Government needs to make sure it protects Government Intellectual Property rights as part of its investment programme.

## Introduction

---

Expenditure on research and development includes exploratory research to acquire new scientific knowledge, applied research to solve specific problems, and translational research to develop new products or processes. In 2015, the UK spent £31.6 billion on research and development, including £8.75 billion of public funding and £15.5 billion of spending by business. The Government has announced plans to increase research funding, and aims to spend an extra £7 billion over the five years to 2021–22. The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) is responsible for the majority of government investment in research, which it funds principally through its research councils, Innovate UK and the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). Around a third of public funding for research comes from other departments. From April 2018, a new body, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) will bring together the research councils, Innovate UK and the research functions of HEFCE. UKRI will be accountable to BEIS.

## Conclusions and recommendations

1. **BEIS does not know how it will achieve the target of increasing total UK investment in research and development, while at the same time compensating for any potential loss of research funding following EU exit.** In 2017, total UK spending on research was 1.68% of GDP, less than some European countries including Germany and an EU average of 2.03%. The Government aims to increase total UK research spending to 2.4% of GDP by 2027 and has announced plans for an additional £7 billion of government funding over the five years to 2021–22. However, half of UK research is currently funded by the private sector over which BEIS has little control. The Government has tried to encourage private sector investment by increasing tax reliefs on research and development from 11% to 12%, but BEIS does not know what impact this incentive will have on industry funding or what the balance between public and private expenditure should be. Furthermore, the UK is currently a net recipient of EU funding for research and development but, depending on the outcome of negotiations, it could face a funding reduction or loss of this source of funding in future following the UK withdrawal from the EU. The Government may need to address a bigger shortfall in research funding in future and BEIS does not appear to have a clear plan for achieving the 2.4% target.

**Recommendation:** *To avoid the Government having to make a disproportionately high contribution to future UK research funding, BEIS should develop a clear strategy for increasing total UK investment to 2.4% of GDP, which addresses issues such as under-funding by business and the potential loss of EU funding.*

2. **Government research is funded by multiple departments, with no organisation taking overall responsibility for investment.** BEIS and its seven research councils are responsible for the majority of publicly-funded research. Other government departments, including the Department of Health and Social Care, the Ministry of Defence, the Department for International Development and the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, account for around a third of public expenditure on research. The new UKRI, which will be established in April 2018, will bring together the research councils, Innovate UK and the research functions of HEFCE. It will have an important leadership and coordination role and aims to fund research through multi-disciplinary funds rather than solely allocating funding to individual research councils. However, it will not have authority to take decisions on the level of funding that other government departments allocate to research from their own budgets.

**Recommendation:** *The new UKRI should, by July 2018, publish a strategy showing how decision-makers will work both across the new organisation and with other parts of government to ensure that research and development is well-coordinated, priorities are aligned, and information is shared.*

3. **Government is still not doing enough to safeguard the economic benefits of its research assets.** Currently, ownership of intellectual property resides with the body that conducted the research rather than with the government funder, but BEIS acknowledges the need to support effective exploitation of publicly-funded research for the benefit of the UK economy. In our 2016 report, we recommended that the former Department for Business, Innovation and Skills should ensure that there

are clear accountabilities in place to safeguard intellectual property rights and the benefits that should accrue to the UK economy as a result of public investment in research. The Government committed to implementing this recommendation by spring 2018. UKRI told us that it would consider intellectual property rights when developing its strategy for UK research, but it did not provide details of what action it would take to protect intellectual property rights. Other countries, for example China, actively ensure that the products of university research are protected. China also invests more in translational research than the UK.

**Recommendation:** *By April 2018, BEIS needs to provide the Committee with a detailed progress update on the action it has taken to ensure that clear accountabilities are in place to safeguard intellectual property in response to the previous Committee's recommendation.*

4. **Government does not know which areas of research need stronger leadership.** Successful research, including clear priorities and beneficial outcomes, is dependent on strong leadership. Government accepted that there is insufficient leadership in key areas of research, including robotics, climate science and advanced materials. The interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser acknowledged that it is not enough simply to increase funding in sectors that are not performing well, and that people with new ideas are often needed to boost areas of research that are lagging behind. BEIS and the interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser identified areas of research that require attention, such as social and political sciences, public administration and behavioural research. However, we are not convinced that government departments are doing enough to identify and address where stronger leadership is needed to increase UK productivity in key sectors of technology.

