

Science, Innovation and Technology Committee

Flying Blind: Innovation, Growth and the Regions

Third Report of Session 2024–26

HC 538



Science, Innovation and Technology Committee

The Science, Innovation and Technology Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and its associated public bodies. It also exists to ensure that Government policies and decision-making across departments are based on solid scientific evidence and advice.

Current membership

Dame Chi Onwurah (Labour; Newcastle upon Tyne Central and West) (Chair)

Emily Darlington (Labour; Milton Keynes Central)

George Freeman (Conservative; Mid Norfolk)

Dr Allison Gardner (Labour; Stoke-on-Trent South)

Kit Malthouse (Conservative; North West Hampshire)

Samantha Niblett (Labour; South Derbyshire)

Dr Lauren Sullivan (Labour; Gravesham)

Adam Thompson (Labour; Erewash)

Martin Wrigley (Liberal Democrat; Newton Abbot)

Daniel Zeichner (Labour; Cambridge)

Freddie van Mierlo (Liberal Democrat; Henley and Thame)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

This Report, together with formal minutes relating to the Report, was Ordered by the House of Commons, on 25 February 2026, to be printed. It was published on 13 March 2026 by authority of the House of Commons.
© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2026.

This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/copyright.

Committee Reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/CommonsSITC and in print by Order of the House.

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Science, Innovation and Technology Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 5023; the Committee's email address is commonssitc@parliament.uk. You can follow the Committee on X (formerly Twitter) using [@CommonsSITC](https://twitter.com/CommonsSITC).

Contents

1	Summary	1
2	Introduction	3
	Scope and remit	4
	Definitions	4
3	The research and development ecosystem	6
	Public funds	6
	Clusters	7
	UK Research and Innovation	9
	ARIA	10
	Private R&D	11
	Tax credits	11
	Case study: the Golden Triangle	12
4	Data and transparency	15
	Public R&D spending	15
	Measuring impact	16
	Private investment	16
5	Commercialising innovation	18
	Universities	18
	University spinouts	19
	Technology transfer offices	20
	University-investor partnerships	21
	Financing growth	22
	Pre-seed	22
	Seed	23
	Series A and beyond	24

Investor readiness	25
Catapults	26
Public procurement	27
Deep tech	28
Infrastructure	30
Treasury Green Book	31
6 Diffusion and absorption	34
Adoption	34
Diffusion	35
Made Smarter	36
Regulation	37
7 Devolution	39
Local and national policy	39
Going further	40
Case study: The West Midlands	41
Conclusions and recommendations	43
Formal minutes	51
Flying Blind: Innovation, Growth and the Regions	51
Witnesses	53
Published written evidence	55
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	59

1 Summary

The UK has world-class scientific research and universities, and a growing number of innovation-led clusters, located across its regions. The importance of this innovation ecosystem to the wider economy, as well as to regional growth, is reflected in the Government's pledge to spend £86 billion on R&D by 2030.

If these funds are accompanied by unlocking private investment across the country to commercialise innovation, it could support the Government's key objectives: economic growth, productivity, and national resilience. It can also support economic growth across the regions – a declared priority for successive governments, which has yet to be achieved.

Yet whilst we welcome the Government's R&D spending commitments, its "unashamedly place-based" Industrial Strategy, and acknowledgement of the importance of devolved and regional leaders to innovation policy, we believe there is still untapped potential for innovation-driven activity across the regions, with an increase in the number of innovation-led clusters. The UK should build on the existing strengths of places across the country, allowing them to compete and attract investment at the global level.

The benefits of such clusters are widely accepted – they can drive growth, productivity and economic regeneration, attracting international investment. Successive governments have sought to use both devolution and innovation policy to support the clusters, as well as the diffusion and absorption of the technologies and innovations they generate – albeit with mixed success.

The current Government's prioritisation of R&D spending and its Industrial Strategy offer a significant opportunity to facilitate the emergence of innovation-led growth across the regions.

Simply pouring more money into the existing ecosystem is not enough, and decision-makers in London cannot afford to be complacent. The Government should take a data-driven approach and comprehensively monitor, map and support the growth of innovation-led clusters across the regions. At present, the UK is flying blind when it comes to public and private R&D spending. It is unacceptable that our major R&D funders cannot properly measure and map levels of investment, their outputs, and regional impacts.

Without clear, transparent measurement of what is being done and its impact across key metrics, it is impossible to assess existing policies or identify improvements. Clear criteria and mechanisms for ensuring money is allocated in a way that drives innovation-led growth across the regions are essential, with clear metrics to inform funding allocations and measure success.

The Secretary of State for Science, Innovation and Technology rightly emphasised to us the need to leverage public funds to unlock private investment in innovation-led activity across the country. Whilst there is a debate to be had about how far Government should attempt to direct the decisions of private capital in this area, we welcome her analysis.

Delivering on this ambition will not only require better data, but a collective effort from the whole R&D ecosystem: government departments, public funders, private investors, universities and, crucially, regional and local leaders. We believe that the Government, in particular the Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, should bring these actors together in pursuit of this ambitious agenda, supporting the emergence of new centres of innovation right across the country.

2 Introduction

1. Innovation is at the heart of the Government’s mission to deliver economic growth.¹ The 2025 Industrial Strategy described itself as “unashamedly place-based” and recognised that “stronger regional growth is critical for the competitiveness of [key growth-driving sectors] and the resilience of the national economy”.² The Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) has as one of its three priorities “maximising the impact of government action to support R&D and science and technology on the UK’s national and regional economic growth”.³
2. The UK has significant advantages in fostering an innovation-driven economy. It has some of the world’s most successful university laboratories, a large population of scientists and engineers, and a tech ecosystem unmatched by all but the United States and China.⁴ We launched this inquiry to find out how these advantages could be harnessed to deliver greater economic growth and to see how effectively the Government is implementing its commitment to place-based innovation policy. Specifically, this report will examine:
 - key actors in the UK’s innovation ecosystem and how they approach different regions (Chapter 3)
 - our ability to accurately track and measure data relating to public and private R&D investment (Chapter 4)
 - the rate and extent of commercialisation of innovations (Chapter 5)
 - the rate and extent of technology diffusion and adoption (Chapter 6); and
 - the devolution of innovation policy (Chapter 7).

1 Prime Minister’s Office, Kickstarting Economic Growth (accessed 5 August 2025)

2 Department for Business and Trade, The UK’s Modern Industrial Strategy, CP 1451, 23 June 2025, p22

3 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Annual Report and Accounts 2024–25, HC 1046, 10 July 2025, p. 11

4 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Science and Technology Framework, GOV.UK, April 2025

Scope and remit

3. While the R&D budget is not devolved, broader devolved policies and governance arrangements shape how this funding is accessed and delivered. Our inquiry was conducted with a UK-wide remit but did not include a detailed analysis of the distinct policy and institutional contexts in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.
4. This report highlights some key themes that have emerged during our inquiry, in our examination of how UK innovation policy shapes differences between and within regions. However, there are many more topics in this area that are each worthy of more attention than they could be given here. These include the interaction between regional and national innovation policy, debates over productivity trends, university finances, the impact of tax policy on innovation, and the optimal balance between private capital and state intervention in supporting innovation.
5. We received over 100 written submissions and heard oral evidence from more than 25 witnesses, including from industry, academia, local authorities and the Government, gathered over five evidence sessions. We have also drawn on sessions conducted as part of our other workstreams, as well as the work of other committees in the Commons and Lords, and other sources. We are grateful to all those who contributed to this inquiry.

Definitions

- **Research and development:** “R&D begins when work to resolve the scientific or technological uncertainty starts [...] R&D ends when knowledge is codified in a form usable by a competent professional working in the field, or when a prototype or pilot plant with all the functional characteristics of the final process, material, device, product or service is produced”.⁵
- **Research commercialisation:** “The process by which new or improved technologies, products, processes and services that have arisen from research are brought to market”.⁶
- **Technology diffusion:** “The process by which the use of an innovation spreads and grows”.⁷

5 HM Revenue and Customs, Corporate Intangibles Research and Development Manual, GOV.UK, March 2016

6 UK Research and Innovation, Research Commercialisation (accessed 8 December 2025)

7 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, The impact of technology diffusions on growth and productivity: findings from an AI-assisted rapid evidence review, GOV.UK, April 2025

- **Technology absorption:** “The degree to which individuals or organisations adopt and integrate new technologies into their practices”.⁸
- **Greater South East:** London, the South East and East of England.⁹ Whilst this term is widely used in innovation policy, it is far from a homogenous zone; it contains significant economic inequalities and distinct areas. Where possible this report’s references are specific, for example London, Oxford or Cambridge.
- **Equity funding stages:** This report uses the equity funding stages terminology set out by the British Business Bank.¹⁰

8 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, The impact of technology diffusions on growth and productivity: findings from an AI-assisted rapid evidence review, GOV.UK, April 2025

9 Office for National Statistics, UK public-funded gross regional capital and non-capital expenditure on research and development: financial year ending 2021 (accessed 13 January 2026)

10 British Business Bank, A guide to equity funding stages for your business (accessed 8 December 2025)

3 The research and development ecosystem

6. Innovation begins with R&D, which can take place across universities, hospitals, public bodies, research institutes, large and small firms, and the solo inventor's garage. In this chapter we examine the roles of key actors in the UK's R&D ecosystem, and how they influence regional outcomes.

