

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Industrial Biotechnology Innovation Centre</b>
<b>Question 1: how should the outcomes framework currently in place for UIF evolve to ensure University KEIF is structured to deliver on its renewed purpose and has the right strategic drivers and incentives in place?</b>	<p>i. The outcomes framework currently in place for UIF should evolve with revisions that include a specific outcome that supports the simplification around intellectual property and associated commercial processes for entrepreneurship purposes, of which could be considered for Outcome two (simplification/commercialisation) or Outcome four (entrepreneurialism). We have heard anecdotally from a variety of our members that barriers around intellectual property rights still exist with universities, and this outcome would help ensure the success of the Knowledge Exchange and Innovation Fund (KEIF).</p> <p>ii. The outcomes framework should consider a new outcome specifically on investment. This would serve as a strategic driver for encouraging wider investment in innovation, as Universities have incredible links in this space already and would benefit the KEIF.</p> <p>iii. An additional outcome for consideration should be specifically on collaboration. There needs to be clearer incentives to encourage evidence of collaboration, rather than competition, across universities to address key challenges, with new strategic drivers that can help to deliver this.</p> <p>iv. Anonymised member feedback on Q1: We frequently find that when working with Universities, the IP and commercialisation can often be approached from a place of opposition rather than collaboration. This has been the experience directed at us but also between academic institutions when there has been multi HEI collaborations. From [our] experience, when the academics we've worked with wish to spin out technology, the process is very complicated.</p> <p>v. Anonymised member feedback on Q1 (2): The outcomes framework should consider a new outcome specifically on skills development. This would serve as a strategic driver for</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>developing the education, skills and mindset required not only for economic growth but also the transition to net zero. This would encourage development of the technical and non-technical skills and systems thinking required to enable innovation for the future and response to emerging sectors. IBioIC could look to strengthen their expertise in this area and inform this outcome through skills and wider partnerships.</p>
<p><b>Question 2: what are your views on the current UIF collaborative framework, how could this evolve and be sustained to support further good practice and purposeful collaboration? Is there a role for the Knowledge Exchange Concordat in this context or more generally?</b></p>	
<p><b>Question 3: what are your views on how the impact and outcomes of University KEIF should be measured, including the role of metrics or other indicators in any future funding and allocation model? We would welcome views on current or potential good practice regarding measuring net-zero KE&amp;I activities and outcomes.</b></p>	

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 4: how could the University KEIF, with Interface, help support collaboration with colleges, collectively supporting Scotland's SME base to be more innovative?**

- i. To support Scotland's SME base to be more innovative through colleges, there needs to be provision and support for colleges to hire Knowledge Exchange staff.
- ii. Another route for helping SMEs is ensuring that collaboration agreements are less paperwork intensive, as we have previously received comments from members around around the sheer amount of paperwork required in applying for funding (this includes comments around IBioIC processes as well).
- iii. IBioIC would be happy to share best practice in encouraging SMEs to engage, as 79% of our project awards have been awarded to SMEs and micro-entities.
- iv. Regional hub-and-spoke models could directly leverage larger HEIs with greater capacity whilst maximising opportunities to coordinate innovation activities towards engaging and supporting smaller scale HEIs alongside, and in alignment with SME interests.
- v. Anonymised member feedback on Q4: 'Dialogue' could be more transparent/collaborative. There has been more than one occasion where Knowledge Exchange staff we have dealt in the preparation of a grant or during a project have one sided conversations/meetings with the academic rather than with both parties which may lead to further KE opportunities, ideas and better collaborative relationships. Regarding agreements and specifically, in the case where a project is industry-led but the academic receives the award, this can cause confusion within universities when preparing collaboration agreements where they do not fully understand the expected dynamic leading to a protracted and complex process to get an agreement in place.