**Recommendation:** *Once UKRI is established, it should identify where UK research is lagging behind and develop tailored strategies for investing in and supporting these areas to develop capability and increase productivity.*

5. **BEIS does not know enough about which areas of science have skills gaps, nor the potential impact on the availability of key skills arising from the UK leaving the EU.** In most of the research areas we examined, funders lacked coherent and complete information on the skills needed to conduct research. All the witnesses acknowledged the challenges in identifying and addressing research skills gaps. The interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser told us that it is important to spot gaps in the skills of researchers early and act to resolve issues such as women and other groups leaving the profession prematurely, while BEIS and UKRI emphasised the need to improve digital and quantitative skills. The UK's exit from the EU could exacerbate skills gaps if it becomes more difficult for the UK to recruit and retain researchers. Although the Home Office has announced that EU nationals who have been resident in the UK for more than 5 years could claim permanent residency, the longer term impact of EU exit on research skills is not clear.

**Recommendation:** *UKRI and BEIS should ensure that data on potential research skills gaps is used to establish whether key capabilities and productivity are at risk, and take appropriate action in response.*

6. **There is good practice in the coordination of research into human health but it has not been sufficiently replicated elsewhere in the sector.** Of the six areas of research examined by the NAO, coordination mechanisms and leadership arrangements were most established in health research. The health research sector is well-established because it benefits from several decades of development and a strong private sector, while the Department for Health and Social Care and the Medical Research Council have clear responsibilities for leading health research. The Office for Strategic Coordination of Health Research plays a key role in leading human health research by providing a forum for bringing key decision makers together. Its running costs are low compared to the overall health research budget. Two other areas of research, research into the energy sector and animal and plant health, have drawn on good practice in human health to establish their own arrangements for aligning priorities and sharing information. While it is not necessarily possible or desirable to directly reproduce arrangements in health research in other research fields, there is an opportunity to share fundamental principles of well-coordinated research more widely, in fields such as robotics and advanced materials.

**Recommendation:** *UKRI should review which elements of the model used to coordinate health research can be replicated in other areas.*

7. **Government lacks a complete picture of who is funding what, and the results of government-funded research, meaning it risks missing gaps and overlaps in research programmes or a shared understanding of outcomes.** UKRI acknowledged that funders need comprehensive information on what research is going on across government and what researchers are finding in order to identify gaps and prioritise investment. While the research councils use some shared systems for capturing information about research projects, there is no single database covering all government-funded research, and funders lack information on research funded by other government departments. Funders face challenges in bringing information together, collecting and analysing data, spotting duplication and evaluating outcomes. Although developing a universal database will be challenging, there is scope to expand the use of existing databases or to work with the Government Digital Service to develop new mechanisms for sharing and analysing data on funding and outcomes.

**Recommendation:** *UKRI should work with other departments to determine options for developing a cross-government database of research projects and write to the Committee with a progress update by September 2018.*

# 1 Government's strategy for research and development

---

1. On the basis of a report by the Comptroller and Auditor General,<sup>1</sup> we took evidence from the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), and the interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser (the GCSA).<sup>2</sup> We also took evidence from the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC).

2. Research and development is important to the UK for several reasons. It benefits the economy by generating new products and services for the market and helps UK businesses compete globally. It assists in tackling challenges to our society and helps to expand human knowledge. Research and development includes basic research to make new scientific discoveries, applied research to solve specific problems, and translational research to exploit technologies and develop new products or processes.<sup>3</sup>

3. In 2015, the UK spent £31.6 billion on research and development. Around half of this total investment (£15.5 billion) was funded by the business sector, while government funded £8.75 billion of research. Most of the remaining funding came from overseas funders or not-for-profit organisations.<sup>4</sup> In November 2017, the government published its Industrial Strategy which announced plans to spend an extra £7 billion on research and development over the five years to 2021–22.<sup>5</sup>

4. BEIS and its research and higher education councils were responsible for the majority of government investment in research and development in 2015–16. However, around a third of government spending on research and development came from other government departments who fund research specific to their own policy areas. In April 2018, a new body, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), will bring together the research councils, Innovate UK and Research England (The Higher Education Funding Council for England's research funding function).<sup>6</sup>