Public funds

7. The Government R&D budget is £20.4 billion for 2025–6, rising to £22.6 billion by 2029–30, and is spent primarily through UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) and by central departments.¹¹ Public funds make up less than a third of total R&D spending, which was £72.6 billion in 2023.¹²
8. In 2022 the then-Government committed in the Levelling Up White Paper to increasing public investment in R&D outside the Greater South East by 40% by 2030, and a third by 2024–25.¹³ This was criticised at the time for failing to address the share going elsewhere, only the absolute amount.¹⁴ Some 49% of public R&D went outside the Greater South East in 2021–22,¹⁵ while 64% of the UK population lives outside that area.¹⁶ We also heard about the difficulty of tracking progress towards the target.¹⁷ The White Paper also set a target for the then-Department for Business, Energy

11 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, DSIT research and development (R&D) allocations for 2025/2026, GOV.UK, April 2025; Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Transformative £86 billion boost to science and tech to turbocharge economy, with regions backed to take cutting-edge research into own hands, GOV.UK, June 2025

12 Office for National Statistics, Gross domestic expenditure on research and development, UK: 2023 (accessed 7 October 2025); Committee of Public Accounts, Forty-First Report of Session 2024–25, UK Research and Innovation, HC 826, para 13

13 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, Levelling Up the United Kingdom, CP 604, February 2022, p. 170

14 Eleanor Shearer, Institute for Government, Will the levelling up missions help reduce regional inequality?, p. 18

15 Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, Levelling-Up Missions annual report 2024 to 2025, 21 May 2025

16 UK Research and Innovation, Geographical distribution of UKRI funding, financial years 2022 to 2023 and 2023 to 2024 (accessed 8 December 2025)

17 National Centre for Universities and Business (NCUB) (IGR0084)

and Industrial Strategy, which oversaw UKRI, to increase the *share* going outside the Greater South East to 55% by 2024–5.¹⁸ However, in 2024 the Sunak Government said that this target had been superseded by a commitment to spend “a cumulative £1.3 billion more in R&D funding outside the Greater South East than in 2021–2022”, appearing to return to targeting an absolute rather than a relative increase.¹⁹

Clusters

9. The Government describes the UK’s research, development and innovation ecosystem as being made up of clusters: geographic concentrations of firms, research institutions, skills, and related industries that benefit from proximity and collaboration.²⁰ Its Modern Industrial Strategy consultation highlighted several examples of innovation clusters:

- life sciences in Cambridge and the Liverpool City Region;
- financial services in Edinburgh, Leeds, and London;
- advanced manufacturing in Broughton and Newport, Greater Manchester, the West Midlands, the North East, and South Yorkshire;
- digital industries in Bristol and Northern Ireland; and
- clean energy industries in Aberdeen and Derby.²¹

Other notable examples include the agritech sector in Norwich,²² satellite manufacturing in Glasgow,²³ and autonomous vehicles in Milton Keynes.²⁴

10. There is a lack of data on clusters needed to guide public and private investment decisions – we explore this in more detail in chapter 4. The Government has said that it is “working with local partners to bring together qualitative and quantitative evidence to understand the strong sectoral clusters that exist across the UK, both emerging and established”.²⁵ It has also stated its intention to “grow or establish high-productivity clusters of growth-driving sectors across the UK, driving up overall

18 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom*, CP 604, February 2022, p. 173

19 Research: Finance PQ 25955, 21 May 2024

20 DSIT, UK innovation clusters (accessed 9 October 2025)

21 Department for Business and Trade, *The UK’s Modern Industrial Strategy*, 14 October 2024, p. 48

22 Roz Bird (IGR0007) and Norwich Research Park (IGR0028)

23 Financial Times, *Tiny satellites take Glasgow to the stars* (accessed 13 January 2026)

24 Milton Keynes Council, *Plans approved to extend self-driving shuttle trials in city centre* (accessed 13 January 2026)

25 Department for Business and Trade, *The UK’s Modern Industrial Strategy*, 14 October 2024, p. 50

GDP growth and increasing opportunity through the benefits of increased agglomeration”.²⁶ It has acknowledged that it is in competition with other countries in pursuit of this goal, and that it is therefore focused on:

capturing a greater share of internationally mobile capital, spurring domestic businesses to scale up [...] and targeting the places and clusters across the UK that support those sectors, to increase national productivity, strengthen our economic security and resilience.²⁷

11.

CONCLUSION

Even in a digital age, physical proximity remains key to innovation and its commercialisation and absorption. Geographic clusters can drive productivity, foster concentrated networks of expertise, infrastructure and collaboration, and support regional growth, which is economically and politically important. Yet their success relies on sustained investment, established infrastructure and skills concentration. Responsive, targeted innovation policy designed to support the emergence and growth of innovation clusters can therefore benefit both individual regions and the entire UK.

12.

CONCLUSION

The UK’s clusters of innovation-led growth—from Cambridge Biotech to Glasgow Satellite City—are key engines of national economic prosperity, productivity growth and economic regeneration. Mapping, monitoring and supporting their growth should be a major pillar of the Industrial Strategy and the Government’s wider economic policy.

13.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should establish a national framework for cluster development that embeds regional Key Performance Indicators and tracks cluster lifecycles. As part of this, it should develop regional economic profiles that line up clusters with key sources of economic activity, such as original equipment manufacturers, major education and health facilities, government and defence facilities, and their supply chains, with an analysis of opportunities for supporting innovation and diffusion. As part of this framework the Government should define its role in supporting the development of regional clusters, versus that of the private sector.

26 Department for Business and Trade, The UK’s Modern Industrial Strategy, 14 October 2024, p. 55

27 Department for Business and Trade, The UK’s Modern Industrial Strategy, CP 1451, 23 June 2025, p. 11

14.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should publish annual data covering the performance and impact of innovation clusters. These should set out any gaps around infrastructure, skills, and commercialisation outcomes and detail how public investment is being used across different parts of the country.

UK Research and Innovation

15. UKRI is the UK's biggest public funder of R&D. It had an allocation of £8.8 billion in 2025–6, as well as distributing some departmental funds.²⁸ UKRI's CEO told us that regional growth was “embedded in everything that we do and in all the decisions that we make”.²⁹ However, UKRI has acknowledged that its “investment per person is consistently higher within the Greater South East than outside”: its per capita spending in that area was 200% of what it spent outside in 2021–22, and 170% in 2023–24.³⁰
16. We were told that UKRI bodies have at times focused more on ensuring that their brands are associated with regional growth, as opposed to engaging with local partners.³¹ The Mayor of the North-East of England told us that UKRI had failed to award her region a level of funding that corresponded to the innovation it produced.³²
17. Complex and slow processes in UKRI and other innovation funding bodies can act as a deterrent to those less familiar with the system. We heard that gaps and overlaps in the overall funding support ecosystem create confusion,³³ and limit its ability to deliver effective support.³⁴ UKRI's CEO told us that UKRI currently had 14 different schemes for industry, which were “hard to navigate”.³⁵
18. The new executive chair of Innovate UK, a business-focused UKRI agency, told us of his determination to reform grant application processes, which he said risked favouring those skilled in navigating bureaucracy, rather than

28 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, DSIT research and development (R&D) allocations for 2025/2026, GOV.UK, April 2025

29 Oral evidence: Work of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), HC 1673, Tuesday 3 February 2026, Q99

30 UK Research and Innovation, Geographical distribution of UKRI funding, financial years 2022 to 2023 and 2023 to 2024 (accessed 8 December 2025); Letter from the Minister of State for Science, Innovation, Research and Nuclear to the Chair, regarding follow up on the Innovation, growth and the regions evidence session, 24 June 2025

31 UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016)

32 Q140 [Mayor Kim McGuinness]

33 Praetura Ventures (IGR0102) and UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016)

34 Make UK (IGR0023)

35 Oral evidence: Work of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), HC 1673, Tuesday 3 February 2026, Q47

reflecting merit³⁶ – a point echoed by UKRI’s CEO.³⁷ Innovate UK also pointed to its network of regionally-located business growth advisors providing on-the-ground support for businesses applying to its programmes.³⁸

19. In November the Government published new objectives for UKRI. Although these included a commitment to consider “regional growth”, maximise regional economic impact, and to establish “a new regional innovation funding programme that supports high-potential clusters to grow across the UK”, there was limited detail as to how UKRI intends to consider regional growth in its funding decisions.³⁹ UKRI’s CEO told us that the organisation was not currently clustering innovation, start-up and scale-up money around places, but that the debate was “live”.⁴⁰

ARIA

20. The Advanced Research and Invention Agency (ARIA) was founded in 2023 as an arm’s-length body funding high-risk research in areas that are “too hard, or too interdisciplinary to pursue elsewhere”.⁴¹ It funds projects “in almost every region” of the UK,⁴² but, in 2024–25, some 51% of its funding went to London and the South East, while at the other end of the scale the West Midlands received 0.8%.⁴³ The then-CEO told us that he did not believe there was a trade-off between diversity and excellence in funding, and that ARIA was increasing its outreach, including through road trips to engage with researchers across the country.⁴⁴

21. **CONCLUSION**

Public support for R&D is not effectively designed to reach researchers and innovators that have not traditionally received large amounts of innovation funding – such as those in the regions. UKRI, the country’s biggest public innovation funder, has acknowledged the problem, but its new objectives are only the starting point in addressing the challenge. It is also disappointing to already see vast regional imbalances in the spending of recently-formed ARIA.

36 Oral evidence taken on 8 April 2025, Qq13, 19, and UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016)

37 Oral evidence: Work of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), HC 1673, Tuesday 3 February 2026, Q77

38 Q280 [Dean Cook]

39 UK Research and Innovation, UKRI Framework Document 2025, GOV.UK, November 2025

40 Oral evidence: Work of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), HC 1673, Tuesday 3 February 2026, Q32

41 ARIA, About ARIA: who we are (accessed 9 October 2025)

42 ARIA, Corporate Plan 2025, June 2025, p. 31; ARIA, Annual Report + Accounts 2024–25, July 2025, p. 15

43 ARIA, Annual Report + Accounts 2024–25, July 2025, p. 14; Recent media reports suggest that the proportion going to the Greater South East increased in the first half of 2025–26

44 Oral evidence taken on 3 September 2025, Q24 [Ilan Gur]

22.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should establish a portal where innovators can be matched with suitable funding and support to help them cut through the current tangle of options. Innovate UK should announce targets for increasing engagement with innovators across the country, using metrics such as outreach and targeted support, more accessible and streamlined application processes, and additional support personnel in the regions.