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 5: how could core capacity funding (College KEIF) best support colleges to be effective agents of KE&I? We would particularly like to learn from colleges directly on what KE&I means to them and where capacity is needed to deliver this effectively, which could include building on current practice.**

- i. To best support colleges to be effective agents of KE&I, best practice can absolutely be learned from the likes of Glasgow Clyde College and Forth Valley College and their involvement in the HND in industrial biotechnology which is driven by effective relationships between academia and industry. Forth Valley College additionally is a leading example of KE&I with its Fuel Change programme, which is also being supported through the Climate Emergency Skills Action Plan (CESAP) on which Zero Waste Scotland are leading on priority actions.
- ii. Access to facilities in colleges could be valuable to SMEs, however we have little oversight of these through the current Innovation Centre operating models, we think this may be an untapped opportunity. The innovation centre would welcome the opportunity to know more about how the colleges operate in the KE&I space and would hope that as an outcome of this consultation that this could be something that those 'in the know' can help around building the infrastructure.
- iii. There is a real opportunity for IBioIC to join up the innovation landscape with Scotland's powerhouse apprenticeship and work-based learning programmes and would like to see the integration of this approach into the current innovation infrastructure which the colleges are the key to reflect the demographics of a Just Transition and lifelong learning.
- iv. Anonymised member feedback on Q5: "Colleges are at various stages on their knowledge journeys with regards to their sustainability from awareness to pioneering. This is not only with regards to KE&I at curricular level but also at institutional strategic level. KE&I has to be across and through the colleges. There is insufficient resource dedicated to this and clearly challenging gaps in climate emergency/Sustainability expertise. Dumfries & Galloway College have established their Green Skills Academy currently focused on Green Energy but the model that can include wider sectors."

**Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)**

<p><b>Question 6: we would welcome views on what would be an appropriate period for SFC to run the first cycle of College KEIF before formally reviewing it and establishing a mature model for future years.</b></p>	<p>i. From our experience, we think three years would be an appropriate period for SFC to run the first cycle of College KEIF. This time period should give the pilot enough time to implement best practice and review impact.</p> <p>ii. Should the concept only be tested on a few exemplars or should SFC chose a few exemplars to test this concept, we would ask Glasgow Clyde College and Forth Valley College be prioritised due to</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>their proactive ways of working. However, we would ask that any such model, pilot or other, be afforded additional funding as our concern would be that the colleges would not be able to afford the KE staff required to deliver this.</p>
<p><b>Question 7: we would welcome views on the potential value of using College KEIF to create frameworks for collaboration and sharing of good practice across the colleges, and with universities.</b></p>	<p>i. An example of best practice that is worth considering is the Scottish Colleges Biotechnology Consortium (SCBC) that ran in the late 1990s and early 2000s. IBioIC would be happy to support investigating this further and our CEO has past experience of working with the SCBC.</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 8: our review recommended that we co-design the Entrepreneurial Campus strategy with colleges and universities. We would welcome views on what is proposed in this consultation, including potential opportunities, weaknesses and gaps.**

i. The Entrepreneurial Campus Strategy should include the opportunity of biotechnology and the wider bioeconomy, taking a whole systems approach that specifically considers multi and trans disciplinary/sectoral nature of bioeconomy. As a part of the life and chemicals sciences world, biotechnology and the bioeconomy has never had higher profile. As we move from translational to commercialisation of science, building clusters and hubs is critical to building mass and the Entrepreneurial Campus Strategy could be key to supporting this. The strategy should enable inward movement, investment and collaboration from global partners, across and through functions, sectors, higher and further education. IBioIC can support the training and skills development offer of the campus.

ii. The concept of the 'campus' does suggest a co-location of expertise and support but also suggests physical resources. Having start up space is essential for this type of campus, and often space is at a premium in universities. The Entrepreneurial Campus should include incubators or shared facilities that helps to draw users in and anchor companies across the nation. IBioIC has a programme of activity (the Net Zero Accelerator Programme) that includes plans for a Research Hotel, which could be incorporated into this strategy, and we would be delighted to work in partnership on the proposal.

iii. The campus needs to be well embedded and connected with local community, so not just for those in FE or HE but support for local start-ups and the wider levelling up agenda and creates a residency between business and innovation. The likes of Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy & Biomedical Sciences (SIPBS) are exemplary but does not have space for everyone, we need more space for increasing activity as early-stage spin outs struggle for space and for space to grow which was our experience with ENOUGH (formerly 3fBio).