## Increasing total UK research expenditure

5. In 2015 the UK spent around 1.68% of its GDP on research and development. This is lower than the average for European Union and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries, which are 2.03% and 2.4% respectively. The EU has set a target to increase investment in research and development to 3% of GDP by 2020.<sup>7</sup> BEIS agreed that the UK is not spending enough on research and development and confirmed that the government has set a target to increase the proportion of GDP spent in this area to 2.4% by 2027.<sup>8</sup>

---

1 Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, [Cross-government funding of research and development](#), Session 2017–19, HC 564, 15 November 2017

2 Professor Chris Whitty, who gave evidence to the Committee, was interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser until 4 April 2018. Professor Whitty is Chief Scientific Adviser to the Department of Health and Social Care.

3 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 1, 1.1

4 [C&AG's Report](#), para 2

5 HM Government, Industrial Strategy, Building a Britain fit for the future, [Cm 9528](#), November 2017, p 67

6 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 3–4, Figure 4

7 [C&AG's Report](#), para 12

8 Q 3

6. BEIS did not provide a detailed plan of how it will reach its overall spending target, but told us that it had announced that it will “describe our overall route to get to 2.4% over the next year”. So far, the government has announced that it will increase public spending on research and development by £7 billion over the five years to 2021–22. However, half of UK research is currently funded by the private sector over which BEIS has little control.<sup>9</sup> The Budget in November 2017 sought to stimulate private sector investment in research and development by increasing R&D tax credits from 11% to 12%. However, BEIS did not know how much impact this incentive will have in boosting investment or what the right balance is between Government and private investment in research.<sup>10</sup> Industry spending accounts for a lower proportion of total research and development spending in the UK than in some other European countries, including Germany.<sup>11</sup>

7. The UK is a net receiver of EU funding for research and development, contributing €5.4 billion to EU science between 2007 and 2013 and receiving €8.8 billion in return.<sup>12</sup> BEIS told us that the financial impact of the UK leaving the EU on research and development would be dependent on the outcome of negotiations, but that the government is keen to continue participating in Horizon 2020 (the EU’s main research funding programme) and its successor programme. It accepted that, should UK participation in these schemes end, the UK government would need to address some of the funding shortfall.<sup>13</sup> To avoid this, BEIS confirmed that it expects to keep paying into the Horizon 2020 programme to allow collaborative research to continue. However, arrangements for the successor programme are yet to be determined.<sup>14</sup>

## Leadership of government research and development

8. Multiple departments and government bodies fund public research and development. BEIS funds the majority of publicly-funded research, through its seven research councils, Innovate UK and Research England, the latter of which is responsible for allocating research grants to universities. Other government departments, including the Department of Health and Social Care, the Ministry of Defence, the Department for International Development and the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, account for around a third of public research expenditure.<sup>15</sup> The Government Chief Scientific Adviser (the GCSA) provides scientific advice to the Prime Minister and also engages with government departments on scientific matters, but plays no formal role in allocating resources.<sup>16</sup>

9. We asked witnesses who is responsible for overall leadership for research and development in the UK and for deciding government spending priorities across research and development.<sup>17</sup> UKRI told us that, once established, it will need to work together with BEIS, the GCSA and with other government departments to agree what the important research questions are.<sup>18</sup> BEIS told us that UKRI will be able to take a more strategic

---

9 Qq 3, 9–10

10 Qq 3–4, 9

11 Qq 10–11

12 [C&AG’s Report](#), para 1.10

13 Q 12

14 Q 15

15 [C&AG’s Report](#), para 3

16 [C&AG’s report](#), para 1.3

17 Qq 16, 20, 29, 33

18 Q 22

approach, as the current system of seven research councils tends to funnel funding into discrete silos and does not incentivise cross-disciplinary work. UKRI will produce a strategy in its first year and will be responsible for multi-disciplinary strategic funds such as the £1.5 billion industrial strategy challenge fund, which should allow it to support the most talented researchers and innovators.<sup>19</sup>

10. However, while UKRI will recommend to BEIS what the distribution of resources between the research councils should be, decisions on the balance of funding and the scale of research conducted by UKRI on behalf of other departments will be made through discussions between Ministers. Decisions on research funding where departments hold their own separate research budgets will also be discussed by Ministers. The witnesses told us that UKRI will assist these discussions by providing a strategic overview of where money should be spent on research across the piece. In addition, the GCSA and the Prime Minister's Council for Science and Technology can provide a challenge on whether the balance is right.<sup>20</sup>

