

# European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding



## Philanthropy, a growing asset for research

Stakeholders' Conference | London, UK  
2-3 December 2009

## CONFERENCE REPORT



The organisation of this event was made possible thanks to the support of the Wellcome Trust who hosted the conference, the Robert Bosch Stiftung who sponsored the scholarship programme, and the European Commission (DG Research) who supported the speakers' fund.

**wellcome**trust

Robert Bosch **Stiftung**



European Commission  
(DG Research)





## FOREWORD

### Partnerships in research

"Philanthropy, a growing asset for research" was the theme of the 2009 annual conference of the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding. The thought-provoking plenary sessions and discussions that followed highlighted that foundations bring much more than just financial resources to the projects that they fund. Key to foundations' increasing status as an asset for research are their independence and autonomy, and their readiness to use these to pursue innovative approaches and to take risks.

The challenges facing foundations and research institutions today are both sizable and many. Our ability to meet the challenges ahead will depend on the effectiveness with which we form collaborative cross-sector and cross-border partnerships. Success will also be determined by an ability to identify the areas, disciplines or projects where our impact will be most profoundly felt and through which we can help to foster curiosity-driven, cutting-edge research.

In 2010, the Forum will run a number of activities including workshops and peer learning events, culminating in the annual stakeholders' conference, set to take place 7-8 December 2010 in Stuttgart. We look forward to seeing you there.

**Pier Mario Vello**

*Secretary General, Fondazione Cariplo*

*Chair of the Steering Group, European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding*

## CONTENTS

### 2 December 2009

Opening plenary: The 21st century challenges of science and philanthropy	4
Afternoon plenary: Philanthropy, a growing asset for research	7
Reception: Talk by Neil Turok	10

### 3 December 2009

Lecture: A forward look, by Tim Hunt	11
Session A: Innovative funding strategies	13
Session B: Striving for excellence in decision-making	15
Session C: Setting the right conditions for enhanced partnerships	16
Closing plenary	18

<i>About the Forum</i>	21
------------------------	----

<i>Attendance</i>	23
-------------------	----

# OPENING PLENARY

## The 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges of science and philanthropy

**Moderator** Mark Walport, Wellcome Trust  
**Panellists** David Drewry, European University Association  
Wilhelm Krull, VolkswagenStiftung  
Diogo Lucena, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian  
Erna Möller, Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse  
Tomasz Perkowski, Foundation for Polish Science

**Mark Walport**, Wellcome Trust, opened the conference by noting that in order to fulfil their missions, foundations and trusts must be run and operate differently from public funders of research. It is only in doing so that they will be able to fulfil their potential and develop the innovative approaches and partnerships necessary to help address the many challenges that lie ahead for research in Europe in the coming years.

**Erna Möller**, Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse, stated that foundations' most important quality when it comes to funding research is the freedom that they have. Funding will always be a challenge for research. Increasingly this challenge is being defined by the need for funding of a cross-disciplinary nature, as more and more projects of this kind emerge. New fields such as biomimetics require a range of expertise and may not fall into any of the traditional funding categories.

She explained that the Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse does not fund in a way that might be termed strategic, since it was not felt that the boards of foundations were those best placed to drive the field. Nor, she added, are politicians.

A further challenge facing science is in the area of education. There is a need to engage more young people in the areas of natural sciences and research. It is not enough for this to start at the university level; earlier intervention is needed. Education of the public on research, innovation and new technologies is also important and often overlooked.

Issues such as data integrity, patient confidentiality, abuse of information, and the myriad of pressures influencing scientists and their research, as well as the many controversial issues such as stem cell research, risk taking, and safety in laboratories, present a host of complex ethical challenges with which the research field must deal on a daily basis.

*"What is so special about foundations is their ability and willingness to listen to scientists' needs and to be flexible in finding ways to meet them."*

**Tomasz Perkowski**, Foundation for Polish Science, placed the work and added value of foundations in the context of the bigger picture that is 'science in Europe'.

It is on those buzz words that we use so freely, 'creativity', 'research', 'innovation', 'development science', to name but a few, that the future of Europe depends. The non-profit sector in Europe does not have to and should not seek to compete with the business or governmental sectors.

Perkowski also raised the issue of scientific policy making. Policy making, he noted, is often described as solving today's problems with yesterday's methods tomorrow. Both researchers and foundations however are groups who should not limit their thinking to the here and now. They can go beyond 'PR policy making' and seek to promote long-term views and solutions. Foundations' autonomy means that they can be more objective, more risk-taking, and can put more weight behind achieving goals rather than simply following procedures, as many governmental bodies find themselves doing.

Shortcomings in the present scientific system, such as the 'publish or perish' rule, highlight that even the best tools at our disposal such as the bibliometrics system, are far from perfect. Similarly, science is still not an egalitarian system; a beautiful mind is not the only passport to its elite. There is a glass ceiling facing women and young scientists, as well as scientists working, in a geographical sense, far from the scientific centre.

*"We need to work on ensuring equal opportunities, not because it is politically correct but because we need fair competition and a free market of thought."*

He also noted how difficult it can be for scientists to secure funding for breakthrough research, reminding participants that failures are often as important for the development of science as successes. Simplification of science, particularly when it comes to policy making, should be avoided. Funding should not be awarded on the basis that good science is science that leads to immediate implementation.

Building on Möller's comments, Perkowski noted that there is a role for foundations in deepening the public understanding of sciences, both to show science as the greatest adventure of humankind and also as a career path for young people. Foundations can encourage their grantees to give public speeches, to present their achievements in the media, and to invite high school

## The 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges of science and philanthropy

students to laboratories, and in doing so can actively participate in the promotion of science. There is also a place for non-governmental organisations in educating young science leaders in how to manage their teams. Being a lab team leader is not that different to being a manager in a company, yet while there are dozens of MBA schools, there is very little training for science leaders. In addition, there is a need to promote codes of conduct for researchers, reviewers, and foundations.

He concluded that foundations have an obligation to society to be at the forefront of research and innovation. They need to support the best scientists whenever they decide to take the riskier path and to encourage them to aspire to take this path. His message for participants was, quite simply: "Be bold."

**Wilhelm Krull**, VolkswagenStiftung, set the discussion in the context of the wider issues and challenges ahead: global issues such as climate change, demographic changes, and also the upcoming shortage of scientists in Europe. These challenges are huge and will require more than the input of the scientific community and foundation world to meet them, but these two groups do have a vital role to play.

What is clear is that more must be invested to overcome the structural deficits we are confronted with in Europe. One large part of the problem is the underfunding of universities. Simply throwing money at this problem will not solve it.

*"We must consider carefully how we can invest more intelligently and more effectively to create a stimulating and inspiring environment in which a culture of creativity can flourish."*

Europe has more doctoral students and post docs than the US, Krull observed, but added that we need to ask ourselves why it is that we do not produce more of the highly-cited papers or hold more of the prestigious prizes. Institutions like the Wellcome Trust are already doing much to change things, but more still needs to be done.

Krull's message to delegates was: "Small things matter." The European Commission and large government funders are supporting ever larger networks and clusters of organisations and this is not where foundations can most usefully play a role. By identifying overlooked areas in which they can really make a difference, foundations can develop islands of success and examples of best practice within these niches and build towards making an impact on the overall system.

In order to do this, he noted, we need to move away from the low trust 2-3 year funding mode, towards a 5-7 year funding mode. It needs to be acknowledged that work takes time and that milestones can all too easily become millstones. It will be their willingness to engage in mutual risk taking that will enable foundations to make an impact on research.