iv. The campus needs to be set up where academic excellence is, the campus cannot be seen as just an Edinburgh/Glasgow/central belt initiative. The campus should consider working in partnership with Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) and South of Scotland Enterprise

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

(SOSE) for 'twin' campuses to not exclude rural areas. An additional consideration should be a hybrid/virtual element to the campus as a learning from Covid-19.

v. The campus needs to operate as a space where technology transfer can occur by co-exist without competing, having researchers work with various industry teams, not paying for a research contract, and making it a collaboration by fostering closer working.

vi. Scotland is home to excellent University business schools, and learnings from business schools could be applied to the campus, including the offer of fundamental business training, and offer learning on the flexibility.

vii. Anonymised member feedback on Q8: “[a gap is] recognition of micro businesses and Scotland’s 97% SMEs and how the campus/hub strategy would engage with them”.

viii. Anonymised member feedback on Q8: “[we know that] Zero Waste Scotland are currently undertaking a similar programme of work. [The Entrepreneurial Campus strategy should] look at the existing IBioIC engagement, campuses, hubs, networks to minimise interference whilst maximising impact and capitalising on what is already working with established stakeholder base and partnerships to enable wider reach.”



## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 9: we would welcome evidence of current practice in Scotland (or elsewhere) to ensure we have an up-to-date picture of what is working well and upon which the Entrepreneurial Campus strategy could build on.**

i. Ireland has a very successful model that should be considered, the National Institute For Bioprocessing Research & Training (NIBRT) <<https://www.nibr.ie/>> the Institute is based on an is an exemplar example of innovative collaboration between industry, government, and academia. NIBRT had all of the Irish colleges join in on the action, it offered high value training and had courses led by industry. This is further supported at the government level there is a bioeconomy Implementation Group <<https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/87110-bioeconomy-implementation-groups-first-progress-report/>>, and a national bioeconomy forum <<https://www.gov.ie/en/press-release/6f92a-first-meeting-of-the-national-bioeconomy-forum/>> of various voices (industry, clusters, researchers, public) who can feed into the implementation group.

ii. The Innovation Centres are a good example of what's working well working across the innovation landscape and with regard to joining up people, business, and academia, we have supported the increased number of spin outs, and 79% of our project awards have been awarded to SMEs and micro-entities. IBioIC's Bioprocessing Scale Up Centres (Rapid Bio at the University of Strathclyde & Flex Bio at Heriot Watt University) are always inundated with work for clients across the bioeconomy space, we have previously hosted companies (ENOUGH, when it was 3fBio).

iii. Scottish examples of good practice are: BioCity in Glasgow; BioQuarter in Edinburgh; Dundee has a life sciences hub; Inverness has exemplar digital health and a newly launched BioHub; in Oban SAMS has business space and is rapidly expanding; Queen Margaret University (QMU) has ambitious plans for a Food and Drink Innovation Hub that will rejuvenate the east of Edinburgh and East Lothian with good links to local councils and has access to City Deal funding.

iv. Heriot Watt University is a great example, lots of our members have space there. HWU has space to build new infrastructure such as the Innis and Gunn Centre of Excellence for brewing.

v. Catapults are a good example of networking support at the UK level. Best practice can be found in the UK Catapult Advanced Therapies Skills Training Network connects training resources and educational programmes from across the advanced therapies and vaccine manufacturing industry.

**Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)**

--	--

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 10: the Review recommended that the university and college sectors join SFC in repositioning Innovation Centres (ICs) as stable long-term infrastructure investments. We would welcome views on the details of the proposed 'repositioning' as described in this consultation, including any opportunities, weaknesses and gaps.**

- i. In terms of our impacts to date, IBioIC has supported 121 collaborative innovation projects (Feasibility Studies or larger Innovation Accelerators) fostering academic-business partnership and co-funded by business. This has leveraged an additional £28.5M from business, follow-on funding from other sources or partnering with other funding initiatives. As a direct outcome from the collaborative projects, 213 jobs have been created by the businesses involved.
- ii. As a key contributor to Scotland's transition to Green Jobs, in 2021 the IBioIC industry-ready PhD cohort reached 120, the MSc in Industrial Biotechnology including industry placement has graduated more than 100 students and IBioIC continues to work with Further Education Colleges on HND and apprenticeship level skills development. IBioIC is also a partner with Roslin Cell Therapies on one of three UK Advanced Therapies Training Networks.
- iii. IBioIC wholeheartedly supports the repositioning of Innovation Centres as stable long-term infrastructure investments, it is something IBioIC is absolute in, not least for the reason of being able to fund long term innovation projects that go beyond the current five-year cycle. This would enable us to embed into the long-term initiatives, without a longer time period ICs will struggle to integrate into 10-year projects due to time constraints. Short term funding cycles are disruptive and damage ICs ability to deliver. Loss of staff and knowledge of landscape is difficult to replace quickly. Embedding ICs in infrastructure reduces that risk and improves longer term impacts.
- iv. An Opportunity is to avoid the possibility of ICs driven by KPIs. The focus should be on meaningful longer-term goals that meets the needs of Scotland's people, agile working, responsiveness to change, and the ability to be the 'honest broker' between academia and industry.
- v. A potential downside might be that industry starts to see ICs as 'part of the public sector establishment' and we do not have the benefit of 'independence' from the

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

HEI system. As an example, ICs cannot apply for funding themselves, so ICs are not on an equal footing with either academia or industry. As such, the targets for 'raising funding' as outlined by the SFC would be difficult within the current restraints.

vi. In terms of gaps, SFC needs to keep sight of potential need for new ICs in emerging sectors (space, agriculture, medical technologies, advanced therapies) and perhaps repurpose the ICs working on areas Scottish Government and its agencies have deemed to be successful and no longer needing public sector interventions. The National Strategy for Economic Transformation sets out a list of new market opportunities that the IC programme should support.

vii. The ICs should be allowed to pivot as was allowed within the pandemic, such as to park business plan to develop and support new economic or environmental opportunities. The ability to deliver collaborative funding allows us to bridge the gaps between enterprise agencies, some things don't fit and fall between the cracks of the likes of SFC and Scottish Enterprise. This is where ICs could be revolutionary in supporting those gaps.

viii. A consistent review of direction and priorities is a good opportunity to work in partnership to ensure ICs are working in the right space, perhaps moving to a longer-term yearly review period rather than a quarterly reporting period. If the move was to be impact KPIs, this needs to be agreed hand in hand with ICs so it will work.

ix. All sectors and subsequent ICs have to look at net zero ambitions realistically, the IBioIC job is to ensure that the new greener processes are ready and scalable.

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 11: we would welcome views on how we could best strengthen the Innovation Centre's relationship with universities and colleges, ensuring added value, sense of partnership and collaboration, avoiding duplication of effort etc. This would include opportunities for alignment and partnership with Interface, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, South of Scotland Enterprise and other relevant agencies and organisations.**

i. The Centre facilitates collaborations, provides scale-up capabilities, creates networks, and develops skills. It provides support and expertise to ease the innovation journey of companies large and small to develop products for global markets. It currently has 134 members as of March 2022, over half of which are SME or Micro companies. IBioIC has also worked with 18 Universities and Research Institutes and 4 Further Education Colleges across Scotland to connect and build IB expertise, develop new skills programmes and foster strong business engagement.

ii. IBioIC is firmly embedded in Scotland's innovation ecosystem and works collaboratively with the other 6 Innovation Centres to build synergies and to find solutions for key challenges such as Net Zero, Health and Wellbeing and Sustainable Food Production.