Private R&D

23. Each £1 of public R&D investment is thought to leverage about £2 of private R&D investment, for example by generating ideas, providing research infrastructure and talent, and de-risking investment.⁴⁵ A comparison of public to business R&D spending per capita by region carried out by NESTA, and cited in evidence we received, suggests that in areas such as the East and West Midlands, the North West, and Northern Ireland, below average public R&D investment yields above average returns in private R&D.⁴⁶ We examine the options for companies seeking to commercialise innovation in Chapter 5.

Tax credits

24. In addition to the R&D budget the Government provides tax credits to businesses undertaking R&D activity, worth £7.6 billion in 2023–4.⁴⁷ We heard that these are important to supporting investment,⁴⁸ and leave decision-making to scientists and businesses rather than funding bodies.⁴⁹ However, smaller companies and institutions may lack the resources for complex application processes. One CEO of a deep tech spinout told us that the paperwork took a full week of his time.⁵⁰ Furthermore, 51% of the total amount claimed in 2023–4 was by companies with offices registered in London and the South East, consistent with previous years.⁵¹

45 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, The value of public R&D, GOV.UK, October 2025

46 University of Manchester (IGR0019) and NESTA, The Missing £4 billion (accessed 8 December 2025)

47 HM Revenue and Customs, Research and Development Tax Credits Statistics: September 2025, GOV.UK, September 2025

48 Cleantech for UK (IGR0101)

49 Neil Lee and Max Herbertson (IGR0010)

50 Q166 [Dan Cathie], University of Liverpool (IGR0070), London Higher (IGR0100), LabCorp (IGR0020)

51 HM Revenue and Customs, Research and Development Tax Credits Statistics: September 2025, GOV.UK, September 2025

Case study: the Golden Triangle

- 25.** The Golden Triangle between Oxford, Cambridge, and London is a national and global hub of innovation, which the Government calls a “super-cluster”.⁵² It receives significant public R&D funding and private investment, absorbing 46% of non-business R&D.⁵³ Parts of the region have high prosperity and productivity: London’s GDP per capita is 40% above the UK average, while its productivity is almost 30% higher than the UK average.⁵⁴
- 26.** The Government has called the Oxford-to-Cambridge Growth Corridor “Europe’s answer to Silicon Valley”,⁵⁵ although the University of Southampton reminded us that, in regional innovation clusters:
- ... the prosperity generated by high potential growth sectors is often not shared equally and improved living standards often do not reach every community within a region. In some areas economic inequalities are exacerbated.⁵⁶
- 27.** In this inquiry we examined whether there is a balance to strike between ensuring that the Golden Triangle remains internationally competitive and raising the level of innovation elsewhere. The science minister and Oxford-Cambridge Innovation Champion,⁵⁷ Lord Vallance, told us that funding for cutting-edge, curiosity-driven research had to be allocated solely on the basis of excellence, that excellence would always be clustered in certain areas, and that funding should “absolutely not” be “spread [...] evenly like jam across the place”.⁵⁸ However, he accepted that funding for more applied research, and for the commercialisation of ideas, could be more evenly distributed.⁵⁹
- 28.** This argument was echoed by Professor Neil Lee of LSE, who told us that funding for applied innovation “[does] not necessarily benefit from the same sort of agglomeration economies that you get at the leading edge”.⁶⁰ While parts of the Greater South East dominate many of the Industrial Strategy’s growth-driving sectors, such as digital and technology,

52 Department for Business and Trade, This is the Oxford to Cambridge Growth Corridor, GOV.UK, October 2025

53 NESTA, The Missing £4 billion (accessed 8 December 2025)

54 Office for National Statistics, Regional and subregional labour productivity, UK: 2023 (accessed 8 December 2025)

55 HM Treasury, This is the Oxford to Cambridge Growth Corridor, GOV.UK, October 2025

56 The University of Southampton (IGR0048)

57 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Minister Vallance underlines how Oxford-Cambridge corridor ambitions can boost whole UK, GOV.UK, January 2025

58 Q319

59 Oral evidence taken on 11 February 2025, Q37

60 Q194 [Professor Neil Lee]

others, such as advanced manufacturing, have a strong presence elsewhere in the country.⁶¹ The CEO of the Northern Powerhouse Partnership argued that the sharp divide between pure science and applied research did not apply across the board.⁶²

29. Both the Universities of Cambridge and Manchester told us about their joint efforts to tackle these issues. Cambridge said that the two were:

establishing strong strategic collaboration between clusters which effectively leverages each region's unique strengths and moves away from the previous model which could sometimes be one of unproductive competition between Golden Triangle and Northern Powerhouse. Cambridge brings internationally recognised academic excellence, a mature scale-up ecosystem, a deep early-stage investment market and inward investment. Manchester brings space and capacity to grow, a very large talent pool, affordability, academic excellence, and liveability.⁶³

30. **CONCLUSION**

While the most cutting-edge science may be best carried out in established centres of excellence, as Lord Vallance put it, there are centres of excellence across the country, in Cardiff, Durham, Edinburgh, Leeds, Manchester, Milton Keynes and Newcastle – amongst others. Traditional innovation hubs like London, Oxford and Cambridge are limited in physical space, housing costs and facilities, which other locations can offer in abundance and often at lower cost. Utilising their potential has the additional benefit of supporting greater regional economic growth.

31. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Government should incentivise complementarities between institutions in London, Oxford and Cambridge and those in other regions, such as through programmes to help spinout companies to scale up elsewhere in the country. Good practice examples include the partnership between the Universities of Cambridge and Manchester. The Government should put in place a mechanism for identifying these opportunities, setting out the details in its response to this report.

61 Department for Business and Trade, Advanced Manufacturing Sector Plan, GOV.UK, June 2025

62 Q108 [Henri Murison]

63 University of Cambridge (IGR0080) and University of Manchester (IGR0019)

32.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should publish a strategy setting out how it plans to exploit the full potential of the Oxford-to-Cambridge Growth Corridor – including locations outside these cities. This strategy should identify the existing and potential strengths of places between Oxford and Cambridge and set out plans to support them.

33.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should publish an assessment of whether funding to Golden Triangle institutions should be made contingent on projects having a quantifiable economic impact elsewhere.

34.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should appoint a minister to champion innovation in each region of the UK – not just the Golden Triangle. These ministers should be tasked with ensuring that regional needs, opportunities and interests are considered in decisions on investment and infrastructure.

4 Data and transparency

- 35.** Throughout our inquiry we heard of major shortfalls in gathering and sharing data relating to innovation policy, meaning that at present there is no clear way to track the pipeline from R&D research through to capital investment, company growth, and wider economic benefit. In this chapter we examine the quality of the data available to key actors in the UK’s R&D ecosystem, the implications of its limitations, and what can be done to stop the UK from ‘flying blind’ when it comes to innovation policy at both national and regional level.

Public R&D spending

- 36.** There is no system that brings together the data on all research and innovation spending across the public sector. The Public Accounts Committee (PAC) noted in July 2025 that UKRI aimed to link up all such data across Government but had not given a target date for this,⁶⁴ and that there are “significant limitations” in its data systems that make it hard to manage its budget strategically.⁶⁵
- 37.** The PAC also noted that UKRI lacked specific, measurable or time-bound objectives.⁶⁶ This was not remedied by the new objectives that were subsequently published in November 2025,⁶⁷ although UKRI’s CEO promised us that the organisation would from later in 2026 be able to “... report quarterly on where the money has gone and the outputs that are achieved every quarter, and to be able to talk quarterly about the quarter ahead.”⁶⁸

64 Committee of Public Accounts, Forty-First Report of Session 2024–25, UK Research and Innovation, HC 826, para 3

65 Committee of Public Accounts, Forty-First Report of Session 2024–25, UK Research and Innovation, HC 826, para 16

66 Committee of Public Accounts, Forty-First Report of Session 2024–25, UK Research and Innovation, HC 826, para 11

67 UK Research and Innovation, UKRI Framework Document 2025, GOV.UK, November 2025

68 Oral evidence taken on 3 February 2026, Q68 (Professor Sir Ian Chapman)

Measuring impact

38. We heard that there is a lack of evidence about how R&D funding and tax credits impact firms.⁶⁹ Their effects could show up through growth and expansion of a company, or through greater efficiencies that do not require a larger headcount,⁷⁰ while the value created could be local, national, or international.⁷¹
39. It is also challenging to accurately compare R&D spend across regions, depending on whether this is calculated in absolute terms, or relative to population, GDP, number of universities, or other metrics.⁷² In response to questions from this committee the Government has agreed to start reporting cross-government R&D spending plans to Parliament as part of the Estimates process, as well as actual expenditure.⁷³ We heard that greater transparency in public sector R&D spending could support more effective policymaking,⁷⁴ as well as helping to identify clusters and providing clearer early signals of innovation opportunities.⁷⁵

