Innovation Sub-Group Meeting

Wednesday 16th December 2020, 14:30 – 16:30

Draft minutes of the meeting

Members present:	**Lesley Thompson (LT):** Chair & VP Academic & Government Strategic Alliance Elsevier **Sarah Haywood Price (SHP):** Managing Director Advanced Oxford **Simonetta Manfredi** (**SMf):** Associate Dean for Research & KE Oxford Brookes (*in attendance for Prof Linda King)* **Roger Neal (RN):** Sophos UK **Barbara Ghinelli (BG):** STFC **Agne Milukaite (AM):** Cycle Land **Stuart Martin (SM):** Catapult **Paul Beasley (PB):** Professor of Energy Systems and Head of R&D Siemens UK **James Colgate (JC):** Williams Engineering **Debbie Buckley– Golder** (**DBG):** Innovate UK
Apologies:	**Chas Bountra (CB):** Oxford University **Ian Chapman (IC):** UKAEA **Jane Galsworthy (JG):** Director of Programmes Oxford Innovation /AO Rep **David Legg (DL):** Innovate UK **Andrew Harrison (AH**): Diamond Light Source
In attendance:	**Phil Clare (PC):** Deputy Director, Knowledge Exchange & Engagement, Oxford University **Thandiwe Hara-Msulira (THM):** OxLEP **Ahmed Goga (AG):** OxLEP **Josh Fedder (JF):** BEIS **Alexandra Capata (AC):** OxLEP **Jeremy Long (JL):** Chair of OxLEP Board **Sally Long (SL):** IPO **Stuart Wilkinson (SW):** Oxford University **Puja Gidwani (PG):** OxLEP **Afroditi Pekou (AP):** OxLEP **Helen Brind (HB):** OxLEP **Sophie Lee (SL):** OxLEP

	Item
1.	**Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**
2.	**Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd September 2020** Minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and approved. **Matters Arising** **AG:** Reported that the South Oxfordshire Local Plan has now been adopted. This is important to innovation in that it opens up a significant amount of investment in the Culham area, adjacent Abington and significant investment in the Culham site. It opens up £220m of capital investment fund to be delivered through the new science bridge, which will connect Didcot into the new Enterprise zone, duelling the Clifton-Hamden bypass, and providing additional river crossings. The other exciting news is that over £7m has gone into space technologies (at Harwell), including battery technology and there will be more investment in RAL space. **BG:** This is an important development for both the region and the country.
3.	**IPO pilot – PG** *Presentation on ISFB progress and feedback from Task & Finish Group; discussion on next steps for 2021 in shaping phase 2 of project* The purpose of survey was: ▪ To measure and understand the use of IP ▪ To develop IP support that OxLEP offers. ▪ Survey involved 10 Q's, 9 multiple choice and 1 free text ▪ GDPR compliance questions were included ▪ 80 responses were received **Headline findings:** ▪ Over 90% of participants were aware of copyright, and over 80% were aware of trademarks and patents and over 70% were aware of confidential information and designs. ▪ The top 3 types of IP owned were: registered trademarks, copy right and trade secrets. ▪ Over 89% strongly agreed that they understood the impact of IP on businesses. ▪ 85% said their business owned one or more registered or unregistered intellectual property. ▪ 92% agreed that IP assets are very/important to business survival and growth. ▪ 53% said they planned to use their as leverage for finance to grow their business IP, 17% did not know and 5% preferred not to say. ▪ The top 3 sources of IP support were – IP attorneys, IPO and OxLEP. ▪ 59% said they wanted industry specific advice, 55% thought further legal support was most needed and 55% thought more training / workshops / events was needed. ▪ 77% were happy to be contacted by OxLEP. The findings suggest that a large proportion of the respondents have already engaged IP and have engaged IP attorney. However, there is a need to build awareness of IP and IP capability across the region. There is also need to further explore how we can adress the gaps that they identified. **Action: Project will now undertake a series of roundtables sessions in January with businesses, innovation hubs and business incubators and professional and advisory firms across the ecosystem to gain further insight on the key issues which need to be considered.**