Despite the huge challenges ahead, we should try to stay optimistic, urged Krull, at least in the way that Albert Einstein was when he once said that "Amidst all the difficulties, there is room for opportunities."

**Diogo Lucena**, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, spoke on the current system of financing in science, noting that the system is in many ways too conservative and that where it is funded by public money, it will most likely stay that way. Systems such as the Bologna Process and the way in which universities are run and funded are, he argued, delivering a message to young people not to take risks in their work and this is hindering the production of innovative, curiosity driven research.

Foundations are important because they are free to ignore geographic or policy restrictions and to spend their money as they choose. It is this that will enable them to play such an important role in innovation. Foundations in Europe do, however, face a number of challenges.

One challenge is the geographical breakdown of Europe. Groups undertaking strong and innovative work are often small and immobile, making both identification and cross fertilization of their work difficult. In the US, he observed, funding bodies can identify the best research centres, fund these well, and thus encourage the best people to move to those centres. In contrast, the geographical fragmentation of Europe acts as a barrier to mobility of scientists, funding and knowledge.

*"Foundations need to look beyond their own countries. If we want to reach the top tier in Europe, we have to breakdown these barriers and remove these restrictions".*



# The 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges of science and philanthropy



© Wellcome Images

**David Drewry**, European University Association (EUA), presented the perspective of the European university sector. He recalled that, some years ago, seed money was provided by the European Science Foundation to bring scientists together to identify and to plan for some of the

grand challenges ahead in the areas of marine and polar science. It was out of this project that some of the most audacious and successful programmes in marine and polar science undertaken during the last 10 to 15 years were born, including the deep core drilling in the Antarctic and Greenland that has been fundamental to climate change research. This is an example of how bringing a few key people together in a fluid and flexible setting can produce powerful results. The question now, he suggested, is how can this approach be extended to assist universities in the future?

*“We must prevent governments from seeing foundations and philanthropic funding as substitutional as opposed to giving a level of additionality to funding.”*

Universities are currently facing huge challenges in terms of overall funding, and diversification of funding streams will be essential to ensure that today’s universities are able to work effectively to meet the challenges of the future. They need to be aware of the benefits that funding from foundations presents and also to consider how they can make best use of it. Funding from foundations represents an additional source to government funding, as well as a more flexible and project-oriented source of finance.

Drewry also touched on the important issue of full economic costing which is vital to universities, yet an area of some current difficulty for foundations. He also reported that there are universities in Europe that have no track record of working with foundations. Organisations and stakeholders such as the EUA have a role to play in raising awareness of what philanthropic foundations can offer, while universities themselves need to develop the internal systems and practices that will enable them to leverage alternative sources of funding, for example by establishing alumni associations. The autonomy of universities may also be an issue. In certain cases, they may not be able to bid for, receive and deploy alternative sources of funding.

Organisations like the EUA can help universities to meet the challenges by encouraging institutions to come to-

gether, identifying important issues, sharing best practice, and stimulating processes of reform in universities across Europe, so that they are better placed to seek and deploy philanthropic funding.

Walport concluded the discussion by observing that the speakers had highlighted the many ways in which foundations can be catalytic in the research process even if they are not acting in a way that we might think of as strategic. They might be catalytic by, for example, giving a longer term grant, or by bringing scientists together: “There are lots of ways in which foundations can and indeed should add value, over and above being a post box through which people drop grant applications.”

Such an approach also provides foundations with a way of interacting with the scientific community without trying to control it. As Krull stated: “We should never forget that as foundations we are partners of the researchers and we are not members of the scientific community. It is always important to try and keep this in mind when positioning ourselves – you must not think that you know better than anybody else.”

## Debate

The discussion with delegates explored the ways in which foundations can avoid their funding being seen as substitutional. It also acknowledged the power of foundations, both individual and collective, to influence governments and leverage funding for projects in addition to that which they themselves are offering. Delegates recommended that foundations might be more open about the ‘trial and error’ nature of funding research – it is necessary to talk about where projects have failed and what was learnt, as well as where they have succeeded. Breakthrough research in particular carries risks and can divide opinion. Even if this information is not suitable for publication in foundations’ annual reports, for example, fora such as the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding are a place where foundations and other stakeholders should feel free to discuss such matters.

As Walport observed: “Risk taking isn’t about funding lunatics. It’s about identifying clever people and giving them space.”

# AFTERNOON PLENARY

## Philanthropy, a growing asset for research

**Chair** João Caraça, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian  
**Panellists** Martin Brookes, New Philanthropy Capital  
Anne-Marie Engel, Lundbeckfonden  
John Smith, European University Association

The plenary explored the ways in which philanthropy can open new avenues for supporting research and the unique opportunities that this source of funding offers, setting the scene for the parallel sessions of 3 December by looking forward to the following questions:

- How can philanthropy provide opportunities for leveraging funds for innovative funding and for research with public and other private funders?
- How can evaluation help foundations make choices and inform their decision making?
- What are the best conditions for philanthropic bodies and universities to work together in ensuring the best environment for their partnerships to flourish?

**João Caraça**, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, opened the session by noting the importance of foundations as resources set aside for the future. Foundations' sustainability enables them to bring a long-term perspective and to help ensure provision for future generations. Referring to the opening plenary, he also noted that being open minded and as well as geographically open would be an important challenge for foundations in the coming years and stressed the importance of curiosity-driven science.

**John Smith**, European University Association (EUA), presented the work of the Brussels-based organisation providing an independent voice for universities across Europe.

He outlined the key characteristics of university-based research, highlighting universities' major role in supplying trained researchers; their capacity to foster interdisciplinary research skills and expertise; and their role as focal points for dialogue and knowledge exchange with society and for developing citizenship.

The context for research is changing and becoming increasingly complex. There has been a growth in the number of external competitive sources of funding in university budgets, meaning that institutions must both compete and cooperate in building European (and international) research. Global challenges are reflected in the emergence of complex research issues requiring new interdisciplinary approaches and skills, and the digital revolution has had, and continues to have, a huge impact on the research process and knowledge exchange.

Universities and research institutions need greater organisational, financial and staffing autonomy. They need to be able to offer competitive salaries, and need to be able to recruit staff on an international and European level, Smith argued. With the availability of public funding currently declining in many countries, universities must diversify their funding streams. This requires the availability of sustainable funding from external competitive sources.

Philanthropic funding can play an important role in helping universities to achieve and maintain excellence in their research. Philanthropic funding of university research should be developed as an integral part of a university's overall strategy for diversifying its fundraising; it should re-enforce a university's own institutional fundraising culture; and at the same time, it should help to successfully develop the multiple research interests and needs of faculties and departments. Foundations can take more risks than public funders, he observed, and can bring long-term rather than short-term perspectives. They can also increase the internationality of Europe's universities through partnerships and mobility in project development.

Smith went on to outline the EUA's approach to the sustainable funding of university-based research and the aims of their 'Prague declaration' issued in April 2009 at the 5th EUA convention. The declaration sends a message to political leaders that education must be seen as an investment and not as consumption in the context of public budgets and the cuts they are currently facing. The declaration identifies ten 'success factors' for European universities in the next decade, two of which are:

- Developing distinctive institutional research profiles: by stimulating a rich variety of unique environments that promote interdisciplinary approaches to tackle 21st century global challenges; enhanced through theme-focused project development supported by competitive research funding
- Increasing and diversifying income: to achieve financial sustainability by implementing sound accounting practices that identify the full cost of all activities, diversifying income portfolios and securing adequate public funding.