Private investment

40. In December 2025 the Secretary of State told us that, where public funds are invested to leverage private funds, the Government would need to “actually deliver that and have some outcomes and figures to show”.⁷⁶ She said that whilst there were different ways of assessing performance, “I am quite a fan of Tom Cruise, who said, ‘Follow the money,’ or, ‘Show me the money’.”⁷⁷
41. Yet there is a stark shortfall in place-based local innovation and investment data,⁷⁸ which makes it a challenge to design policy interventions and assess their impact. In 2024 DSIT launched an interactive national cluster mapping tool showing firm-level R&D and innovation activity across the UK. However, we heard that these mapping efforts struggled to accurately assess clusters’ strength and potential and that they have

69 Dr Kevin Mulligan (IGR0001)

70 Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (IGR0017)

71 Universities Wales (IGR0025)

72 University College, London (IGR0018)

73 Chief Secretary to the Treasury, Letter to Chair, Response to request for breakdown of R&D expenditure across government, 20 January 2025

74 Dr Kevin Mulligan (IGR0001)

75 Startup Coalition (IGR0057), Connected Places Catapult (IGR0065), UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016)

76 Oral evidence taken on 3 December 2025, Q19 [Rt. Hon. Liz Kendall MP]

77 Oral evidence taken on 3 December 2025, Q11 [Rt. Hon. Liz Kendall MP]

78 City-Region Economic Development Institute (City-REDI), University of Birmingham (IGR0021)

yet to have an impact on the Government's R&D spending.⁷⁹ In October 2025 DSIT published an updated cluster map, which offered improved data quality,⁸⁰ though it continues to treat clusters in isolation by sector.⁸¹

42. CONCLUSION

The UK is flying blind when it comes innovation policy. It is unacceptable that the Government and UKRI cannot properly measure and map R&D spending and the accompanying private sector investment. Without clear, transparent measurement of what is being done and its impact, it is impossible to assess existing policies or identify improvements. We welcome the Government's agreement to release departmental R&D spending plans and outturn data in response to our previous request. This will help to support more effective innovation policy, ensure greater accountability and ultimately contribute to regional economic growth.

43. RECOMMENDATION

Future disclosures of departmental R&D spending should include breakdowns by region and cluster. The Government and UKRI should also develop a framework for tracking impact and publish annual regionally disaggregated reports that set out how public R&D funding supports innovation across the country. These should include company-level data on funding, innovation diffusion and take-up, and geographic distribution.

44. RECOMMENDATION

The Government and UKRI should, in response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out how the R&D budget will be allocated by sector, region and cluster. The Government should also, in its response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out the current level of private sector R&D investment by sector, region and cluster. This should include detailed mapping of not just total investment but key metrics such as company formation, job creation and intellectual property filings.

45. RECOMMENDATION

The Government should in its response to this report set out how it intends to ensure the Secretary of State's mandate to use public spending to unlock private sector investment is taken up by Government departments, UKRI, Innovate UK and other public funders of R&D to inform their funding allocations.

79 N8 Research Partnership (IGR0034)

80 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Innovation Clusters Map: summary and methods (accessed 2 October 2025)

81 Innovation Clusters Map: summary and methods - GOV.UK (accessed 2 October 2025)

5 Commercialising innovation

46. The commercialisation of innovation derived from scientific research is critical to delivering growth, a top priority for this Government. In this chapter we examine how innovations and ideas are activated and commercialised across the UK economy, and the role of universities, private investors and public bodies in this process.

Universities

47. Lord Vallance described the UK’s universities as “a very special feature of this country... Our universities, with their research-intensive ability, are not like other countries”⁸² Universities UK, which represents the sector, told us that its members “play a fundamental role in the innovation ecosystem, both as anchor institutions translating commercialised research into local impact and as a foundational sector for national RD&I excellence”⁸³
48. The Education Committee has noted the “place-based importance” of universities: for example, that the gross-value added of Manchester Metropolitan University to the city of Manchester outweighs that of both Manchester United and Manchester City football clubs.⁸⁴ But, despite their significance to local economies, universities often face profound financial challenges. Lord Vallance told us that many were:

under huge pressure for four main reasons: overdependence on overseas student numbers – as they drop, that has presented a problem; [...] full economic costing, which does not meet the total cost of the research that they do; and inflation.⁸⁵

82 Q345

83 Universities UK (IGR0060)

84 Letter from the Chair of the Education Select Committee to the Secretary of State for Education regarding higher education, 6 May 2025

85 Q366

Whilst this inquiry did not consider university finances in depth, it is notable that the June 2025 spending review did little to address the challenges facing the sector, despite its commitments to increase research spending.⁸⁶ The Education Committee has said that if these challenges are left unaddressed it would increase the risk to:

the financial viability of some institutions and courses, to the breadth and diversity of opportunities available at UK universities, to the local economy in places where a university is an anchor institution and major employer, and ultimately to the international reputation and standing of the UK.⁸⁷

University spinouts

49. The Government has acknowledged that the UK’s universities sector produces “... organisational leaders who commercialise innovation; it generates novel research which address market failures; and it supports translation, company formation and scaling”.⁸⁸ The number of spinouts—startups established to commercialise intellectual property (IP) arising from university research—is growing fast.⁸⁹
50. The Government has also highlighted instances of “... excessively high equity shares and royalty rates” being taken by some universities,⁹⁰ whilst the Startup Coalition told us that for some “the terms spinouts are forced to accept remain heavily weighted against them, leaving them with little room to manoeuvre when seeking external investment”.⁹¹
51. Access to capital and investment also remains heavily concentrated in the Golden Triangle. In 2023, university spinouts secured £1.66 billion in equity funding, “the process where companies raise money to grow their business by offering a share of the business to an investor in exchange for funding”.⁹² This £1.66 billion equated to 9.5% of all UK equity investment for the year,⁹³ but commercialisation outcomes vary by location.⁹⁴ The British Business

86 Universities UK, UUK responds to the spending review (accessed 8 December 2025)

87 Letter from the Chair of the Education Select Committee to the Secretary of State for Education regarding higher education, 6 May 2025

88 Department for Education, Post-16 education and skills white paper, GOV.UK, November 2025, section 3.5

89 Universities UK (IGR0060)

90 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (IGR0051)

91 The Startup Coalition (IGR0057)

92 British Business Bank, A guide to equity funding stages for your business (accessed 8 December 2025)

93 Royal Academy of Engineering, April 2024 Spotlight on Spinouts: UK academic spinout trends, April 2024

94 Q155 [Dr Natasha Boulding]

Bank found that spinouts in the Golden Triangle were more likely to raise external equity funding, while those that did gained higher amounts, with the median such company gaining four times more than those outside.⁹⁵

52. Data relating to spinouts is also lacking. The vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford said that:

It is very hard to get the data to know how many companies we are spinning out, what the deal terms are, how it is going, how many have collapsed, how many are doing very well or how many have left the UK and grown in the US.⁹⁶

Recent reviews have called on the Government to produce better data about spinout numbers, locations and progress. However, while the Government has launched a national spinout register, there is still no comprehensive dashboard tracking performance, equity terms, and regional outcomes.⁹⁷

53. **CONCLUSION**

University spinouts play an important part in ensuring that the UK's research base contributes to economic growth. However, academics at some institutions would benefit from greater flexibility in working structures as they start and grow their spinouts, and universities should be prepared to accept smaller returns on IP if it encourages greater levels of innovation and delivers wider economic benefits. This would help rebalance the risk-reward dynamic that is essential to delivering an innovation-driven economy; and support greater regional growth.

54. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Government should accelerate delivery of the University Spinout Dashboard and commit to making it an annual publication. The dashboard should include standardised data on equity terms, intellectual property agreements, institutional support, and regional outcomes.

Technology transfer offices

55. There are significant variations in the effectiveness of technology transfer offices (TTOs), units within universities responsible for research commercialisation and spinout support. Oxford University, for example, has a well-resourced TTO, helping it to consistently generate spinout companies

95 British Business Bank, *Backing Innovation-Led Businesses 2022* (accessed 8 December 2025)

96 Q4 [Professor Irene Tracey]

97 Higher Education Statistics Agency, *Spin-out register* (accessed 8 December 2025)

and attract investment.⁹⁸ However, many others, particularly those outside the traditional leading research institutions, are under-resourced,⁹⁹ indicating that the volume of throughput is a major factor in the success of TTOs.

56. Research England has supported a pilot of regional TTOs shared between several universities. These are intended to provide coordinated access to key services, including legal expertise, venture capital, skilled personnel, and planning support, rather than universities sustaining their own.¹⁰⁰

57. **CONCLUSION**

Some university technology transfer offices have made a significant contribution to their local economies. Others, however, are underperforming, leaving academic founders without the support and expertise needed to scale.

58. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Government should consider making funding to build the capacity of technology transfer offices contingent on their ability to deliver significant volume of throughput and provide evidence of success in building capacity and developing skills in their local economies.

University-investor partnerships

59. Our inquiry also examined other initiatives to strengthen regional spinout activity, such as university-investor partnerships:
- **Northern Gritstone:** Founded in 2021 by the universities of Sheffield, Leeds, and Manchester, it aims to address the venture capital gap for Northern spinouts. It has secured £362 million, including over £150 million from local authority pension funds to support scale-up funding.¹⁰¹
 - **Midlands Mindforge:** Established in 2023 by eight research-intensive universities in the Midlands, with the aim of addressing the venture capital gap for university spinouts in the region.¹⁰²

98 University of Oxford (IGR0076)

99 Professor Irene Tracey, Dr Andrew Williamson, Independent Review of University Spin-out Companies, DSIT and HM Treasury, November 2023 (p. 18)

100 UKRI, CCF-RED: shared technology transfer office functions pilot (accessed 1 October 2025)

101 Kim Moore, UK spinout firm Northern Gritstone to tap external VC investors, Global University Venturing (accessed 9 October 2025)

102 Midlands Mindforge, Midlands Innovation, (accessed 9 October 2025)

60. We heard calls for greater investment in the joint Research England-Office for Students Higher Education Innovation Funding mechanism, which supports universities to commercialise research,¹⁰³ and for a more joined up approach between UKRI, Innovate UK and the British Business Bank to support spinouts.¹⁰⁴

61. **RECOMMENDATION**

In its response to this report, the Government should set out how it plans to support the establishment of a Northern Gritstone or Midlands Mindforge for every region of the UK.