### Safeguarding intellectual property

11. Ownership of intellectual property (including patents and trademarks) arising from publicly funded research in the UK resides with the body that conducted the research rather than with the government funder.<sup>21</sup> The previous Committee, having heard evidence on the funding of UK science projects, was concerned that the government was not doing enough to protect the intellectual property that resulted from its investment in research and development. In 2016, we recommended that the then Department for Business, Innovation & Skills should ensure that there are clear accountabilities in place to safeguard intellectual property rights and the benefits that should accrue to the UK economy as a result of public investment in research.<sup>22</sup> In response, the Government agreed “to develop additional proposals to enhance and support effective exploitation of publicly funded research for the benefit of the UK economy and society as part of the Industrial Strategy”. It committed to implementing these changes by the spring of 2018.<sup>23</sup>

12. UKRI told us that it will “look at intellectual property as part of our work”, but did not provide more detail on precisely what it planned to do. UKRI also assured us that British universities are “increasingly conscious” of the importance of protecting intellectual property. It asserted that the real issue facing the UK is not safeguarding intellectual property resulting from research and development, but ensuring that it is exploited properly. We suggested that there may be scope for the UK to learn from China where there is a strong partnership between the government and educational institutions to ensure that intellectual property rights from research are protected.<sup>24</sup>

---

19 Qq 31–32

20 Qq 33–34

21 HM Treasury, Treasury Minutes: Government responses to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Thirty-Seventh and Thirty-Ninth reports from session 2015–16; and the First to the Thirteenth reports from session 2016–17, [Cm 9351](#), November 2016, p 35

22 Committee of Public Accounts, Capital investment in science projects, 5th report, Session 2016–17, HC 126

23 HM Treasury, Treasury Minutes: Government responses to the Committee of Public Accounts on the Thirty-Seventh and Thirty-Ninth reports from session 2015–16; and the First to the Thirteenth reports from session 2016–17, [Cm 9351](#), November 2016, p 35

24 Qq 7–8

13. The UK lags behind some countries, such as China and Israel, in the proportion of research and development spending that goes on translational research (research intended to bring new products and services to the market).<sup>25</sup> The GCSA told us that differentiating between basic, applied and translational spending could be difficult, but asserted that the UK's research and development spending was well-balanced across all three areas.<sup>26</sup> UKRI told us that the UK is good at creating spin-out companies based on new products, but is less good at developing them. A 2017 review by HM Treasury aimed to address this problem by examining approaches to encouraging longer-term capital investment. In response, in November 2017 the Government announced an action plan to finance growth in innovative firms over the next ten years.<sup>27</sup>

---

25 [C&AG's Report](#), Figure 7

26 Q 6

27 Q 6; HM Treasury, [Financing Growth in innovative firms: consultation response](#), November 2017

## 2 Improving performance in key sectors

### Strengthening leadership in weaker areas of research

14. Successful research, including clear priorities and beneficial outcomes is dependent on strong leadership. While leadership arrangements are well-established in human health and currently being developed in energy research and animal and plant health research, they are less developed in robotics, advanced materials and climate science.<sup>28</sup> The interim Government Chief Scientific Adviser (the GCSA) confirmed that the Government recognised and did not dispute these findings.<sup>29</sup> Where fields of research are not progressing well, it is important to understand why and to bring in people with new ideas rather than simply increase funding.<sup>30</sup>

15. Although the witnesses accepted that there is considerable room for improvement in the leadership of research and development in the UK, none were able to provide us with a convincing answer as to which sectors were the worst.<sup>31</sup> The Department of Health and Social Care told us that the areas which were not achieving their full potential were ones where ‘the social sciences and political sciences could have a huge contribution’, such as policing and social care. The GCSA agreed that behavioural science was lagging behind and impeded significant research in areas such as climate science. BEIS highlighted sectors with low productivity such as construction and public administration and accepted that higher levels of research and innovation would be needed to increase future productivity.<sup>32</sup>