Universities will need to work hard to create the best conditions for working together with philanthropic

## Philanthropy, a growing asset for research

bodies, he added. Alumni associations can help to foster the spirit of philanthropy at the university level, while universities' governing bodies may benefit from opening up to independent members from a range of sectors, including philanthropic institutions.

**Martin Brookes**, New Philanthropy Capital, shared his expertise in helping funders and charities achieve a greater impact. He stated that there are few genuinely different or new ideas for funding research, but that this is not to say that research funding is not highly important. In the public sector, research is used to inform policy discussions and in the private sector it is vital to guide decision-making. In the third sector however, the absence of relevant research is often alarming.

Brookes outlined four basic 'innovative' ways to fund research:

1. Picking neglected areas of research to concentrate funding.
2. Designing funding so as to leverage new money.
3. Designing funding so as to change the behaviour of researchers, leading to better outcomes.
4. Co-production of knowledge.

One striking example of how foundations can make an impact by focusing their attention on neglected areas of research can be seen in the work of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which has committed large sums to research and tackle neglected diseases within its Global Public Health programme. Their Grand Challenges Exploration Fund shows philanthropy supporting innovative research. New Philanthropy Capital, is itself finalising research into a practical tool to help charities measure their impact on children's well-being. This has been funded by individual donors on NPC's trustee board who recognise that UK foundations often do not like to support research.

A large scale example of designing funding to leverage new money can be seen in the work of Atlantic Philanthropies in Ireland. The Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions was co-designed with the Irish government to boost the volume of research funding going into Irish universities with the specific aim of improving the state of knowledge and the labour market in the Irish economy. The programme was launched in 1999 with €06 million, 54% of which came from the government, the remainder coming from Atlantic Philanthropies. This total grew over three cycles to €20 million, 82% of which came from government. This represents a very positive outcome from a sustained, but ultimately limited, private funding commitment.

Designing a research programme in such a way as to change the behaviour of researchers, is increasingly widespread and most clearly seen through the growing use of prizes. Research by management consultants, McKinsey & Co, shows an increase in the use of prizes to incentivise researchers. Of the philanthropic prizes introduced before 1990, only 3% aimed to incentivise behaviour and alter outputs and outcomes. Of the philanthropic prizes introduced since 1990, 78% have included incentives. Some may find this dispiriting, a sad reflection on human behaviour and instincts. Others may regard it as a brilliant way of nudging researchers' to address the right topics.

To illustrate the fourth of his innovative approaches to funding, the co-production of knowledge, Brookes used the issue of autism. Parents with autistic children frequently experiment with diet to see if this makes any difference to their children's behaviours. Scientists are not, it seems, working on trials to test such diets. It may however be, he observed, that research needs to engage more with 'users'. Parents need to know - they want and demand to know - whether diet affects autism. Co-producing research with them would offer a real prospect of adding to the sum of relevant human knowledge. Ignoring this interest means that research is not servicing legitimate needs.

Brookes went on to add that while philanthropists may not be interested in research per se, they are interested in outcomes, as are the general public. To take an example from the UK: general donations have made Cancer Research UK one of the UK's largest charities, not because people care about research into cancer, but because they understand this is a good way to improve the lives of those affected by cancer. Research is for them, quite simply, a means to an end. But, funding secured in this way is supporting early-stage research which could be picked up by industry later on. As such, it represents an example of leveraging in extra money over time.

He stated that there was a parallel agenda about research into and research for the third sector that should not be ignored.

*"There needs to be more research done on the activities, the performance and the behaviours of charities and non-profits. Charities need to be taken seriously as objects of analysis and research and, also, as audiences for research and analysis."*

Foundations have an important role to play here, as do public sector funders of research.

## Philanthropy, a growing asset for research

**Anne-Marie Engel**, Lundbeckfonden, introduced the topic of evaluation and outlined some of the questions that are raised when a foundation decides to evaluate either the research that it is planning to fund or the research that it has already funded. Most important of all when it comes to evaluation, she noted, is its use as a means of enabling foundations to take risks in an informed way.

Why do funders evaluate? Public funders need to justify the use of public money. Equally foundations that have collected money from public donations may also be looking to justify to donors how that money was spent.

Foundations evaluate to identify the best and most promising research and researchers (ex-ante evaluation); to monitor the progress of projects, review their objectives, and review the appropriateness of the support provided by the funder (in-itinere evaluation); and to measure the quality of research output and to understand how the research funded has an impact on science and on the researchers supported (ex-post evaluation).

Engel then introduced evaluation practice at the Lundbeckfonden, a Danish foundation granting around €5 million per year for biomedical and natural sciences research, and outlined some of the ways that the foundation is using evaluation. While it is not possible to develop a 'one size fits all' approach to evaluation, the Lundbeckfonden is working to develop a one-flow evaluation model from which relevant parts can be selected depending on the kind of grant or activity that is being evaluated. The aim is for as much of the evaluation process as possible to be included into the electronic applications system, so as to keep everything in one database, so that neither researchers nor foundation staff should find themselves drowning in bureaucracy. Inspired by the Wellcome Trust's use of 'timeline portraits', the foundation also wants to incorporate increased use of storytelling on individual projects or centre grants into the evaluation process.

There are over 110,000<sup>1</sup> public benefit foundations in Europe including foundations which fund research directly, or indirectly as a means of supporting their mission. Foundations that support research are very diverse in size, both in terms of financial and human resources and they support research in many different ways. In these respects, foundations represent a great asset for research. There are, however, many challenges that they face when evaluating their activities and foundations can benefit from sharing experiences and

best practices in this area. Evaluation should enable foundations to take the right decisions to improve their funding and operations and thus their impact. It should also help to inform the public of foundations' activities and provide evidence of how their money is spent and what the foundations hope to achieve by funding particular researchers or areas of research.

Where do we go from here? Engel outlined the steps that the Lundbeckfonden is currently taking to improve evaluation processes in the area of philanthropic funding of research. Within the framework of the evaluation group of the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding, the foundation is also involved in developing a set of tools starting with input from foundations that participated in recent workshops. A series of pamphlets covering the topics of why, how and what to evaluate, in addition to providing case studies and information on available resources will be published in the autumn of 2010, after being piloted by selected foundations and interested public funders.

### Debate

Delegates put questions to the panel on topics including foundations' use of committees, the influence of the founding company in the case of corporate foundations, and the difference between the funding systems of foundations and those of public funders. It was observed that evaluation is one of the areas in which private and public funders operate in similar ways. This can be beneficial to researchers since it cuts the number of different types of form that they are required to spend valuable time filling in. It was also noted that foundations' greater freedom in comparison to other funders enables them to act more quickly and extensively on the findings of evaluations; a private foundation is at liberty to change its strategy as it chooses. As Engel observed.

*"Public funders have to ensure that a broad area is being funded. Foundations have more freedom and can take greater risks."*

<sup>1</sup>Feasibility Study on a European Foundation Statute, published February 2009: <http://www.efc.be/EuropeanFoundationStatute/Pages/FeasibilityStudy.aspx>

# RECEPTION

## Talk by Neil Turok



Neil Turok founded the African Institute for Mathematical Sciences (AIMS) in 2003. Based in Cape Town, this postgraduate educational centre supports the development of mathematics and science across the African continent. The goal of AIMS is to offer advanced training to some of Africa's most able graduates, thereby enabling them to

contribute to the development of Africa. The Institute recruits outstanding maths, science and engineering graduates from across the continent, and through an innovative, intense programme develops their talent as independent problem solvers, creative "outside-the-box" thinkers, and excellent teachers.