Financing growth

62. We heard that the challenges facing innovative companies looking to grow can be more significant for those outside parts of the Greater South East. Many can fail in the “valley of death” gap between research funding and commercial viability.¹⁰⁵
63. We also detected a concerning, perhaps unconscious, complacency and apparent acceptance of the status quo on the part of some decision makers based in London. The Government Chief Scientific Adviser told us, for example, that if Northern universities wanted to attract investors they should “buy a helicopter”.¹⁰⁶ This comment was clearly meant in jest, but revealing all the same, and the level of amusement was inversely related to the distance from London of the listener.
64. The British Business Bank has identified a series of stages associated with equity funding and company growth,¹⁰⁷ considered in turn below.

Pre-seed

65. After the research stage, innovators face the challenge of showing that their idea can develop into a minimum viable product, often through prototypes or feasibility studies, before it can attract investment.¹⁰⁸ This challenge is normally not financed by R&D funding or investors. The Government has

103 Russell Group (IGR0032), Universities UK (IGR0060), techUK (IGR0066)

104 Russell Group (IGR0032), Institute of Mechanical Engineers (IGR0049)

105 Qq. 67-68 [Irene Graham OBE, Duncan Johnson]

106 Oral evidence taken on 28 January 2025, Q60 [Professor Dame Angela McLean]

107 British Business Bank, A guide to equity funding stages for your business (accessed 8 December 2025)

108 British Business Bank, A guide to equity funding stages for your business (accessed 8 December 2025)

launched a new £40 million Proof of Concept (PoC) fund over five years to bridge this gap,¹⁰⁹ but demand far exceeds supply.¹¹⁰ UKRI's CEO told us that he hopes to be able to increase funding in the future.¹¹¹

66. Angel investors, who invest their own money in early stage, high risk business, can help innovators to bridge the valley of death. However, one study found that these investors were "... very unevenly distributed around the different regions of the UK, with over half (i.e., 53.0%) residing in Greater London and the South East".¹¹² The Royal Society of Chemistry also highlighted "... the lack of a critical mass of businesses in regional areas. Potential investors struggle to mitigate risk, as they cannot diversify across a large number of businesses".¹¹³
67. The Regional Angels Programme, launched by the British Business Bank in 2018, aimed to tackle this problem by pooling funds, expertise, and networks to back early-stage businesses in the regions.¹¹⁴ Some local authorities are looking to set up their own syndicates.¹¹⁵

Seed

68. The Government incentivises investors to back high-risk early-stage businesses through the Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme (SEIS), and the Enterprise Investment Scheme (EIS), via British Business Bank.¹¹⁶ However, the regional benefits are limited: companies registered in London and the South East accounted for 63% of all EIS investment in 2023 to 2024, and 65% of SEIS investment over the same period.¹¹⁷ SEIS also offers only limited amounts and we heard calls for the limits to be increased.¹¹⁸

109 TenU, Driving Economic Growth from University Innovation: the Case for Proof-of-Concept Funding (accessed 9 September 2025)

110 Universities UK (IGR0060), Engineering Professors' Council (EPC) (IGR0050), Satellite Application Catapult (IGR0055) and University of Oxford (IGR0076)

111 Oral evidence: Work of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), HC 1673, Tuesday 3 February 2026, Q47

112 Professor Marc Cowling (IGR0077)

113 Royal Society of Chemistry (IGR0031)

114 2025: A turning point for UK regional investment, UK Business Angels Association (UKBAA), (accessed 12 August 2025)

115 Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (IGR0017)

116 British Business Bank, What is the Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme? (accessed 8 December 2025). The 2024 Autumn Budget confirmed that EIS would be extended until April 2035.

117 HM Revenue and Customs, Enterprise Investment Scheme, Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme and Social Investment Tax Relief statistics: 2025 (accessed 13 January 2026)

118 Q169 [Dan Cathie]

Series A and beyond

- 69.** As businesses grow, they need greater investment to scale up, and we heard that UK companies are often forced go abroad to access significant finance. The Government Chief Scientific Advisor, Professor Dame Angela McLean, told us that:

... we are really good at research. We publish fantastic papers that are highly cited and have a lot of impact. Actually, we are not bad at patents, and we are really quite good these days at spinout. What we are bad at is growth. What we are bad at is the £100 million ask. That is the point at which our wonderful spinouts from all sorts of places, not just from universities, go abroad.¹¹⁹

- 70.** According to the Startup Coalition 80% of venture capital funds (VCs) are based in London and deploy 69% of their funds to companies based in London and the South East.¹²⁰ Some 56% of all private equity and VC funds go to London and the South East, with 0.3% going to Northern Ireland and 0.4% to Wales.¹²¹
- 71.** Professor Dame Angela McLean told us that investors often don't like to travel far, which limits their exposure to regional business.¹²² Similarly Lord Vallance cited the importance of not only bringing VCs to visit companies in the UK's regions but encouraging them to establish bases there.¹²³ The British Business Bank's Nations and Regions Investment Funds aims to address this need by identifying 'Cluster Champions': individuals with local expertise to help connect high-potential businesses with investors located in major UK cities.¹²⁴
- 72.** When asked about their regional presence the Bank also told us that "... we do not need our own huge network around the UK because others [such as Innovate UK] have huge networks".¹²⁵ Yet they also stated that

119 Q59

120 The Startup Coalition, Unleashing regional startup investment (accessed 8 December 2025)

121 British Private Equity and Venture Capital Association, Report on investment activity 2024, May 2025, p. 41

122 Q61

123 Oral evidence taken on 11 February 2025, Q41

124 British Business Bank, British Business Bank commits £6.6bn to back innovation as part the UK's modern Industrial Strategy and to unlock potential for entrepreneurs across the UK (accessed 8 December 2025)

125 Q 261 [Louis Taylor]

Innovate UK “largely [does] grant-funding of research”,¹²⁶ and with only 21 people in the Bank’s UK network, it is not clear that they can effectively address challenges and regional disparities in attracting investment.¹²⁷

73. Nevertheless, we heard that the British Business Bank would be critical to unlocking institutional capital,¹²⁸ and the ScaleUp Institute said that progress that had been made in this area.¹²⁹ Other regional initiatives include the Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund, which is delivered in collaboration with Local Enterprise Partnerships: business-led partnerships with local authorities that support SME growth across the North of England.¹³⁰

74. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Government should establish a series of regional branches of the British Business Bank, with a substantial presence on the ground in undercapitalised regions, to ensure that the Bank’s policies are aligned with the needs of innovative businesses across the UK.

Investor readiness

75. We heard that it is vital not just to connect innovative companies with investors but to get these companies ready to receive investment. This can involve building their skills in engaging with investors and demonstrating that a business has commercial potential. The CEO of Northern Gritstone told us that “it is a race, and to be successful and to get through the valley of death, you need momentum and commercial traction”.¹³¹
76. Innovate UK places business support experts in regional hubs that work with firms to help them access finance from British Business Bank and others.¹³² However, the Government acknowledged that it does not consider the idea of investment readiness in the same way that it uses Technology Readiness Levels, a numerical scale to assess the type of support a new technology requires. The science minister told us that he would look into this issue.¹³³

126 Q244 [Louis Taylor]

127 Q260 [Louis Taylor]

128 Q99 [Irene Graham OBE]

129 Q64 [Irene Graham OBE]

130 British Business Bank, Northern Powerhouse Investment Fund (accessed 8 December 2025)

131 Q68

132 Q348 [Oliver St John]

133 Qq. 348-349 [Lord Vallance]

77.

CONCLUSION

Taking risk and being rewarded for doing so are essential components of a dynamic, innovative economy and capital is essential to driving national, regional and local growth. Whilst the Government is limited in what it can do to influence the flow of capital across the economy, London, Oxford and Cambridge dominate venture capital flows and angel investor networks, leaving high-potential early-stage businesses in other parts of the UK underfunded. The Government's additional Proof of Concept funding, to help bridge the first part of the 'valley of death' between research and commercialisation, falls far short of what is needed to drive real change, at just £40 million over five years.

78.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should expand the Proof of Concept Fund and ensure it meets the needs of existing or emerging clusters of innovation. It should also increase the size of available awards to £1 million.

79.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should introduce a mechanism for businesses that 'graduate' from proof of concept funding, to funnel them directly through subsequent stages of investment.

Catapults

80. Catapult Centres are a network of not-for-profit organisations established by Innovate UK to bridge the gap between research and industry.¹³⁴ They were not designed specifically to support regional innovation, but a House of Lords Science and Technology Committee inquiry found that they had the potential to do so and recommended aligning Catapults more closely with regional development goals.¹³⁵ Some 74% of Innovate UK's core funding to Catapults is directed outside London and the Greater South East.¹³⁶

134 House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, 2nd Report of Session 2019–21, Catapults: bridging the gap between research and industry, HL paper 218, p 3; UKRI, Our Centres - The Catapult Network (accessed 9 October 2025)

135 House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, 2nd Report of Session 2019–21, Catapults: bridging the gap between research and industry, HL paper 218, p 17

136 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, 2023 Update to the 'Catapult Network Review' An update on developments since the Catapult Network Review April 2021, GOV.UK, September 2023

81. We heard mixed views on the success and regional impact of the Catapults. Some stakeholders reported that they had contributed to regional as well as national growth.¹³⁷ Others highlighted concerns, including that the network's funding model, which requires Catapults to attract private as well as public funding, can force them to compete with local industry and universities.¹³⁸ They also risk outbidding local small businesses on salaries.¹³⁹

82. **CONCLUSION**

The Catapult network has the potential to help drive innovation and economic growth across the UK's regions, but in regions with low R&D intensity and limited public investment, Catapults risk competing with local bodies for funds rather than fostering knowledge diffusion.