iii. IBioIC is already channel partner with Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE), and Scottish Funding Council (SFC) though we have suggestions on how we could strengthen these collaboration agreements and we are actively pursuing a relationship with South of Scotland Enterprise (SOSE). Zero Waste Scotland are an exemplary example of best practice in partnership working within the public sector. IBioIC has a partnership working agreement in place with Zero Waste Scotland to make working together on the likes of joint funding calls easier for companies to engage. Zero Waste Scotland has bolstered its support for driving a bioeconomy as they have dedicated staff to drive the agenda, by having the dedicated resource this makes for natural engagement through the account manager type relationship. Zero Waste Scotland also have dedicated resource to lead and partner on the Climate Emergency Skills Action Plan (CESAP) and the Green Jobs Skills Hub to develop green jobs and the skills required across sectors.

iv. SFC and Enterprise agencies could work together to facilitate funding of Commercial R&D programmes with SFC funding academia and enterprise agencies funding the SMEs. This could lead to bigger and more impactful programmes of work, and further embed ICs in the enterprise agencies and their ways of working.

Anonymised member feedback on Q11 specifically on point iv in IBioIC's response: "More of this sort of funding would be really beneficial to SMEs in particular. Sometimes, although we would like

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

to simultaneously push more innovation via collaborative grants, the in-kind contribution can be a barrier particularly if an academic is receiving slightly larger pots (100k and above)”.

v. A suggestion could be for each enterprise agency to host specific cross-IC meetings aligned to the EAs remit to ensure more collaboration and avoiding duplication of effort.

vi. There needs to be more of a consistent spread of activity and projects with less commercially focused universities and support them in levelling up, though this would require time and resources. A potential solution could be secondments from tech transfer offices in the leading Universities into the IC teams for 6-12 months and vice versa, this would help educate all actors on how stakeholders operate. IBioIC would be happy to pilot this scheme for the purposes of wider roll out of industrial biotechnology, which if successful could be rolled out to other sectors. This pilot scheme could encourage secondment of staff between wider stakeholders and ICs to better understand challenges and opportunities. This particular pilot for biotechnology could have Net Zero as its high-level ambitions in an educational sense, and part of the IC role could be scoping for technologies in universities in relation to net zero. IBioIC has a range of case studies in the Net Zero space < <https://www.ibioic.com/net-zero-industrial-biotechnology-is-a-carbon-capturing-technology>>.

Anonymised member feedback on Q11 specifically on point vi in IBioIC’s response: “This would be brilliant if it led more HEIs to become more industry collaborative. Whilst there are stand-out HEIs who work really well on industry led collaborations, many universities still don't engage well with industry and others don't at all. This can be a real shame, particularly where the university has expertise or equipment that they could exploit better via collaboration.”

vii. IBioIC is a leading example of how best to collaborate across the innovation landscape (ICs, EAs, HEIs). There does need to be more consistency across the ICs around confidentiality agreements, process for evaluating projects, funding criteria, shared project management tools etc.

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

viii. Looking to skills and training, the ICs could collaborate to create a 'Skills and Training Hub' that could offer generic skills and training courses around innovation and entrepreneurship leaning on the vast and varied experience across the innovation centres and their teams. There is additional potential for the Green Jobs Skills Hub to inform and guide this.

ix. It is the experience of IBioIC that we need better transparency and better communication and interaction from Universities KE groups. We know through our experience that many of these groups are understaffed and do not have the bandwidth to fully engage with ICs. We have found that interactions across the nation's universities is patchy despite our best efforts to strengthen these relationships.

x. The ICs could benefit from greater engagement from senior university staff to create a real sense of ownership and direction for ICs to better meet their local University needs and aspirations for industry engagement. A lot of the IBioIC interaction is at tech transfer and business development level and has proven strong, but perhaps we need more senior level interactions.

xi. Looking to specific support for the more rural areas of Scotland and the HIE and SOSE regions, ICs could have more regional representation with 'boots on the ground' across Scotland. Apart from SAIC and Net Zero Technology Centre all of the ICs are central belt of Scotland. IBioIC has a strong relationship with HIE as we have a staff member who is based in the HIE region and acts as the key account manager for the region, and this member of our team has built a very strong relationship with HIE, and we would like to think of expanding this to SOSE if possible so there is an IC business lead for this specific geographical region.