In 2008, AIMS launched its Next Einstein Initiative, to create 15 AIMS centres within the next decade. By publicly stating the objective of the programme to be to facilitate the emergence of an "African Einstein", Turok hopes to make clear that the programme is aiming for the highest levels of intellectual achievement and to emphasise his and his colleagues' conviction that human talent of enormous potential is currently being wasted in Africa, capacity which is vitally needed for progress. Among those recruited and trained at AIMS centres will be people of rare talent capable of revolutionary advances, such as scientists, educators, wealth-creators and leaders. Together they will form a powerful network working together towards African educational and economic self-sufficiency.

### About Neil Turok

Born in South Africa, Neil Turok earned his PhD at Imperial College, London. After a postdoctoral fellowship in Santa Barbara, he was an Associate Scientist at Fermilab before moving to Princeton University where he became Professor of Physics in 1994. In 1997, he was appointed Chair of Mathematical Physics at the University of Cambridge. In October 2008, he moved to the Perimeter Institute as its new Director. Among his many honours, Turok was awarded Sloan and Packard Fellowships and the James Clerk Maxwell Medal.

For more information,  
please see [www.aims.ac.za](http://www.aims.ac.za)  
and [www.nexteinstein.org](http://www.nexteinstein.org)



## LECTURE

### A forward look, by Tim Hunt

Tim Hunt opened the second day of the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding with a lecture examining the role that philanthropy can play in helping to meet the challenges of science and in helping to create the conditions in which creative approaches to research can thrive.

**Tim Hunt is a principal scientist at Cancer Research UK, Clare Hall Laboratories, in South Mimms. After reading natural Sciences at Cambridge, he did his Ph.D. in the Department of Biochemistry on “The Synthesis of Haemoglobin”. In 1982, he discovered cyclins, which turned out to be “Key Regulator(s) of the Cell Cycle”. This discovery led to a share of the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 2001, together with Lee Hartwell and Paul Nurse. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society, a Fellow of the Academy of Medical Sciences, a Foreign Associate of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, a Member of EMBO, a Foreign Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a Member of Academia Europaea. He was knighted in June 2006.**

Hunt stated that having worked at Cancer Research UK, an organisation that receives no government funding, for almost 20 years now, his daily work is directly supported by philanthropy. Between 30 and 40 per cent of Cancer Research UK’s income comes from legacies. There is often pressure, he remarked, from people at the top, business-like people, for the organisation to undertake translational research. The general public however, is more understanding of the need for basic research. Science isn’t really business-like.

He went on to acknowledge that he grew up in a golden age, in which education was free, paid for by the state at school and university level. All that has changed and in the UK we do not know yet what the long term consequences of this will be, he noted.

Looking back to the early years of his academic career, Hunt spoke of the freedom that philanthropy, in the form of memorial fellowships, had given him. Compared in particular to what was on offer for comparable positions in the US, UK research fellowships were not worth much financially, but it was something. Paid just to do research, he had the freedom to choose whether and when this was supplemented by teaching. He worked hard of course, but it was fun: “it was a total life support system,” he said. With freedom, however, comes responsibility. Scientists doing research who fail to make advances during the period of their fellowship

will not be given further funding and need to bear this in mind.

The flexible schedule also enabled Hunt to spend several months of the year working in the US. These regular periods of doing something completely different and working with a completely different set of people was immensely stimulating and enriched his learning and work back in the UK, he recalled.

Identifying excellent people and supporting them for a set period such as three years is a good way to support science, suggested Hunt, if you have good ways to identify excellent people. How do you identify bright people and get value for money? In many ways, science is entertainment; you are trying to find out how things work, not necessarily useful things. It is dangerous sometimes when people are forced to work on targeted research – the 20th century is littered with frightful examples of this.

On the challenge facing scientists of what problem to investigate, he quoted particle physicist Steven Weinberg who once said: “In the real world, it’s very hard to know which problems are important, and you never know whether at a given moment in history a problem is solvable.”

*“Good scientists want to work in areas where the answers aren’t clear. The hard thing is to find a problem that is interesting, important and which is soluble. Similarly, foundations need to identify and invest in these kinds of problems.”*

Discoveries are (by definition) unexpected. For this reason, it is shocking that bodies such as the EU issue contracts for research in just the same way as they issue contracts for the production of airplane wings, argued Hunt. It is, he observed, impossible to contract for research in this way, because those embarking on the research do not know what it is they will find out.

*“You can contract to go on a voyage of discovery, but you can’t guarantee that you will discover anything during that voyage. All this talk of milestones and deliverables is totally inappropriate in basic research because you never know what is going to work.”*

Hunt then posed the question: how can we to encourage creativity in science? The problem can be outlined in the words of Max Perutz, former director of research in biology at the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology in Cambridge: “Creativity in science, as in the arts, cannot be organised. It arises spontaneously from individual talent. Well-run laboratories can foster it, but hierarchical organisation, inflexible, bureaucratic rules, and mountains of futile paperwork can kill it. Discover-

## A forward look, by Tim Hunt

ies cannot be planned; they pop up, like Puck, in unexpected corners.” This can of course cause difficulties – creating this kind of vibrant environment is no easy matter as anyone who ever has tried will know, he noted. Patronage is crucial to the process, but the style of that patronage is equally important. Different styles of patronage in different organizations make a huge difference to what goes on within those institutions and to the flavour of a place.

Hunt also raised concerns of the current state of European universities. Recent research revealed that of the top 20 global universities, 15 are US institutions, 1 Japanese, 1 Swiss, and 4 UK. We need to ask ourselves “where was Berlin in this list? Where were Paris and Rome?” suggested Hunt and asked “Why were the European universities that should be standing out so far down the hierarchy?”

Hunt recalled how, during his time at university, his lecturers had included Nobel laureates. Inspiring as these individuals were, they were never felt to be omniscient; what they did was within grasp and your ideas could be as good as theirs were. Quoting the motto of the Royal Society in London ‘Nullius in verba’, he stressed the importance of young scientists not going upon the word of somebody else but to find out for themselves. He gave the examples of Galileo, who instead of trying to explain why things fall as Aristotle had done, undertook to quantify how they fall; and Vesalius who started dissecting dead bodies to find out what was in them as a basis for his anatomy book, instead of relying on the ancient books of Galen. It is this type of curiosity, as well as a high-level of independence among young scientists that makes UK science strong, believes Hunt. He added that scientists must have the freedom to make mistakes and in the course of this to learn from them.

Hunt advocated the kind of ‘irresponsible behaviour’ that Max Perutz observed in Crick and Watson, suggesting that every now and then it was best to put off routine duties, avoid committee meetings, and find time to day dream, talk and read. It is in these moments that many of the best ideas are born: “When Crick and Watson lounged around, arguing about problems for which there existed as yet no firm experimental data, instead of getting down to the bench and doing experiments, I thought they were wasting their time. However, like Leonardo, they sometimes achieved most when they seemed to be working least, and their apparent idleness led them to solve the greatest of all biological problems, the structure of DNA. There is more than one way of doing good science.”

That really is the key to foundations large and small, Hunt remarked – “you are allowed to follow your noses

and do what you like.” He quoted Craig Loehle on the conflict of creativity and bureaucracy: “The path of creativity is strewn with the bones of those consumed by the vultures of mediocrity, accountability and responsibility. One cannot schedule creative breakthroughs, budget for them, or prove them to a review panel.” Hunt also spoke of the work of the European Molecular Biology Organisation in Heidelberg (EMBO). The organisation identifies outstanding people, offering a range of fellowships as well as courses and workshops. The one condition of what EMBO offers is that scientists must move country in order to obtain a fellowship. He put forward the idea that a foundation could set up a similar scholarship fund to bring US scholars to Europe, to alleviate the current situation of ‘brain drain’ where Europe sends a lot of its talent to the US.