83. **RECOMMENDATION**

In its response to this report, the Government should set out how it intends to ensure the Catapult network is more effectively targeted at addressing regional disparities, including its assessment of whether removing the imperative for Catapults to raise private funds would increase their impact in the UK's regions.

84. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Government and Innovate UK should develop a standardised and transparent set of performance indicators for the Catapults. These should include measures of industry engagement, commercialisation outcomes, support for technology and innovation adoption, regional economic impact, and wider societal benefits by region.

Public procurement

85. DSIT has said that it is considering how to make public procurement frameworks easier for small technology businesses to navigate.¹⁴⁰ The co-founder of a start-up told us that "if you go to a private investor with a purchase order for a Government Department to carry out a first-of-a-kind project or grant funding, they go for the purchase order every single time".¹⁴¹

137 Neil Lee and Max Herbertson (IGR0010), N8 Research Partnership (IGR0034), DSIT (IGR0051)

138 Space Forge (IGR0003), UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016)

139 UK Tech Cluster Group (IGR0016), Newcastle University (IGR0039), Space Forge (IGR0003), Mr John Yates (IGR0013)

140 Committee of Public Accounts, Forty-First Report of Session 2024–25, UK Research and Innovation, HC 826, para 28

141 Q158 [Dr Natasha Boulding]

86. We heard calls for greater focus on using public procurement to support innovative businesses.¹⁴² This could include setting contract criteria that are better suited to start-ups and SMEs and offering longer-term agreements that allow businesses to invest in emerging technologies and novel ways of working.¹⁴³ Approaches such as place-based procurement and tailored support services can also help connect businesses with public and private funding sources.¹⁴⁴
87. The Government recently set out its strategic priorities for public procurement under the Procurement Act 2023.¹⁴⁵ However, there were limited references to the UK's regions, and no detailed commentary on the implications for high-tech industries in the accompanying National Procurement Policy Statement.¹⁴⁶ The technology adoption review noted that procurement had been used to drive greater technology adoption through supply chains, for example, for the curation of data or use of digital payment.¹⁴⁷
88. **RECOMMENDATION**
There should be a minister in the Cabinet Office responsible for innovative procurement, supported by a dedicated unit and responsible for exploring new approaches to engaging SMEs, spinouts, and scaleups, particularly those developing UK-owned intellectual property; and making use of testbeds to trial emerging technologies and new procurement models.

Deep tech

89. Deep tech startups, including in strategic areas such as quantum, AI, biotechnology, and clean energy, often involve high costs, high risks, and long development timelines.¹⁴⁸ They can face challenges in maintaining

142 Q63 [Irene Graham OBE]

143 Satellite Application Catapult (IGR0055), Digital Catapult (IGR0064), Russell Group (IGR0032)

144 Connected Places Catapult (IGR0065)

145 Government Commercial Function, National Procurement Policy Statement (accessed 9 October 2025)

146 Ben Pollard - Tussell, What is the National Procurement Policy Statement? (Procurement Act 2023) (accessed 14 August 2025) and Nick Pimlott, Holly Johnson - Fieldfisher, The UK Government's National Procurement Policy Statement: a summary, (accessed 14 August 2025)

147 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review 2025, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 6

148 Royal Academy of Engineering (IGR0014)

growth, including funding limits and eligibility criteria that prevent them from accessing schemes such as SEIS and EIS,¹⁴⁹ or the cost and availability of lab space and equipment.¹⁵⁰

90. There is a limited presence of investors with specialist knowledge of these fields outside parts of the Greater South East, despite strong regional clusters in certain sectors. To address this shortfall and to educate investors about the opportunities in deep tech, the Government has established a science and technology venture capital fellowship.¹⁵¹
91. Quantum computing provides an example of the current landscape. The UK is a world leader, ranking third globally for the impact of its quantum technologies research.¹⁵² We heard how the sector has been aided by the UK's model of quantum research and innovation hubs centred at universities and distributed regionally.¹⁵³ However, quantum start-ups face challenges in scaling up and competing with US counterparts due to the lack of funding,¹⁵⁴ while the University of Sussex, which hosts a centre of quantum technologies, highlighted the short timelines of some Innovate UK funds.¹⁵⁵
92. Regulation was also highlighted as a challenge, particularly "risk-averse" regulatory frameworks ill-suited to new technologies.¹⁵⁶ The Modern Industrial Strategy emphasised that "... the regulatory and competition environment in which our growth-driving sectors operate will be an important determinant of their success" and said that "... regulation should support emerging sectors to grow".¹⁵⁷ We discuss the role of the Regulatory Innovation Office in delivering on this objective in Chapter 6.

149 Digital Catapult (IGR0064)

150 Science Creates (IGR0088)

151 Q349 [Lord Vallance]

152 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, National Quantum Strategy: Additional Evidence, GOV.UK, December 2023, p. 4

153 Oral evidence: Science diplomacy, HC 838, Tuesday 2 December 2025 [Jessica Wade] Q125

154 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, National Quantum Strategy: Additional Evidence, GOV.UK, December 2023, p. 19

155 University of Sussex (IGR0067)

156 University of Bristol (IGR0078)

157 Department for Business and Trade, The UK's Modern Industrial Strategy, CP 1451, 23 June 2025, p. 38

93.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should encourage the development of specialist investor capability in science and tech across the UK, particularly in strategic deep tech sectors such as quantum. It should support the development of regional investor and investment readiness training programmes, expand partnerships between technical experts and investment networks, and reduce business rates on lab space for early-stage companies. It should create investor envoys for key deep tech sectors, modelled on the existing trade envoys, to liaise between stakeholders and the Government.

Infrastructure

94. Infrastructure, i.e. the buildings, facilities, instruments and equipment needed to carry out scientific research, as well as wider facilities such as transport, housing, digital connectivity, and access to energy, plays a central role in enabling and commercialising innovation.¹⁵⁸
95. We heard that gaps in infrastructure constrain innovation and that the high costs of accessing specialised facilities and equipment can be a barrier to growth.¹⁵⁹ Dr David McBeth of Dundee University pointed out that the private sector is less likely to invest in innovation infrastructure away from the Golden Triangle because of perceived lack of demand, and so “the public sector has to play an increasing role in creating innovation infrastructure the further from the Golden Triangle you go”.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸ UKRI defines infrastructure as “the equipment, facilities, resources and services used by research and innovation communities and businesses to conduct research, foster innovation and boost productivity in their fields. [...] This includes: research equipment; - large-scale physical research facilities and sets of instruments (such as particle accelerators, research ships, and scientific satellites); - knowledge-based resources, including scientific, cultural and artistic collections and physical and digital archives (such as UK Biobank or the Archaeology Data Service, the UK’s openly accessible repository of heritage data); - development of research infrastructures in the universities sector (including new buildings, major refurbishment of existing facilities, or the purchase of high-cost research equipment); - networks of technologies and digital infrastructures (including data and computing systems and communication networks, like the large-scale computing service ARCHER)”.

¹⁵⁹ LabCorp (IGR0020), Norwich Research Park (IGR0028), Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (IGR0017), Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE) (IGR0008), Science Creates (IGR0088), University of Nottingham (IGR0058); There are also wider national challenges, with lab space in London, Oxford, and Cambridge notably more expensive than in New York or Boston. See Campaign for Science and Engineering (CaSE) (IGR0008), Neil Lee and Max Herbertson (IGR0010), LabCorp (IGR0020), TechUK (IGR0066)

¹⁶⁰ Q27

- 96.** We also heard concerns about placing major scientific institutions, such as the Francis Crick Institute, in London.¹⁶¹ In 2022 the Crick received £71 million in infrastructure funding, while all combined authorities in the North received £49 million, according to analysis by the Northern Health Science Alliance.¹⁶² One witness suggested that the British Business Bank could ringfence a percentage of its funds to work with the private sector to develop innovation infrastructure in cities and regions across the UK.¹⁶³
- 97.** Witnesses highlighted poor transport links as a barrier to growth, such as those between the life science and tech clusters in Manchester, Cheshire and Liverpool.¹⁶⁴ As the CEO of the Northern Powerhouse Partnership put it: “there is only one economy in this country that currently has a transport system that allows you to get large numbers of people to one place, and it is London”.¹⁶⁵
- 98.** UKRI is due to publish an updated Infrastructure Roadmap, setting out national priorities for research facilities and technologies to support future planning.¹⁶⁶ Bruntwood SciTech, a science and technology property provider, told us that at present UKRI focused on national capabilities with less attention to the role of innovation infrastructure in regional economies, reflecting a broader lack of focus on leveraging public investment to deliver growth.¹⁶⁷

Treasury Green Book

- 99.** The Treasury Green Book is used to assess value for money of spending proposals, but the Northern Powerhouse Partnership told us that the current system incentivises spending money on things that are already happening.¹⁶⁸ The Government committed to reforming guidance to better capture local economic potential and to facilitate place-based business cases aligned to regional priorities,¹⁶⁹ and in February 2026 issued a revised Green Book, intended to “support fairer and more balanced decisions

¹⁶¹ Q107 [Henri Murison]

¹⁶² The Pandemic Institute (IGR0068) and Northern Health Science Alliance: NHA Analysis of the UK Clinical Research Landscape in 2022, p. 3

¹⁶³ Q27 [Dr David McBeth]

¹⁶⁴ Q126 [Dr Kath Mackay]

¹⁶⁵ Q126 [Henri Murison]

¹⁶⁶ UKRI, Infrastructure roadmap programme (accessed 31 May 2025)

¹⁶⁷ Q105 [Dr Kath Mackay]

¹⁶⁸ Q122 [Henri Murison]

¹⁶⁹ HM Treasury, Green Book Review 2025: findings and actions, GOV.UK, June 2025

on investment in every part of the country”.¹⁷⁰ We heard that these steps could have significant implications for infrastructure and allow long-term benefits from spending to be better realised.¹⁷¹

100. CONCLUSION

Infrastructure deficits can be a major barrier to scaling up innovation, commercialising research, and ultimately to regional growth. Planned reforms to the Green Book offer an opportunity to rebalance regional investment, but their impact will depend on effective implementation. Scientific infrastructure plans should be aligned with those for services such as transport that facilitate the necessary concentrations of people in individual regions.