### Identifying and addressing skills gaps in research and development

16. The National Audit Office (NAO) reported that funders or stakeholders had concerns about skills gaps in most of the six areas of research it looked at, but found few examples of a systematic approach to assessing the current and projected supply and demand for specific research skills. In each of these areas, those funding the research lacked coherent and complete information on the skills needed to conduct the research.<sup>33</sup> We asked the witnesses whether UK academic institutions are producing enough skilled people to undertake the research needed in the future.<sup>34</sup> The GCSA told us that the system of training people across the necessary disciplines for medical research generally works well. However, he told us that it is important to spot gaps in the skills of researchers early and act to resolve issues such as women and other groups leaving the profession prematurely.<sup>35</sup> BEIS and UKRI told us that the UK requires many more people to study science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) subjects to meet its future skills needs and that digital skills will be particularly important. The Department told us that it currently sponsors a network of 30,000 STEM ambassadors to visit schools and encourage young people to study STEM subjects, but that even this is not enough.<sup>36</sup>

---

28 [C&AG's Report](#), Figure 2, para 16

29 Q 24

30 Q 30

31 Qq 47–52

32 Qq 53–55

33 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 21 and 4.2

34 Q 62

35 Q 65

36 Qq 67–68

17. We asked the witnesses about the potential impact of the UK exiting the EU on people and skills, particularly whether the UK's exit from the EU could exacerbate skills gaps if it becomes more difficult for the UK to recruit and retain researchers. The GCSA told us that he expects that European scientists will still want to work in the UK after it leaves the EU as it is the strongest country in many scientific fields. However, he accepted that there will be some 'turbulence' in the short to medium term as the mechanisms for people moving between the UK and the EU change.<sup>37</sup> BEIS told us that the Home Office's announcement that people who have been living here for five years would gain a right to permanent residency is reassuring to EU researchers working in the UK. Long-term arrangements for this, or the impact on research skills, are not yet clear, but the Migration Advisory Committee, which will be advising the Home Secretary, has been gathering evidence on the subject, including input from the academic community.<sup>38</sup>

### Improving coordination

18. The NAO examine six areas of research: human health; animal and plant health; energy; climate science; advanced materials; and robotics and autonomous systems. Of these, arrangements to co-ordinate research were most established in health research.<sup>39</sup> The health research sector is well-established because it benefits from several decades of development, and a strong private sector, while the Department for Health and Social Care, and the Medical Research Council, both have clear responsibilities for leading health research.<sup>40</sup> There are well-developed mechanisms for the coordination of research in the health sector, including the Office for Strategic Coordination of Health Research (OSCHR) and the UK Clinical Research Collaboration (UKCRC). These organisations work well because they provide a clear framework for key players to work together as a single community.<sup>41</sup> The Office for Strategic Coordination of Health Research plays a key role in leading human health research by providing a forum for bringing key decision makers together. Although its running costs were higher while it was being established, OSCHR now costs £46,000 a year to run compared to a research budget of some £2 billion. Although it does not have executive power, its members agree a shared approach and then go on to take actions in their own organisations.<sup>42</sup>

19. We learned that the newer Energy Innovation Board, which has been in existence for just over two years, and the animal and plant health partnership, have developed by drawing on good practice in the coordination of health research to establish their own arrangements for aligning priorities and sharing information.<sup>43</sup> However, while there may not be a 'one size fits all' model for coordination, there has been less progress in sharing good practice and developing sustainable arrangements in other areas such as robotics and advanced materials.<sup>44</sup>

---

37 Qq 16, 17

38 Q 19

39 [C&AG's Report](#), Figure 2, para 16

40 Qq 23–24

41 Qq 23–24

42 Qq 59–60

43 Qq 24–25

44 Qq 25–28

## Quality of information sharing

20. Most of the research areas examined by the NAO lacked coherent and complete information on funding of research, skills and infrastructure. Funders recognised the need for better information on who was funding what in order to identify gaps and prioritise investment.<sup>45</sup> UKRI recognised the need for more strategic coordination so that departments have clear information on what research is being funded and know where the gaps are.<sup>46</sup>

21. Research councils use some shared systems for capturing information about research projects, and have tools such as Researchfish for reporting findings. However, there is no single database covering all government-funded research, and funders lack information on research funded by other government departments.<sup>47</sup> This leads to challenges in bringing information together, collecting and analysing data, spotting duplication and evaluating outcomes.<sup>48</sup> The Department of Health and Social Care highlighted the importance of sharing information not just between government departments but also with other bodies such as the What Works Centres which help to make research easier to access.<sup>49</sup> UKRI and the GCSA told us that producing a universal database of research would be challenging but accepted that each Department needs to do more to share the research it is doing.<sup>50</sup> We suggested that the Government Digital Service could assist in developing a solution.<sup>51</sup>