The ‘young investigator’ fellowships offered by EBMO do not, he explained, offer much money, but simply by identifying and bringing together these scientists the fellowships can have an impact on the landscape and bring these people to the attention of others who may have further resources to offer. Hunt concluded by stating that key to successful partnerships between researchers and funders was a system of ‘trust and verify’ that should not need to rely on contracts – funders should trust that researchers will use the money wisely, while researchers should understand that if they fail to produce something in, say 5 years, then they probably will not get the next grant: “A teeming mass of people doing stuff, doing what they like doing is the real seat of the next generation’s great discoveries.” Science is often a matter of self selection, good scientists are intensely competitive and a lot is staked on reputation. He noted that there is also a degree of luck involved, but added “the people who are lucky tend to be the ones who are more intelligent than their peers and seem to be the ones who work harder than the rest of them.”



# SESSION A

## Innovative funding strategies

**Chair** David Lynn, Wellcome Trust

**Panellists** Leonor Parreira, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência

Maria Wikse, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond

Adam Zielinski, Foundation for Polish Science

David Lynn introduced the session by stating that the discussions so far had indicated that, with research now having become a global activity and cross border funding becoming more common, innovative models for funding such work will become increasingly important. The discussion in this session would focus on some examples of innovative funding models being put into practice by foundations.

**Adam Zielinski**, Foundation for Polish Science, presented a joint project of this organisation and the Max Planck Institut in Germany. He pointed to the universal nature of science, in particular of basic research, as an important reason for why working cross borders in science should be achievable. The vital role that basic research plays in broadening the frontiers of knowledge, providing profound answers to relevant socio-political questions, and providing momentum for economic and technological progress, makes it especially important that such activity is able to thrive internationally.

It is with this in mind that the joint project between the Foundation for Polish Science and the Max Planck Institut was devised. The project helps to establish Independent Junior Research Groups for the promotion of young scientists. The concept for such groups was developed and originally used by the Max Planck Institut. Following on from the example of a successful partnership between the Institut and various partners on a project to foster successful and long term cooperation between Germany and Argentina, it made sense to build on the existing and successful cooperation between Germany and Poland in the area of life sciences and to extend this via the establishment of Independent Junior Research Groups.

The groups require a three way process of cooperation between the Max Planck Institut, the Foundation for Polish Science, and each research group's hosting institution in Poland. Groups hold a "tenure" of 5 years at the Max Planck Institut in Germany followed by a further 5 years at a host institution in Poland, funded by the Foundation for Polish Science. The project receives equal financial contribution from the Max Planck Institut and the Foundation for Polish Science and both organisations have equal input in other ways, including the right to veto a project. Matching and evaluation procedures are also managed jointly.

The project is special because it links research funding and research performing organisations, it is transnational, and it supports young scientists regardless

of nationality. The groups have high visibility in both Germany and Poland, are flexible and are managed in a bottom up manner. By encouraging scientists to work in institutions both in Germany and Poland, the scheme hopes to encourage competitiveness. In addition the Foundation for Polish Science also hopes that the programme will promote Poland as an attractive place for research and that young scientists will be inspired by seeing young leaders in action.

**Leonor Parreira**, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, then presented the Programme for Advanced Medical Education. The programme established a doctoral programme for clinicians in Portugal who wish to pursue research activities as a long term professional project, with the aim of fostering high quality medical research by physicians.

This is the first example in Portugal of cooperation between a public institution (The National Research Council) and a private non-profit institution for advanced education in science of medical doctors. Designed to attract medical doctors into research whilst still enabling them to continue to practice and thereby to foster and support high quality medical research by physicians, the programme offers participants excellent education in biomedical and clinical sciences under a multidisciplinary approach as well as opportunities to work on projects both in Portugal and abroad.

**Maria Wikse**, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, outlined a new pilot project of the foundation entitled 'Flexit'. The programme is designed to foster the spread of research and researchers beyond academia by placing humanities and social science post docs in a range of placements in the private sector.

The main aims of the programme are as follows:

- Build new bridges and networks between research in the humanities and social sciences and sectors outside the university.

## Innovative funding strategies

- Ease knowledge transfer and influence the merit system. This is to help both the private and public sectors to access and utilise the competency of academics with doctorates in the fields of the humanities and social sciences. The programme also seeks to increase appreciation within academia of input and experience from business and public organisations.
- Demonstrate the possibility of alternative careers for researchers within the humanities and social sciences.

Currently, three companies are hosting researchers: Ericsson Consumer Lab, the strategic web organisation Good Old and NCC Property Development. The three year fellowships are devoted 75% to research and 25% to a placement as a trainee within an organisation and

are funded by the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond and the company involved proportionally. Still in its pilot phase, the programme has not yet produced sufficient data to be fully evaluated and certain aspects remain to be reviewed, such as the length of the fellowships which it is thought may deter applicants.

The discussion with delegates focused on the ways in which organisations have been able to influence policy makers and the importance of programmes such as those discussed in helping to highlight the importance of and practical applications of research for organisations be these private companies or Non Governmental Organisations.



# SESSION B

## Striving for excellence in decision-making

**Chair** Ingrid Wuenning-Tschol, Robert Bosch Stiftung

**Panellists** Liz Allen, The Wellcome Trust  
Carlo Mango, Fondazione Cariplo

**Liz Allen**, Senior Policy Advisor at the Wellcome Trust, spoke about the important role of evaluation in strategic decision making. There are a variety of rationales for carrying out evaluations – the requirement to be accountable, the need to monitor the performance of funding processes, the production of an evidence base for advocacy and policy work, as well as its learning role it plays in guiding strategy and planning.

Although all funding bodies are concerned to demonstrate the impact they make through their interventions, measuring such impact can be difficult due to factors such as time-lags, the serendipitous nature of scientific discovery, and the difficulty of attributing outcomes or impact to a single intervention.

It is important to keep the evaluation process simple and to avoid unnecessary burdens or complexity. It is also important to remember that evidence of impact can be found at different funding levels, for example at the level of project, programme, scientific portfolio or the organization as a whole.

Allen went on to explain the role that evaluation played in developing strategy in the Wellcome Trust. Key indicators of progress are agreed at the start of the planning cycle and these provide the reporting framework which allows the implementation of the strategy to be monitored and modified as necessary, in turn providing valuable feedback for the next planning cycle.

The Trust uses a range of methods to evaluate its research portfolio, from bibliometric analysis to qualitative techniques such as focus groups and survey to more textured narrative approaches. The latter approach could be particularly useful when trying to engage stakeholders with vivid examples or in providing a longer overview of research process, breakthrough or career than can be done with standard evaluation techniques.

In summary, Allen gave a number of 'top tips' when embarking upon an evaluation: make sure you understand the viewpoints of all the stakeholders; ensure access to key data and other information; be proportionate and manage the burden of reporting; understand the role of subject-experts in evaluation and pay attention to the importance of benchmarks and the context of the exercise.

**Carlo Mango**, Head of the Scientific Research Department at the Fondazione Cariplo, started his presentation with an overview of the structure and activities of the foundation, ranked as one of the top private financing bodies both regionally and nationally. The organization is continually working to improve both its ex-ante and ex-post evaluation procedures. In developing these procedures, the organization can rely on the input from a Strategic Planning Board, from foresight studies in collaboration with the staff of the Strategic Unit for Philanthropy, from the scientific community both nationally and internationally, as well as its own staff expertise and in-itinere monitoring exercises.