101. RECOMMENDATION

The Government should publish a long-term strategy for science infrastructure investment. It should instruct the British Business Bank to ring-fence a percentage of its funds to support the development of innovation infrastructure in partnership with the private sector.

102. RECOMMENDATION

UKRI should revise its Infrastructure Roadmap to include a detailed mapping of existing capabilities, identify underserved regions, and prioritise infrastructure development that supports economic resilience and long-term growth.

103. CONCLUSION

We are concerned by an apparent tendency to place major new scientific institutions in London by default. This compounds the challenges other regions face in attracting and retaining graduates and skilled professionals, despite their world-class universities and thriving innovation hubs. Disparities in salaries, access to funding, and quality of public services contribute to the ongoing migration of talent to London. Infrastructure support can help address this imbalance.

170 HM Treasury, New Green Book to ensure that investment in all parts of the UK given a “fair hearing”, 5 February 2026

171 David Hawkes, Rewriting the rules: what does the Green Book review mean for infrastructure?, Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) (accessed 7 August 2025)

104.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should publish a Regional Graduate Retention Strategy, backed by investment and cross-department coordination. This should include support for university-industry collaboration to create high-skilled local employment, linked to analysis of public services such as housing, transport, and education – which are needed to create the conditions for graduates to build careers throughout the UK.

6 Diffusion and absorption

- 105.** Thus far, in this report we have focused on creating and commercialising innovations, but the real impact on productivity and regional growth comes from innovations being diffused (made available) and absorbed (put into use). There is evidence that putting existing innovations into general use has a greater impact on productivity than additional R&D spending,¹⁷² but doing so is an area of relative weakness for the UK, which ranks 5th overall in the Global Innovation Index, but 12th for knowledge diffusion and 31st for knowledge absorption.¹⁷³

Adoption

- 106.** The UK lags behind other advanced economies in technology adoption, according to a Government-commissioned review.¹⁷⁴ Newcastle University pointed to graphene as an example: though it was invented in the UK, the majority of recent patent applications have come from China and South Korea.¹⁷⁵ The CEO of the Northern Powerhouse Partnership told us that the UK “... currently spend[s] so much of our money on pure science that we subsidise science for the whole world”.¹⁷⁶
- 107.** We heard that the UK’s innovation ecosystem should place a greater focus on the translation and diffusion of knowledge, particularly in regions of the UK with weaker economies.¹⁷⁷ Professor Neil Lee told us that:
- our great strengths in frontier research are not matched by sufficient focus on the diffusion, adoption, and adaptation of innovation in the private sector.¹⁷⁸

172 The Northern Powerhouse Partnership, *Innovation For Impact: Closing the productivity gap in the North*, June 2025, p. 9

173 techUK (IGR0066)

174 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, *Technology Adoption Review*, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 3

175 Newcastle University (IGR0039)

176 Q113 [Henri Murison]

177 Newcastle University (IGR0039)

178 Professor Neil Lee and Max Herbertson (IGR0010)

- 108.** Other witnesses cited the importance of applying innovations to businesses across the country that don't see themselves as being innovative.¹⁷⁹ The Northern Powerhouse Partnership offered the example of Greater Manchester's innovation programmes, which cover not just pure research and commercialisation but the application of innovations to existing businesses – such as AI to a timber merchant.¹⁸⁰

Diffusion

- 109.** The Council for Science and Technology said in 2019 that “‘diffusion’ may be taken to imply a passive process, but in fact it should be pursued actively”.¹⁸¹ Key factors in enabling firms to take up new technologies include:
- STEM and wider management skills;
 - availability of finance, quality of infrastructure such as broadband and 5G;
 - level of engagement between universities and local businesses; and
 - networks between businesses to share information and awareness of new technologies.¹⁸²
- 110.** We heard that Catapults have been “instrumental” in supporting technology diffusion in their regions,¹⁸³ and enabling businesses to access cutting-edge technologies and expertise.¹⁸⁴ However we also heard that Catapults vary in their degree of focus on diffusion, in part due to the need to raise private funds,¹⁸⁵ and that SMEs can face barriers in engaging with them.¹⁸⁶

179 Q114 [Henri Murison]

180 Q113 [Henri Murison]

181 Letter from the Council for Science and Technology to the Prime Minister on diffusion of technology for productivity, 9 August 2019

182 Professor Neil Lee and Max Herbertson (IGR0010)

183 Make UK (IGR0023)

184 N8 Research Partnership (IGR0034)

185 Newcastle University (IGR0039)

186 Make UK (IGR0023)

Made Smarter

111. The Government's Made Smarter initiative¹⁸⁷ has had some success in helping SMEs adopt technology:¹⁸⁸ the pilot in the North-West reported £8 return for every £1 of Government investment,¹⁸⁹ and it is being rolled out more widely.¹⁹⁰ However, the 2025 technology adoption review highlighted widening regional disparities outside parts of the Greater South East.¹⁹¹
112. The review recommended expanding support for the Made Smarter Adoption programme, especially for SMEs and those in the life sciences.¹⁹² However, it also noted that the short-lived nature of many business support programmes has led to "a proliferation of different schemes that industry finds difficult to navigate".¹⁹³ Make UK also told us there was a gap in support for businesses to adopt technologies, as opposed to innovating themselves.¹⁹⁴

113. **CONCLUSION**

The UK's strengths in cutting-edge science have been hampered by low rates of technology and innovation adoption, particularly among SMEs and in non-tech sectors. This is the low-hanging fruit of innovation policy: the investment needed to support businesses in adopting technologies could have a transformative economic impact in regions and sectors where adoption has been low.

114. **CONCLUSION**

Strategies to support increased industry adoption of technologies must have a regional focus, just as industries are largely regionally focused. This will require targeted interventions that identify high-potential clusters, provide long-term investment to deliver the infrastructure for them to flourish, foster the development of expert networks, and support regional economic growth.

187 UKRI, Made Smarter Innovation (accessed 9 October 2025)

188 Qq. 113, 119 [Henri Murison]

189 The Northern Powerhouse Partnership, Innovation For Impact: Closing the productivity gap in the North, June 2025; Institute for Manufacturing, University of Cambridge; Made Smarter Adoption Research Project Summary report, February 2023

190 Made Smarter, Thousands more SME manufacturers to benefit from Made Smarter after Budget commitment (accessed 13 August 2025)

191 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 3

192 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review 2025, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 7

193 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review 2025, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 6

194 Make UK (IGR0023)

115.

RECOMMENDATION

The Government should prioritise the diffusion and adoption of innovation and technologies across the UK. This will require greater emphasis on building skills for smaller businesses; increased advice and support on regulatory matters for smaller businesses; making finance available to companies to adopt technologies, such as AI; and facilitating engagement between universities and local businesses. In its response to this report the Government should set out its plans to do this, including how it intends to scale up support for the Made Smarter Adoption programme to better engage SMEs and non-tech businesses across all regions.

Regulation

116. We heard that unclear or risk-averse regulatory frameworks for emerging and novel technologies can hinder the spread of technology, as well as R&D and commercialisation.¹⁹⁵ In a recent Government survey businesses identified regulation as the top barrier to technology adoption.¹⁹⁶ The technology adoption review also highlighted a lack of clarity about current regulations, as well as concerns that regulations would change, as barriers to adoption.¹⁹⁷

117. In 2024 the current Government established a new Regulatory Innovation Office (RIO) to “reduce the burden of red tape and speed up access to new technologies”, initially focusing on four key areas of technology: AI in healthcare, engineering biology, space, and drones and other autonomous technologies. In its first year of operation RIO has engaged with over 150 businesses and 40 regulators, “... accelerating the path to market for innovative businesses as diverse as novel foods and drone deliveries for the NHS”, according to its report on its first year of activity.¹⁹⁸

118.

RECOMMENDATION

The establishment of the Regulatory Innovation Office is a welcome recognition of the need to tackle regulatory barriers to innovation, particularly at the cutting edge. We believe that it can play a significant role in ensuring that innovation benefits the whole of the UK, beyond the and we will be closely tracking its development and impact.

195 University of Oxford (IGR0076), University of Bristol (IGR0078)

196 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review 2025, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 5

197 Department for Business and Trade, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology and HM Treasury, Technology Adoption Review 2025, GOV.UK, June 2025, p. 5

198 Regulatory Innovation Office, Regulatory Innovation Office: one year on, GOV.UK, October 2025

119.

RECOMMENDATION

The Regulatory Innovation Office should work with universities, SMEs, and spinouts to map the full pathway from research to market, identifying where disproportionate burdens or barriers exist. It should also publish a regional support strategy with measurable objectives and deliverables.