4.	**Women & Spinouts: *The Spinout Journey : SM*** *A summary report on gender inclusive innovation study prepared by Oxford Brookes* The report focuses on the people and the process of spinning out, and the journey of individual academics (women and men). ▪ This was a qualitative piece involving 35 people. ▪ The researchers can't draw generalised conclusion from it but it gives insight. ▪ It included women at the early career stage. ▪ Some had finished their PhDs, and others were research fellows. ▪ 77% are from Russell Group universities because that is where most spin outs occur. **Key findings** ▪ They were motivated by a desire to see an application of their research and this motivation was shared between the genders. ▪ They shared a desire for more freedom and flexibility. ▪ They felt that they were constrained. ▪ There pathways to to spit outs are all different. One told of how she almost left academia because she felt she was behind on her career on publications, then she decided to explore possibilities of commercialisation. ▪ They noted the demanding multiple demands in setting up business ▪ They shared a lack of business experience ▪ They noted a lack of support ▪ This area is male dominated and there may be some bias and disadvantage. There may be need to pin down how it may occur and where. The issue of bias is also emerging in other larger studies. Being a woman in a masculine culture is more difficult. ▪ Stereotyping is also an issue and it accumulates in the journey. ▪ We may need to investigate the role of investors and the decisions they make. E.g. to have a round table with investors to unpack the issues. On the policy angle, the treasury could do more to influence investors to encourage diversity ▪ There are questions to be asked regarding skills: Are we training women to meet certain skills or are we rebalancing the ways in which women can fit into the existing system? ▪ Can we unpack the stereotypes? e.g. Who is a good entrepreneur? What gives people assurance in an entrepreneur? What is the criteria? What does a scientist look like? – it is important how we project the images of female scientists. If we want to encourage more girls – stereotypical images of the female scientists may be unhelpful. ▪ There is a strong aspect around culture that we need to address. We have so many examples of success amongst but we have not done enough to promote our successes. We need to show who our heroes are so they can inspire the people looking up to them. There is a strong narrative we need to follow that started to celebrate the fantastic success we have had. **DBG:** Was there any insight into whether women are more risk averse? **SM:** Not sure about the extent to this which was the case. Some spoke of the nervousness of taking the risk, but they took the risk anyway. **RN:** We also need to look at reasons why new businesses fail and learn from that. **AM :** Some of the things that SV have done wrong – we can turn those around and promote innovation around diversity so we do not miss out on talent. How can we make sure that we take talent and do the best with it?

	Women Spinouts and the LIS: The university spinouts can shape and is shaped by the local innovation ecosystem. e.g. immunocore are doing well on gender. The high flyer programme is included in the LIS and these insights could inform that**.** **Action – Celebrating diversity**
5.	**Innovation Support for Business Project** *Presentation on ISFB progress and feedback from Task & Finish Group; discussion on next steps for 2021 in shaping phase 2 of project* The ISFB programme has engaged a broad range of sectors. 40% of the businesses engage are less than 2yrs old and the programme has been successful in its reach. **Key areas of focus** ▪ Increase networking to support improved linkages across areas of high tech; ▪ Increase smart collaboration and SME investment in R&D; ▪ Increase the number of SMEs involved in KE with Research institutions; ▪ Help bring new products to market; ▪ Support an effective innovation system; ▪ Supports R&D companies at all stages of the journey. **Levers at disposal** ▪ Can help develop more support for SME via BEIS; ▪ Access to wide network of technology clusters which we can deploy to strengthen innovation; ▪ Grants to co-invest in innovative projects c£269k. **Approach** ▪ Innovation support products; ▪ Co-funded facilities (Eco-Business Center, Bicester & Agile Lab Begbroke); ▪ Go-Create innovation grants; **Key focus areas – Future** ▪ Engage small rather than micro businesses; ▪ Enable more formal collaborations between business and research institutions; ▪ Prioritise under-developed areas of the ecosystem; ▪ Reach into network and sector groups; ▪ To work with the ISG within the parameters of ISFSB. **PC**: **Explain the percentages of clients in spatial take-up** Percentages of current client list – how many of them are based in areas. They are also an indication of where the programme needs to reach into in the second phase of the programme. This is the measure of penetration into the science and business community of this programme This is a four-year programme and we have opportunity to reshape the support within programme limits. We can draw on the expertise in the group to see how we can drive more innovation into the group. It would be good to have some idea of case studies so we can communicate statistics so we can interrogate them. It would be interesting to understand the stories behind some of the companies we care working with. **RB:** One of the companies received a grant of £11500 and helped the vaccine to life. **Action: To share the slides to the group and links to where case studies are on the OxLEP website.**