The ex-ante evaluation procedures for recent calls in 4 priority areas for the Foundation were outlined – Biomedicine, Material Science, Human Capital and the Agro-food sector. Specific calls for proposals included 'Scientific Research in Biomedicine', 'Innovative Vaccines for Transmissible Diseases', 'Scientific Research on Advanced Materials' and 'Promotion of International Projects Aimed at the Recruitment of Young Researchers'. Of particular interest here is the AGER (Agro-food and Research) project, a collaboration of 13 Italian banking foundations to fund research in the agro-food sector. This required the development of a bespoke ex-ante evaluation system agreeable to all partners. The evaluation is a two step procedure that involves a joint board and independent peer review of the second-stage full proposals.

Fondazione Cariplo also funds programmes with the aim of encouraging technology transfer. This requires a modified approach to ex-ante and ex-post evaluation involving different evaluation criteria and different kinds of reviewer expertise.

## SESSION C

### Setting the right conditions for enhanced partnerships

**Chair** Thomas Estermann, European University Association

**Panellists** Karim Chatti, HSH Nordbank AG

Ian Creagh, King's College London

Shirley Pearce, Loughborough University

**Ian Creagh**, Secretary General of King's College London, introduced the European Universities Diversifying Income Streams (EUDIS) project, a project supported by the European University Association (EUA). The objectives of the project are to gauge the level of development of institutions' strategies to diversify the institutional funding base; to collect evidence about regulatory and other incentives that enable institutions to diversify their funding base; to investigate the managerial and governance challenges of funding diversification including the impact of autonomy; to identify innovative and transferable good practices; and, finally, to provide universities with a set of useful tools to diversify their funding base in a coherent and strategic fashion. Data for the project is collected via surveys, site visits and thematic seminars and the results are subject to validation by a steering committee and expert conferences.

Over 100 universities from 27 countries have participated in the main survey. They conduct a mix of teaching and research activities and are mainly funded through public sources. On average, funding from philanthropic sources constitutes only 3.5% of their income. The survey found that public funding in its different forms – e.g. teaching, infrastructure – is most widely expected to decrease, whereas philanthropic funding – both from alumni and the foundation and charitable sector – are expected to increase in importance.

Creagh emphasized that the number of funding sources (some universities reported over 100 funding sources) adds a considerable degree of complexity to university administration, thereby increasing the transaction costs of research. There is still a significant degree of variation in reporting requirements, particularly among some of the smaller funders and more targeted programmes.

Foundations and charities account for about half of the funding from philanthropic sources, according to the survey. The majority of the rest of the funding comes from business and individuals. While the amount of funding from these sources does not affect the financial sustainability of an institution, it can be a marker of social recognition and its relationship with the wider community. For university administrations concerned with sustainability, the short-term nature

of philanthropic funding and its highly targeted form in some cases can be a challenge. He noted the role of public authorities in either promoting or hampering charitable giving, citing the UK matching funding scheme as an example of the former. While some universities had a centralized system for dealing with charitable donors, in many cases a decentralized approach dominated which made coordination difficult, exacerbated by the different structures for charitable giving (e.g. alumni, public private partnerships).

Creagh ended his presentation by listing some of the internal obstacles (lack of fundraising culture among academic staff, inappropriate organizational structures) and external obstacles (legal & regulatory constraints, lack of support/incentives from public bodies) to diversifying income streams. A number of ways to overcome these obstacles had been identified, however. Universities need to develop long-term plans for sustainable funding that involve building trust relationships with donors. This is a cultural shift and should not compromise the academic objectives that are of interest to both parties. Public administrations also have a role to play by putting in place tax incentives for private giving and setting the right framework conditions. Foundations and universities have a common interest in addressing these obstacles.

**Shirley Pearce**, Vice-Chancellor and President of Loughborough University, spoke about a UK scheme designed to increase the amount of voluntary giving to universities. An important feature of the project is accurate reporting. Taking part in the scheme requires institutions to take part in a nation-wide survey that provides anonymity of data, but enables trends to be assessed. The scheme has been very beneficial in a number of ways. Apart from the sense of urgency and additional funding it creates, it also provides institutional focus and builds good practice; gives universities a reason to approach funding sources; and identifies departments which have received charitable donations, upon which Gift Aid, the well-established programme for an organization to claim a portion of the tax a donor has already paid on the funds contributed, has not been claimed. The scheme was preceded by a capacity-building scheme for smaller operations. The ratio of matching funding varies with the scale of the funds raised, from £1 to £1 in the smallest operations to

## Setting the right conditions for enhanced partnerships

£0.33 per £1 at the highest end. This is in addition to tax benefits through gift aid. In the case of Loughborough this means that each pound it raises through its fund-raising activities is supplemented by an additional 69p through a combination of tax rebates and the scheme. Loughborough University has been very successful in attracting research income and foundation support, although it has a relatively brief history of philanthropic support from individuals. This makes the scheme especially important to achieving the University's aims of broadening its base of support and building up a fund-raising infrastructure. In financial terms, there is clear evidence that the scheme has helped to improve the amount of support the University has raised through its telephone campaigns.

More generally, a study by the National Centre for Social Research has shown that the increased investment made possible by the earlier capacity building project administered by UUK (Universities UK) had a direct result on fundraising outcomes, with cash median income increasing substantially. National surveys have also demonstrated that the trend in philanthropic giving to UK universities is on the rise, with a 54% increase in recent years.

It is hoped that the lessons learned from implementing this and other matching funding schemes can be disseminated more widely. Similar schemes have run successfully in the US, Canada, Singapore, Hong Kong, New Zealand and Norway, but have received little attention elsewhere in Europe. Funding is being sought for a project that will culturally adapt, enhance and translate this global experience to make it accessible to a wide, pan-European community of practice.

Foundations have a role to play in spreading this practice more widely by helping in capacity-building and giving their support for fundraising infrastructure. They can amplify the match funding scheme with a 'challenge match' of an appropriate scale. Support for a survey function – along the lines of that supported in the UK – and for placement opportunities would also be important as a basis of any future European programme.

**Karim Chatti**, Vice President of International Private Banking HSH Nordbank AG, outlined donors' expectations of universities. It is important for donors to have a dedicated contact within the university leadership

structure. The commitment of this leadership to the partnership also needs to be evident and that commitment should diffuse through the broader university environment. It is also essential for universities to communicate with the donors on how their funds are used and its impact. A proactive approach by universities, implemented through a marketing and fundraising plan with dedicated staff resources, will also yield dividends. Banking intermediaries are available to help with their efforts. These efforts must be seen in the context of ongoing attempts by universities to increase their financial autonomy.

In discussion, participants agreed with the presenters on the need to improve the infrastructure within universities to raise funds and to track alumni. The challenges of this kind of partnership need to be balanced by the flexibility of the funding arrangement in contrast to some other sources. Foundations could also encourage fundraising by universities by providing matching or 'challenge' funds.

# CLOSING PLENARY

**Chair** Pier Mario Vello, Fondazione Cariplo

**Panellists** Liz Allen, Wellcome Trust

Thomas Estermann, European University Association

Tiit Jürimäe, DG Research, European Commission

David Lynn, Wellcome Trust

Carlo Mango, Fondazione Cariplo

Leonor Parreira, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência

Maria Wikse, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond

Ingrid Wüning-Tschol, Robert Bosch Stiftung

Adam Zielinski, Foundation for Polish Science

**Pier Mario Vello**, Fondazione Cariplo, asked each of the panellists to give a brief summary of the discussion in the session they had attended; the issues and examples raised and how these were linked to themes discussed over the course of the conference.