---

45 [C&AG's report](#) para 21 and 4.1

46 Q71

47 Q 71, [C&AG's report](#) para 4.5–4.6

48 [C&AG's report](#) para 4.5, 24, 27f

49 Q71

50 Q72

51 Q71

# Formal minutes

---

**Wednesday 28 March 2018**

Members present:

Meg Hillier, in the Chair

Bim Afolami	Layla Moran
Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown	Anne Marie Morris
Chris Evans	Lee Rowley
Gillian Keegan	Gareth Snell
Shabana Mahmood	

Draft Report (*Research and Development funding across government*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

*Ordered*, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 21 read and agreed to.

Introduction agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Report be the Thirty-third of the Committee to the House.

*Ordered*, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

*Ordered*, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 18 April 2018 at 2.00pm]

## Witnesses

---

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

### Wednesday 31 January 2018

*Question number*

**Alex Chisholm**, Permanent Secretary, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, **Sir Mark Walport**, Chief Executive, UK Research and Innovation, **Sir Chris Wormald**, Permanent Secretary, Department of Health, and Professor Chris Whitty, Government Chief Scientific Adviser

[Q1-72](#)

## Published written evidence

---

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

RAD numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Bishop Fleming LLP ([RAD0005](#))
- 2 Campaign for Science and Engineering ([RAD0004](#))
- 3 Dr Martyn Thomas ([RAD0002](#))
- 4 Prospect ([RAD0003](#))

## List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

### Session 2017–19

First Report	Tackling online VAT fraud and error	HC 312 (Cm 9549)
Second Report	Brexit and the future of Customs	HC 401 (Cm 9565)
Third Report	Hinkley Point C	HC 393 (Cm 9565)
Fourth Report	Clinical correspondence handling at NHS Shared Business Services	HC 396 (Cm 9575)
Fifth Report	Managing the costs of clinical negligence in hospital trusts	HC 397 (Cm 9575)
Sixth Report	The growing threat of online fraud	HC 399 (Cm 9575)
Seventh Report	Brexit and the UK border	HC 558 (Cm 9575)
Eighth Report	Mental health in prisons	HC 400 (Cm 9575) (Cm 9596)
Ninth Report	Sheffield to Rotherham tram-trains	HC 453 (Cm 9575)
Tenth Report	High Speed 2 Annual Report and Accounts	HC 454 (Cm 9575)
Eleventh Report	Homeless households	HC 462 (Cm 9575)
Twelfth Report	HMRC's Performance in 2016–17	HC 456 (Cm 9596)
Thirteenth Report	NHS continuing healthcare funding	HC 455 (Cm 9596)
Fourteenth Report	Delivering Carrier Strike	HC 394 (Cm 9596)
Fifteenth Report	Offender-monitoring tags	HC 458 (Cm 9596)
Sixteenth Report	Government borrowing and the Whole of Government Accounts	HC 463 (Cm 9596)
Seventeenth Report	Retaining and developing the teaching workforce	HC 460 (Cm 9596)
Eighteenth Report	Exiting the European Union	HC 467 (Cm 9596)

Nineteenth Report	Excess Votes 2016–17	HC 806 (Cm 9596)
Twentieth Report	Update on the Thameslink Programme	HC 466
Twenty-First Report	The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's Magnox	HC 461
Twenty-Second Report	The monitoring, inspection and funding of Learndirect Ltd.	HC 875
Twenty-Third Report	Alternative Higher Education Providers	HC 736
Twenty-Fourth Report	Care Quality Commission: regulating health and social care	HC 468
Twenty-Fifth Report	The sale of the Green Investment Bank	HC 468
Twenty-Sixth Report	Governance and departmental oversight of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	HC 896
Twenty-Seventh Report	Government contracts for Community Rehabilitation Companies	HC 897
Twenty-Eighth Report	Ministry of Defence: Acquisition and support of defence equipment	HC 724
Twenty-Ninth Report	Sustainability and transformation in the NHS	HC 793
Thirtieth Report	Academy schools' finances	HC 760
Thirty-First Report	The future of the National Lottery	HC 898
Thirty-Second Report	Cyber-attack on the NHS	HC 787
First Special Report	Chair of the Public Accounts Committee's Second Annual Report	HC 347