xii. ICs can sometimes be viewed as a given university's 'property' and this can limit/deter engagement with other universities in our experience.

xiii. In regard to Interface, it would be beneficial if Interfaces' offering was aligned with IC areas of activity more explicitly so that it is clear to industry and academia that there is a seamless route

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

between a. signposting and b. Innovation Vouchers and then c. IC interventions.

xiv. Anonymised member feedback on Q11: “A place-based approach to developing skills would add value, particular to targeted support business development and employment opportunities in specific geographic areas. This could also align with the Just Transition. Colleges and universities are looking at what green skills looks like for their geographic area responding to industry and net zero drivers.”

xv. Anonymised member feedback on Q11: “Looking from the outside in It is not always apparent how the IC are learning from each other and cascading and communicating best practice from the other ICs to inform better relationships.”



## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 12: we would welcome views on potential areas of future opportunity where the Innovation Centre model could help deliver outcomes for Scotland.**

- i. The Industrial Biotechnology Innovation Centre (IBioIC) was established in 2014 to stimulate growth of the Industrial Biotechnology (IB) sector in Scotland. The National Plan for Industrial Biotechnology set a £900m turnover target to be achieved by 2025. In 2012 industrial biotechnology turnover in Scotland was less than £200 million, and as of 2019 the figure has grown significantly to £747 million (representing an increase of over 270%), helping it to become a powerhouse of Scotland's economy. Analysis of the year-on-year accelerated company turnover growth can be correlated to the growth of IBioIC and its activities.
- ii. IBioIC is recognised as a European centre of excellence and connects world-leading industry with outstanding academic expertise and government to bring new IB processes and products to the global market. The IB sector makes an important contribution to the Scottish economy, while also reducing our impact on the environment. The growth of IB will help Scotland transition from being an economy largely based on fossil fuels to a more modern, cleaner model, fit for the future. As a key opinion former, IBioIC has increasingly featured in the media such as The Times, The Scotsman, The Herald, and New Statesman, for example.
- iii. IBioIC has consistently over-delivered on the metrics set in the Phase II business plan. In response to the pandemic and climate emergency, IBioIC has swiftly pivoted its operations to demonstrate how the growth of the bio-based industry in Scotland can contribute to net zero carbon targets while growing a new sustainable industry for Scotland. The three areas of growth will be: Sustainable Manufacturing, Decarbonisation Across Supply Chains, and Health and Wellbeing
- iv. In addition to the current focus on the Chemicals Sector, other areas where IB can drive significant growth include Feed, Food and Drink; Medicines, Vaccines and Advanced Therapies; Materials and Textiles; Consumer Products.
- v. IBioIC is keen to deliver a range of expanded and new activities to meet outstanding gaps and needs across the innovation, manufacturing, and skills landscape for IB in Scotland. These include:

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

- a. Growing an innovation pipeline: continue and grow current innovation support, networking and events, fostering collaboration both B2A and B2B, and building strategic partnerships.
- b. De-risk and Validate Innovation: increase market intelligence, growth appropriate technical expertise to include carbon accounting; develop University-based specialists to support potential entrepreneurs.
- c. Accelerate Growth: grow a strong investor forum, support new spinouts as commercial champions and support R&D transition to scale-up and manufacturing.
- d. Talent Development: deliver a Scotland-wide Bioeconomy Skills Academy as part of the Green Jobs and Just Transition needs and include entrepreneurship training.
- e. Grow Scale-Up Centre capabilities: Grow capability to larger scale, work with Grangemouth and Falkirk Growth Deal to develop Sustainable Chemicals Innovation Campus, work with stakeholders to define and deliver IB Innovation Incubator / Hotel.
- vi. IBioIC will continue to work collaboratively across Universities, Research Institutes and Further Education Colleges on these initiatives to significantly grow the Bioeconomy in Scotland, build a new industry and deliver carbon savings, economic growth, and jobs in doing so. The current refresh of the National Plan for IB will be delivered in 2022 and set out the new targets for turnover, company creation and jobs.
- vii. Since inception IBioIC has driven business to academia collaboration, nucleating new projects and collaborations, of which there have been 121 Innovative collaborations bringing industry and academia together and 207 companies supported in their innovation journey (since 2014). To continue driving these collaborations we need seed funding to continue proof of concept type projects that are essential for those moving from academic to the commercial