**David Lynn**, Wellcome Trust, outlined what had taken place in the session on innovative funding models for research. The session consisted of three very different presentations, from Poland, Portugal and Sweden. Offering a Polish perspective, **Adam Zielinski**, Foundation for Polish Science, focused on a joint project his organisation and the Max Planck Society in Germany, which aimed to facilitate the establishment of independent research groups that after five years would base themselves in Poland, with equal funding from the two organisations. The presentation highlighted the benefits and the challenges of working with several different organisations and of working across borders.

A presentation from **Leonor Parreira**, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência which was founded by Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian in Portugal, highlighted the work that the foundation has been doing to address the difficulty of attracting clinicians into research activity. It outlined the successful PhD programmes that the foundation has developed and the ways in which they have built on these through talks with the Portuguese government over the last 10-20 years with the aim of altering the legal environment to enable clinicians to spend a certain amount of time doing research within the framework of their clinical careers. The project serves as a strong example of a foundation's independence enabling it to direct resources towards a specific and neglected area and to persuade the national government to change direction on an issue.

The presentation by **Maria Wikse**, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, introduced a new project currently in development that will place social scientists in industry for a fellowship period. Designed to help build bridges between academia and the private and other sectors, the programme, still in its pilot phase, aims to identify

talented people and increase their mobility. Riksbankens Jubileumsfond will fund 75% of a fellow's salary during the 3 year fellowship period, while 25% will be paid by the hosting company, where fellows receive professional training and are able to deliver services such as consultancy. So far, the programme has placed social science post docs in organisations operating in areas as diverse as web strategy, journalism, and civil society.

Discussions in the session focused on the ways in which foundations can change national policy and the role that foundations have played in setting up new programmes in areas left untouched by governments. The conclusion drawn from the session was that we should not underestimate the role that foundations can play in policy and advocacy and working with national governments.

**Thomas Estermann**, European University Association, summarized the session on setting the right conditions for enhanced partnerships, looking at how philanthropic bodies and universities are working together and what needs to be done to improve these partnerships. It was noted that these partnerships in fact involve three players: Next to foundations and universities, regulatory authorities, like national and regional governments, play a crucial role in enhancing partnerships. The findings of the EUA's EUDIS study, presented in this session, highlighted the importance of autonomy and governance reforms to provide the right conditions for universities to be able to act properly in seeking and deploying philanthropic funding. Tax incentives and matched funding schemes were discussed as good examples of incentive mechanisms. A matched funding scheme introduced in the UK not only lead to increased income for universities, but also created a change within the institutions, by building capacity of university management and leadership. One conclusion drawn from the session was that governments and policy makers across Europe need to invest more in such incentive mechanisms - only three countries so far have set up matched funding schemes.

One recommendation for universities that came out of the session was that they should improve communication and show their activities and outputs more clearly, so that funders know more about what they could support. There is still room to build up universities' leadership and management capacity for attracting different types of funding. It is necessary to see this as a long-term development that needs to be integrated into the strategy of the institutions.

It was agreed by those at the session that foundations can contribute to improving partnerships by recognising the need for investment in support mechanisms and facilities and by funding a higher proportion of indirect costs to contribute to universities' financial sustainability.

**Ingrid Wüning-Tschol**, Robert Bosch Stiftung, explained the main points of the session on evaluation. **Liz Allen**, Wellcome Trust and **Carlo Mango**, Fondazione Cariplo, gave presentations highlighting that while there is no 'one size fits all' for evaluation, there are many useful tools at the disposal of funders to help identify the best researcher and projects. What is crucial, however, is to assess where it is most appropriate to use which tools. While focusing primarily on individual projects and researchers, discussions also addressed in part the role of decision makers in facilitating the evaluation process. Recent years have seen some important developments at decision making level. One such development is that, increasingly, basic research is falling within the remit of Europe, as is indicated, for example, by the development of the European Research Council, while national funding is more often being directed towards more strategic, top-down, research. It was felt by participants in the session that it would be helpful to organise more workshops on this topic, as this would help all players to improve their procedures and to address issues such as the danger of over-evaluating and how best to adjust and tailor the tools at our disposal to the needs of each project.

Presenting a EU perspective, **Tiit Jürimäe**, Research Directorate General of the European Commission, stressed the importance of platforms such as the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding, where people can come together and share experiences. The European Commission had helped to launch the Forum in 2007 and was pleased to see its importance growing, as stakeholders were becoming increasingly involved, sharing ideas and best practices and meeting new colleagues in the field.

The environment in which the forum is operating has changed notably over the last two years. In the area of

policy making, this has been influenced in particular by the Ljubljana Process, launched in 2008, which focuses on partnerships between the EU and national authorities. This has shown that there is a strong commitment from national policy makers to undertake necessary actions - this is the right time for them to be involved since they are now much more open to making regulatory changes and the recommendations and suggestions of foundations and research institutions will be much more welcome than they might have been before: "It is not only the foundation's job to do something innovative, but also to communicate this to policy makers. Don't be afraid that they will duplicate it, or copy it and that this will diminish your role. This morning's presentations showed very clearly that it's not all about big budgets; sometimes a small budget in the right place can really make a difference. Foundations' strength is in their freedom and the flexibility of their funding conditions, national authorities and public tax money will never have that. The way that you are doing things is something that public funders can often only dream of." noted Jürimäe.

He went on to explain that the European Commission has opened a public consultation on a new 10 year vision for Europe in 2020. A crucial aspect of this vision will be a low-carbon knowledge-based economy. It remains unclear how the problems faced by public finances will be solved in the coming years and although there is a strong commitment that there will be more money for research and education, strategies are already being adjusted. A recent Eurobarometer survey asked people what they thought would influence their lives in the coming years: research came almost bottom. It is clear therefore that the examples that have been discussed over the last 2 days at the Forum need to be publicised to make clear to the public that science can solve problems.

He added that the word 'impact' should be used carefully. Investors want to see impact but it will take years for the true impact of work being done today to be seen - we are building the basis for discoveries to come. He also urged people to become an active part of the European Research Area: "Whether your contribution is small or big, you are always considered an important player."

Vello drew the discussion to a close and announced a new initiative entitled TIEPOLO (Tailormade International Exchange Programme Offering Learning Opportunities). The programme will aim to offer short exchanges of 1-2 weeks to the staff of foundations to increase their knowledge and analyse the work of the host institution in the area of benchmarking. The pro-

programme was designed to ensure that the knowledge gained would not remain the asset only of the individual taking part in the exchange, but would be shared with other staff and even other organisations. The pilot phase of the programme is set to begin in 2010 and a workshop will be held afterwards to discuss the results of this. He then invited questions, comments, and suggestions from the floor.

## Debate

It was suggested that the recent work done on the Foremap project be expanded upon, perhaps with a workshop on the findings of the recently published study. The point was raised that there is a need to improve cooperation between philanthropy and public institutions and the danger for foundations of their funding being seen as substitutional to public money was also mentioned again. As an example of how foundations can avoid being seen as a substitute for government

funding, David Lynn described how the Wellcome Trust had recently made an announcement that it would be making fundamental changes to the way that it funds researchers. The changes are taking place for a range of reasons, but one important effect of them will be to serve as a reminder that, as a foundation, the Wellcome trust does not have to fund in the same way that research councils do and that they are not here to take care of universities, since this is a role for governments. "What we as foundations are here to do", he added, "is to make sure that we deliver our mission, and we are constantly looking for new ways and opportunities to improve how we deliver that mission."