6.	**Jeremy Long (JL) Innovation Ecosystem and R&D Roadmap** **R&D Place Strategy** JL sits on the LEP network which engages with issues across Government more widely and he has been tasked to engage all LEPs on this piece. This is not Government policy but a consultation piece of work in which BEIS is engaged with. Other LEP representatives from across the ARC also sit on the network, including some academics and international members of the communities. A wide range of organisations have been invited to comment. ▪ Government is keen to see R&D increase and to review how 'Place and Sectors' are connected to determinants of growth. ▪ There is a tension between investing on a levelling up basis towards places which may have had less R&D expenditure. However, there is a dichotomy between investing in places that have traditionally had less investment, and those parts, which may, increase the private investor and create jobs. ▪ Alternatively, investment could be in placed which may already have seen growth and investment and where there is evidence that more investment may lead to short-term success. ▪ The purpose is to understand potential drivers of research and development in places. So the review is looking at how place and decisions can be factored into the decision making process and how to co-create R&D in those areas including what impact (if any) the place based strategy should have on R&D investment. ▪ We can put a case on what worked and what did not e.g. cluster effect, history, and how this has made significant pay back nationally. E.g. we can tell the story of closer investment around sectors and what we now have around vaccination plus the ability to draw in the history of investment and the expertise that is here and to accelerate that work. We have already showed the cluster effect on the history and record of successful R&D investment in Oxfordshire including the ability to respond quickly. ▪ There is also needed to decide the value of future R&D investment. **BG:** Sometimes we may not have been clear and loud enough about what we have achieved for the UK. We need to review how we are going to work together to understand the key messages and case studies of that we have done for the region and putting the UK in competitive position in key areas. **JL:** We need to continue to make the case on what we are doing and where we have been successful. **BG:** We have sectors which are also connected to national sectors – e.g. Space. We need to understand how we place ourselves in this. **JL:** We also need to understand how certain sectors may differ with others in terms of how it works and what works. **Action : BG – to feed JL further information on this** **Action: LT** – will share with JL examples on how a global company made a location investment decision, which resulted in them opting out of the UK in favour of Barcelona. **LT: to send a work example – of when a company makes a location investment decisions.** **PC:** We need to be careful about separating out the multiple arguments in "place debate," some of which include: - How do you do things that benefit the country as a whole? - How do we help the country as a whole? – e.g. the economy - How can particular regions help the UK international competition? - Are there some interventions which can improve or lessen the gap of economically less advantaged regions? This is the politically difficult point.

	As we are talking about place and levelling up we need to make sure we can do all these three things. We need to support differential investment so long as it is done alongside investment in national and international aspects of development. **DBG:** The LIS is clear that Oxfordshire is conscious of its role in how it benefits all the UK. But we need to find ways of evidencing how this works; e.g. the Satellite Catapult and their role in other regions; What other examples do we have? Can we support our case with more evidence to that effect? **LT:** Where does OX-ARC fit into this? **JL:** Ideas are being put forward on behalf of LEPs, but we could think of working in ways that could collectively lead to more national collaboration. The key issue may be looking at how universities with significant spend can work with other universities. **AG:** There is a danger that the levelling up conversation is domesticated but our wider conversations and ambitions shouldn't be limited by regions or localities and it is important that this point should continue to be made. **SHP:** Understanding the decision-making processes that take place in the companies is critical. The competition is not with other parts of the UK but it is international. There is an important issue around the fundamentals of what we have in the region – both physical and talent. Businesses stay loyal to their areas f they have support available including access to skills and fundamentals like hard and soft infrastructure. **DBG:** We should continue to consider scope for partnering with other parts of the country **LT : How can we help moving forward** **BG:** We should make case study available e.g. explaining why the catapult is making a difference across the UK because of the environment.
7.	**AoB – None**
8.	**Date of next meeting:** 23rd of February, 10am-12pm;