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>space. To support the Net zero and just transition economic plans we need larger and more flexible pots of funding that can be used and administered in a longer-term basis to evidence sustainability impacts around the likes of carbon accounting.</p> <p>viii. There needs to be an annual scan of emerging sectors that Scotland can support through the creation of new innovation centres or current innovation centres can pivot to support through redefining the direction of a centre/flexing current business plans. These priorities should be aligned to Scottish Government new market opportunities outlined in the National Strategy for Economic Transformation: renewable energy, the hydrogen economy, high-value manufacturing, space, circular economy, the blue economy, financial services and fintech, industrial biotechnology, photonics and quantum, digital technology, life sciences, food and drink, creative industries and tourism. For example, we have no Innovation Centre specifically supporting the likes of Space or Medical Technologies.</p>
<p><b>Question 13: we would welcome views on strengthening Interface’s relationship with universities and colleges, ensuring added value, sense of partnership and collaboration, avoiding duplication of effort etc. This would include opportunities for alignment and partnership with Innovation Centres, Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise, South of Scotland Enterprise and other relevant agencies and organisations.</b></p>	<p>i. When IBioIC has met with Interface in person they have been good at passing on referrals from their funding programme, which have led to funding and membership opportunities for IBioIC. We are keen to facilitate more of such engagements in the future.</p> <p>ii. Looking to strengthening relationships and building partnerships and collaboration, perhaps an outcome of this consultation should be to consider re-drawing the boundaries in the roles of what Interface and the ICs are responsible for.</p>
<p><b>Question 14: if you have direct experience of working with Interface, we would welcome suggestions for evolutions to its operating model to help it develop even more effective support for productive relationships between businesses and our universities and colleges.</b></p>	<p>i. When engaging companies IBioIC points companies first to Innovation vouchers and then to our own Feasibility Funding.</p> <p>ii. We have experienced difficulty in working to secure funding for partnerships that IBioIC has identified. This is not the fault of Interface, it seems that Interface’s funding is limited (one voucher per company, collaboration can't have interacted before etc). We would like to see Interface have</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>more flexibility in how it can fund projects and would like to work with Interface with a view to being able to co-fund projects in future.</p>
<p><b>Question 15: we would welcome general views, based on direct experience of the Innovation Voucher scheme, on how it could evolve and better support our system for KE&amp;I.</b></p>	<p>i. An IBioIC member shared anecdotally that they were unable to use the Innovation Voucher scheme as the Intellectual Property (IP) conditions for the vouchers were too inflexible, as the voucher scheme requires all IP be owned by the company, even in cases where the IP was generated by an academic. We would ask for flexibility around IP arrangements when considering any changes to the Innovation Voucher scheme.</p>
<p><b>Question 16: we would welcome views on widening the scope of Innovation Vouchers to encompass wider KE activity but retaining the key objective of using them as a means to promote first time collaborations and encourage longer-term relationships.</b></p>	<p>i. Considerations for the Innovation Voucher scheme should be widening the list the vouchers can be used for, such as access to facilities. IBioIC is currently running a Facilities Access Fund in order to bridge this current gap.</p> <p>ii. Looking to encouraging longer-term relationships, the amount of money allocated needs to increase. The voucher scheme hasn't increased much in value since inception whereas the cost of research has, so perhaps a measure should be ensuring the voucher scheme is linked to inflation.</p> <p>iii. We support a scheme that promotes wider use, but it needs to include those outside of traditional Universities and beyond just tech transfer. For wider uptake, additional engagement with business may be required, as the term 'Innovation' may not resonate with all businesses. KE does not have to mean innovation just exchange of useful knowledge which could be across areas ranging from skills and market insights to the likes of policy development.</p> <p>iv. Where looking to encourage longer-term relationships following engaging the scheme, there needs to be more follow-on support for companies and academic innovators making the outlook less short-term. Where a company or academic has secured an innovation voucher, perhaps an outcome the scheme could consider is providing more support for a next stage proposal.</p>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