---

<sup>2</sup>With the FOREMAP project, the EFC has developed a mapping methodology and tools to gather qualitative and quantitative information on the contribution of foundations to research. These tools were then tested in four EU Countries namely Germany, Portugal, Slovakia and Sweden. The countries were chosen to represent the diversity of research and philanthropic sectors found in Europe. The report, published in November 2009, provides an overview of the methodology and tools that were developed for mapping European research foundations as well as an exploratory overview of research foundations in the 4 pilot countries and the experience in mapping research foundations in the countries. The full report can be downloaded at [www.efc.be](http://www.efc.be)

# ABOUT THE FORUM

## Why a Forum?

Foundations and philanthropic organisations can play a leading role in supporting research across Europe, and have valuable expertise to share with all research stakeholders. To develop this potential, the European Foundation Centre (EFC) has set up a European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding with support from the European Commission and individual funders. The Forum helps underpin philanthropic funding for research through exchanging experiences and best practice, developing cooperation on research funding, and promoting a favourable environment for foundation and private philanthropy activities.

## “Towards a new vision for philanthropy and research”

The Forum is a collaborative network and supports initiatives which advance a vision for a new environment for philanthropy in research. This would see:

- Effective philanthropic support for research by improving the legal and fiscal environment
- Enhanced cooperation between philanthropic bodies, and other research stakeholders
- Better understanding of the value which foundations contribute to research
- Increased awareness of philanthropy's role in supporting research
- Philanthropic investment in research which complements (not substitutes) public funding

## Addressing the key issues

The Forum addresses four key issues identified by stakeholders in consultations run by the Commission and the EFC in 2006:

1. Philanthropic organisations' research funding policies, with a focus on evaluation
2. Legal, regulatory and fiscal issues relating to donors and philanthropic organisations
3. Governance and ethical issues relating to philanthropic support for research
4. Fundraising from philanthropic sources by universities

These issues are investigated through the following types of activities:

- Peer learning and exchange of good practice
- Documenting foundation actions and practices in funding research
- Documenting and fostering a more helpful legal and fiscal European environment for philanthropy
- Monitoring European developments and programmes underpinning research in Europe and worldwide

## Presentations

To download the conference presentations, and for further information on the Forum activities check out the Forum webpages: [www.efc.be/Research\\_Forum](http://www.efc.be/Research_Forum)

## Contact information

Want to contribute or be kept informed of the Forum's activities?  
Don't hesitate to contact the Forum secretariat at the EFC:  
t +32.2.512.8938 | [researchforum@efc.be](mailto:researchforum@efc.be)

## Interested in the EFC?

Are you a foundation? Would you like to know how the EFC can support you and help develop your activities? Information on the benefits of joining the EFC can be found at: [www.efc.be/membership](http://www.efc.be/membership)

[www.efc.be/Research\\_Forum](http://www.efc.be/Research_Forum)

## Steering Group

The activities of the Forum are led by a Steering Group made up of representatives from EFC member foundations that are active in research, and the European University Association.

The current Steering Group members are:

- Pier Mario Vello, Secretary General, Fondazione Cariplo (Steering Group Chair)
- Göran Blomqvist, Managing Director, Stiftelsen Riksbankens Jubileumsfond
- João Caraça, Director for Research, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian
- Steen Hemmingsen, Managing Director, Lundbeckfonden
- Wilhelm Krull, Secretary General, VolkswagenStiftung
- David Lynn, Head of Strategic Planning and Policy, The Wellcome Trust
- John Smith, Deputy Secretary General, European University Association
- Ingrid Wüning Tschol, Head of Science and Research, Robert Bosch Stiftung
- Maciej Zyllicz, President, Executive Director, Foundation for Polish Science

The European Commission, DG Research, is an observer of the Steering Group.



CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION



VolkswagenStiftung



fondazione  
c a r i p l o



STIFTELSEN  
Riksbankens  
Jubileumsfond

Robert Bosch Stiftung



Fundacja na rzecz Nauki Polskiej

LUNDBECKFONDEN

wellcome trust



EUROPEAN  
FOUNDATION  
CENTRE



European Commission  
(DG Research)

## Attendance:

### The following organisations attended the conference:

**A** Aeras Global TB Vaccine Foundation | AIMS.NEI (Next Einstein Initiative) | Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung | Associazione di Fondazioni e di Casse di Risparmio (ACRI) | Aston University | AXA Research Fund **B** Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation | Bodossaki Foundation | British Medical Journal **C** Cancer Research UK | Centre for Social Investment | Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique | Compagnia di San Paolo **E** Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne | European Association of Research Managers and Administrators | European Charities' Committee on VAT Conference (ECCVAT) | European Commission | European Foundation Centre | European Molecular Biology Laboratory | European University Association | Evolution and Philanthropy **F** Fondation Fourmentin-Guilbert | Fondazione Cariplo | Fondazione Cariplo | Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Cuneo | Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Padova e Rovigo | Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Padova e Rovigo | Foundation for Polish Science | Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian **G** German-Polish Research Foundation | Global Forum for Health Research | Global Philanthropic **H** HSH Nordbank AG **I** Institut Pasteur de Lille | Institute for the Study of Knowledge in Society | Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência | International Development Research Centre **J** JJB-Philcom **K** King Baudouin Foundation | King's College London | Knut och Alice Wallenbergs Stiftelse **L** League of European Research Universities (LERU) | Leiden University | Loughborough University | Lundbeckfonden **M** Medicines for Malaria Venture | Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche **N** New Philanthropy Capital | Northern Rock Foundation **P** Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics **Q** Queen Mary, University of London **R** RAND Europe | Robert Bosch Stiftung **S** Sightsavers | St George's, University of London | Stiftelsen Riksbankens Jubileumsfond | Stiftung Mercator GmbH **T** The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation | The Hebrew University of Jerusalem | Tuberculosis Vaccine Initiative **U** UK Department for Business Innovation and Skills | Universiteit Stellenbosch | University College Dublin | University of Leeds | University of Limerick | University of Southampton | University of Witwatersrand **V** Victoria Children Foundation | VolkswagenStiftung | Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam | Vu University Amsterdam **W** Wellcome Trust

# Join us for the next Forum Stakeholders' Conference!

Are we running out of talent?  
The role of European foundations in  
building human capacity

7-8 December 2010 in Stuttgart  
Hosted by Robert Bosch Stiftung

Good research needs good people. European research foundations support many thousands of researchers in the sciences and humanities. The 2010 Annual Conference of the European Forum on Philanthropy and Research Funding will focus on how foundations and other funders work with the researchers they support to foster creativity and innovation, and encourage mobility, international networking and the development of research leaders of tomorrow.

For further information on the event or the Forum please contact:  
[researchforum@efc.be](mailto:researchforum@efc.be) or visit [www.efc.be/Research\\_Forum](http://www.efc.be/Research_Forum)

## About the European Foundation Centre

The European Foundation Centre is an international association of foundations and corporate funders dedicated to creating an enabling legal and fiscal environment for foundations, documenting the foundation landscape, strengthening the infrastructure of the sector, and promoting collaboration, both among foundations and between foundations and other actors, to advance the public good in Europe and beyond.

## European Foundation Centre, AISBL

78, avenue de la Toison d'Or | 1060 Brussels, Belgium  
t +32.2.512.8938 | f +32.2.512.3265 | [efc@efc.be](mailto:efc@efc.be) | [www.efc.be](http://www.efc.be)