



Trend Chart on Innovation in Europe

UK 4

General presentation of the measure/scheme/action/regulation

Country

United Kingdom

Geographical coverage, national or regional (state region)

(National)

Title of the measure

R&D Scoreboard

Information Source/Reference

DTI Innovation Unit.

Overview (nature, main goals)

A document containing financial data, aimed at encouraging more effective investment in R&D by stimulating informed debate within, and between companies and their investors

Action Plan objective addressed by measure

II.5. Financing

Administering agency

[DTI - Department of Trade and Industry](#)

151 Buckingham Palace Road, United Kingdom

Web Site: www.dti.gov.uk

Name of the manager(s) responsible for the implementation of this measure with address, fax, phone

[Milos Komac](#)

Ministry of Science and Technology

Trg Osvobodilne fronte 13, Slovenia

Phone: +386/61 1784 649

Fax: +386/ 61 1784 719

e-mail: info@mzt.si

[No specific contact](#)

DTI - Department of Trade and Industry

151 Buckingham Palace Road, United Kingdom

Description of Scheme

General Information

Reference to legal basis (e.g. act, public document, ...)

There is no direct legal basis for the Scoreboard, although the general budget used to pay for the Scoreboard has a legal basis in the Science and Technology Act 1965.

Does the measure receive central funding or regional funding?

Central

Start date

1991,

Expected date of completion

None yet planned

Previous measure (name, date, links with the current measure)

N/A

Reasons for launching/modifying the new measure

There was concern in the early 1990s that many UK companies were under-investing in R&D and focusing too much on short-term goals. This was thought at the time to be related to high dividend payments relative to companies in other countries. The Scoreboard was intended to stimulate debate on this subject and hold a mirror up to companies to see if they were content they were investing sufficiently in innovation and longer-term goals to maintain their competitive edge in an increasingly global and competitive market.

Have any of the main features of the measure/scheme/action/regulation changed during its implementation

No, not significantly.

What is the predominant role of the government?

- Search
- Publications
- Who is Who
- News
- Links
- Search
- Contact Us
- FAQ
- Disclaimer

This is not a specific Government scheme. The role of the document is to encourage companies to consider if they are investing sufficiently in innovation to maintain their long term competitive edge.

Target Group

Who are the target groups of the measure?

Large Companies/Large Industrial Companies
SMEs/Industrial SMEs
Universities

Organisation and Implementation

Organisation and Structure

The Scoreboard contains a Ministerial introduction, two commentaries from senior members of the investor and corporate communities, a descriptive section on the meaning of the data, and around 100 pages of tabulated data. The project is managed by the DT Innovation Unit and the data is collected under contract by Company Reporting Ltd.

What are the criteria for eligibility?

The companies listed in the Scoreboard are the top 500 (in terms of R&D spend) in the (300 internationally) that declare their R&D spend. Apart from potentially a company being missed in the data trawl there is no scope for selection bias.

What is the mode of delivery of the measure?

The document is published by Company Reporting Ltd in parallel with significant articles in the Financial Times and other media roll-out. Copies are sent out initially to a wide range of contacts including the Chief Executives of those companies in the Scoreboard, and thereafter on request and, where appropriate, at other functions.

Financing : Overall budget allocated to the measure

See I.c.5

Financing : expenditure per year

Around £80,000 (129,300 EURO) this year. Has increased progressively year on year due to inflation and incrementally expanded requirements.

Financing : other budgetary sources (additional financing)

N/A.

Results

Result Measurement

What are the main indicators for the measurement of the results ?

The impact of the Scoreboard in terms of stimulating debate is measured by capturing the quantity and quality of media coverage, for example whether the key messages were conveyed and in which media they appeared. This happens particularly in the period immediately after publication each year, although any reference in the media throughout the year is watched for and its message content studied. Measuring the extent to which the Scoreboard has changed people's attitudes to R&D and encouraged more effective investment in R&D is more difficult. Some feedback for this has come from: direct communications from companies and investors on issues related to the Scoreboard; feedback arising during dedicated feedback sessions following publication; and feedback from the Innovation Unit's industrial secondees who are often in contact with companies on such issues. The increase in the number of companies each year that are declaring R&D in their accounts is also possibly related to the higher profile that the Scoreboard has given to this issue.

Where an evaluation has taken place, what were the main results achieved?

See response to II.a.1 for part of the answer. A formal market-penetration analysis beyond that already stated has not taken yet place, although there are plans for one to be undertaken following publication of the 1998 R&D Scoreboard. The aim of this will be to test how effective the Scoreboard is being at encouraging more effective investment in R&D, who is picking up the messages, to what extent attitudes are being changed and debate stimulated, whether changes in approach would help convey the messages etc.

If no official evaluation has been undertaken, have there been any indicators of success?

See response to II.a.1 for part of the answer. The results from analysing media response and through feedback directly from companies and investors, show that the Scoreboard has become a widely respected tool for companies to benchmark their performance against their competitors. The impact in terms of stimulating wider debate has also been successful as previously stated.

Observations

Which mechanisms seem to function well in the measure?

The non-judgmental nature of the Scoreboard and the fact that the data is all publicly available in Reports and Accounts are very important factors in ensuring that a healthy debate ensues which is not distracted by suspicions of political nuance. The commentaries by senior members of the investment and corporate communities have been welcomed

adding flesh to the tabular bones of the Scoreboard, in particular in respect of conveying the key messages about: the importance of effective investment in R&D and innovation and the need for effective dialogue between companies and their investors to underpin this.

Which mechanisms seem to be less successful in the measure?

The Scoreboard data tends to focus on larger companies, even though the messages it contains are just as valid for smaller companies. One weakness has therefore been its ability to convey these messages to SMEs. For this reason, a smaller company document just containing the key messages is being prepared for co-production with the main 1998 Scoreboard.

Are there any other measures planned or in operation as a follow up to this measure? Direction of the planned measures? Objectives? Target groups?

The impact of the Scoreboard is followed each year following publication through an analysis of media interest (see above). There will also (as usual) be a follow-up meeting after the 1998 Scoreboard has been published to discuss with customers how the Scoreboard could be improved to meet its objectives.