**Question 17: how could colleges and universities help SFC understand, or monitor longitudinally, how many Innovation Vouchers have led to ongoing relationships? Are there cross sectoral digital solutions to this which can help us better understand the outcome we hope to achieve?**

- i. As referenced in our answer to Question 16, point v, if providing follow on support this should be recorded and reported on for the purposes of monitoring though this may become a difficult way to record all progress of the scheme.
- ii. A measure for consideration could be a marketplace that interested parties go to secure an innovation voucher. A centralised database/CRM with automated alerts that nudge recipients to provide updates. Through investing in a centralised database/CRM it would mean SFC have the data to pull reports on the vouchers and recipients, making reporting information much easier. This should be caveated that while data is important it will not provide understanding of why vouchers are or are not used, so there may be a need for qualitative research as well.
- iii. Anonymised member feedback on Q17: “Pathways [are] not just about the voucher, it’s the pathway to the voucher and the journey afterwards that is equally important to the use of the voucher itself. Colleges and universities have to identify the role of the voucher in strategies/ pathways. If an ongoing relationship is a KPI/ benefit of the voucher, then how and when will this be realised and over what time period especially as relationships mature? Again, link to pre and post voucher. There are also wider benefits out with the original voucher primary benefits that can be mapped across sectors but also across business functions.”

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

<p><b>Question 18: From experience of mission-led approaches elsewhere, how would you advise SFC to use its resources and investments to facilitate such activity in support of Scottish Government objectives for economic transformation?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Challenge-led approaches should be the foundation of any mission-led approaches. This new approach from SFC will align with the missions of the Scottish National Investment Bank ('The Bank'): Achieving a Just Transition to net zero by 2045; Extending equality of opportunity through improving places by 2040; and Harnessing innovation to enable our people to flourish by 2040.</li>   <li>ii. The missions need to be very well funded to achieve anything of value as frequently missions are existential threats that can't be solved without substantial investment, such as achieving net zero by 2045.</li>   <li>iii. One of the mission-led approaches has to be securing investment or supporting investment in infrastructure. As SFC can only fund academic research, the missions need investment from a range of public and private investors (the private sector, the Scottish Government, The Bank, and the Enterprise Agencies) to delivery truly collaborative partnerships.</li>   <li>iv. The missions have to be developed with multiple stakeholders to get early buy in across the landscape. IBioIC would be happy to support SFC in convening its members to support this new approach.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Question 19: We would welcome views on the breadth of the role a KE&amp;I Advisory Board could play and what stakeholder membership would give us the most effective support for SFC's role in the ecosystem.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. IBioIC welcomes the premise of a KE&amp;I Advisory Board and would suggest stakeholder membership to include one member from each of the innovation centres alongside the research pools and other key institutions within the research space but slightly out with the current university funding landscape such as the James Hutton Institute and Moredun and an invitation to Scotland's colleges.</li>   <li>ii. The Innovation Centres could suggest industry, academic and skills and learning champions given this is the ICs area of expertise.</li>   <li>iii. There should be some international representation from countries that demonstrate best</li> </ul>

## Consultation on changes to our funding policies for knowledge exchange and innovation (KE&I)

	<p>practice in KE&amp;I.</p> <p>iv. University of Strathclyde has been a fantastic supporter of innovation, and has provided incredible support for IBioIC, so should be absolutely included on the board.</p>
<p><b>We may publish a summary of the consultation responses and, in some cases, the responses themselves. Published responses may be attributed to an organisation where this information has been provided but will not contain personal data. When providing a response in an individual capacity, published responses will be anonymised. Please confirm whether or not you agree to your response being included in any potential publication.</b></p>	<p>Publish information and excerpts from this survey response INCLUDING the organisation name.</p>