7 Devolution

- 120.** In this report we have examined the innovation pipeline from R&D to commercialisation, diffusion and absorption. However, each region is different, which is why successive governments have committed to place-based policy that adapts to the needs and opportunities presented by different locations.¹⁹⁹ We heard that local and regional authorities can play a key part in shaping place-based innovation ecosystems, ensuring investment is targeted to maximise impact and economic growth, and encouraging diffusion and adoption.²⁰⁰ In this chapter we examine what this might look like.

Local and national policy

- 121.** Liverpool City Region Combined Authority is aiming to invest 5% of the region's GVA in R&D by 2030.²⁰¹ We visited Liverpool Knowledge Quarter in December 2024 and observed developments at first hand. Greater Manchester also provides a devolution success story, having reported the biggest productivity increase of any UK region or mayoralty between 2004 and 2023. It attributes this increase to investment in public transport and infrastructure, and the devolution of powers to the metro mayor since 2017.²⁰²
- 122.** We heard that the “triple-helix model”, where universities, civic leaders, and businesses co-design innovation strategies, can support regional growth.²⁰³ Initiatives such as the University of Manchester's Unit M and the University of Sheffield's Made Together programme combine translational research, skills development, and civic collaboration to support startups, grow innovation clusters, and attract investment.²⁰⁴ Professor Lou Cordwell, Chief Executive Officer of Unit M, observed that:

199 University of Manchester (IGR0019)

200 Q118 [Henri Murison]

201 University of Liverpool (IGR0070)

202 Greater Manchester Business Board, Greater Manchester tops UK productivity growth (accessed 8 December 2025)

203 Q309 [Dean Cook], Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry (IGR0006)

204 The University of Manchester, Unit M, (accessed 8 December 2025), University of Sheffield, Ambitious Plans. Made Together (accessed 8 December 2025) and University of Sheffield, Runway Park (accessed 8 December 2025)

the innovation industry and the innovation process requires agility and flexibility and, for understandable reasons, that is not always aligned with Government process and procedure. Devolved processes, single settlements and some of the regional levers at a more localised level help with some of that and help us to think in a whole-system way.²⁰⁵

Former cabinet minister and chair of this committee Greg Clark told us that mayoral leadership can play a crucial role in facilitating engagement between central and local government, and that “[local] leaders can make a big difference”.²⁰⁶

- 123.** In July 2025 the Government announced details of a £500 million Local Innovation Partnerships Fund intended to “empower local leaders with skin in the game” between 2026–31 by growing high potential innovation clusters and giving regions greater control over R&D investment.²⁰⁷ This funding equates to approximately 0.5% of the total planned public sector R&D spending between 2026–27 and 2029–30.²⁰⁸ UKRI’s CEO acknowledged its small size, but said it was intended to be “catalytic”.²⁰⁹

Going further

- 124.** The English Devolution White Paper published by the current Government outlined plans to work more closely with established Mayoral Strategic Authorities on regional innovation funding, including through engagement between mayors, ministers and UKRI leadership.²¹⁰ We received evidence welcoming the development of Local Growth Plans: 10-year strategic frameworks for growth, produced by Mayoral Strategic Authorities.²¹¹
- 125.** However, we also heard that these steps could exclude non-mayoral areas, whether parts of England without mayoral combined authorities, or in the devolved nations.²¹² Cardiff Capital Region’s Chair stressed that nations such as Wales, despite hosting globally significant sectors such as compound

205 Q48 [Professor Lou Cordwell]

206 Qq. 160, 185 [Rt. Hon. Greg Clark]

207 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, Local leaders in every UK nation backed by £30 million each to drive transformative innovation and grow the economy (accessed 9 October 2025)

208 HM Treasury, Spending Review 2025, CP 1336, 11 June 2025, p. 34

209 Q286 [Dean Cook]

210 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, English Devolution White Paper, CP 1218, 16 December 2024, p. 16

211 The Startup Coalition (IGR0057), Universities UK (IGR0060), Imperial College London (IGR0098)

212 Lancaster University (IGR0009), University of Manchester (IGR0019), Western Gateway (IGR0035), GuildHE (IGR0053), Norwich Research Park (IGR0028)

semiconductors, risked being overlooked.²¹³ We also heard that the potential of towns, rural communities, and broader city-regions should not be neglected in place-based strategies.²¹⁴

- 126.** Other programmes such as Innovation Accelerators¹⁴⁴ and the Strength in Places Fund¹⁴⁵ have potential. However, we heard concerns about their limited scale and duration.¹⁴⁶ Strength in Places is currently closed to new applications, while Innovation Accelerators is due to end in 2026, with learnings from each set to inform the new Local Innovation Partnership Fund.

Case study: The West Midlands

- 127.** The West Midlands was chosen as one of three locations for the Innovation Accelerator Pilot, the precursor to the Local Innovation Partnerships Fund, which distributed £130 million between 2022–26 across different locations. It was intended to “accelerate the growth of three high-potential clusters”, including by attracting private sector co-investment and driving productivity improvements.²¹⁵ The West Midlands is now due to receive at least £50 million through the Local Innovation Partnerships Fund,²¹⁶ and hosted a Regional Investment Summit in October 2025.²¹⁷ It is the location of an investment zone, with tax incentives for companies investing in certain sites.²¹⁸
- 128.** The combined authority told us that the region had seen the second highest level of growth in business investment in R&D in the UK between 2022–23, behind only London. It said that the ratio of private to public R&D investment, at 5:1, was one of the highest in Europe, driven by automotive and advanced engineering businesses. It called itself a “testbed for advanced devolution” and called for greater devolution of innovation policy.²¹⁹

213 Q151 [Councillor Ann Brocklesby]

214 Innovation Caucus, Regional economic growth through innovation policy and business engagement: evidence from three UK city regions (accessed 8 December 2025)

215 UK Research and Innovation, Innovation accelerator programme (accessed 8 December 2025)

216 Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, HM Treasury, UK regions given extra £20 million science and tech cash boost as new investment kicks off landmark growth summit, GOV.UK (accessed 8 December 2025)

217 Department for Business and Trade, HM Treasury, Regional Investment Summit delivers almost a thousand jobs for UK communities (accessed 8 December 2025)

218 West Midlands Combined Authority, West Midlands Investment Zone (accessed 8 December 2025)

219 West Midlands Combined Authority (IGR0054)

129. CONCLUSION

Local leaders, including but not only mayoral authorities, are pivotal to regional innovation ecosystems and regional growth. Their proximity to stakeholders, understanding of their areas, and ability to convene cross-sector partnerships position them uniquely to drive growth. Devolved national, regional and local authorities could play a greater role in funding early-stage businesses, such as through initiatives to match UKRI funding.

130. CONCLUSION

The Local Innovation Partnerships Fund's ambition to give regions more control over innovation policy is welcome, but it falls short on scale, with just £500 million over five years, or around 0.5% of the science budget.

131. RECOMMENDATION

The Government should, in its response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out a framework to clarify the roles and responsibilities of sub-national authorities in the innovation landscape, particularly in areas that do not yet have formal devolution arrangements. This framework should include guidance on strategic planning, data-sharing protocols, and mechanisms for cross-regional collaboration. It should create a model that ensures all regions, regardless of devolution status, can access strategic planning tools, funding, and representation in national innovation policy.

132. RECOMMENDATION

The Government should commission an independent review examining the link between R&D, new businesses and growth in jobs and GDP since 2008, and task it with recommending how to make public investment in R&D increase productivity, growth, and jobs. This should use examples such as Greater Manchester as case studies in raising productivity, to identify lessons for other regions.

Conclusions and recommendations

The research and development ecosystem

1. Even in a digital age, physical proximity remains key to innovation and its commercialisation and absorption. Geographic clusters can drive productivity, foster concentrated networks of expertise, infrastructure and collaboration, and support regional growth, which is economically and politically important. Yet their success relies on sustained investment, established infrastructure and skills concentration. Responsive, targeted innovation policy designed to support the emergence and growth of innovation clusters can therefore benefit both individual regions and the entire UK. (Conclusion, Paragraph 11)
2. The UK's clusters of innovation-led growth—from Cambridge Biotech to Glasgow Satellite City—are key engines of national economic prosperity, productivity growth and economic regeneration. Mapping, monitoring and supporting their growth should be a major pillar of the Industrial Strategy and the Government's wider economic policy. (Conclusion, Paragraph 12)
3. The Government should establish a national framework for cluster development that embeds regional Key Performance Indicators and tracks cluster lifecycles. As part of this, it should develop regional economic profiles that line up clusters with key sources of economic activity, such as original equipment manufacturers, major education and health facilities, government and defence facilities, and their supply chains, with an analysis of opportunities for supporting innovation and diffusion. As part of this framework the Government should define its role in supporting the development of regional clusters, versus that of the private sector. (Recommendation, Paragraph 13)
4. The Government should publish annual data covering the performance and impact of innovation clusters. These should set out any gaps around infrastructure, skills, and commercialisation outcomes and detail how public investment is being used across different parts of the country. (Recommendation, Paragraph 14)

5. Public support for R&D is not effectively designed to reach researchers and innovators that have not traditionally received large amounts of innovation funding – such as those in the regions. UKRI, the country’s biggest public innovation funder, has acknowledged the problem, but its new objectives are only the starting point in addressing the challenge. It is also disappointing to already see vast regional imbalances in the spending of recently-formed ARIA. (Conclusion, Paragraph 21)
6. The Government should establish a portal where innovators can be matched with suitable funding and support to help them cut through the current tangle of options. Innovate UK should announce targets for increasing engagement with innovators across the country, using metrics such as outreach and targeted support, more accessible and streamlined application processes, and additional support personnel in the regions. (Recommendation, Paragraph 22)
7. While the most cutting-edge science may be best carried out in established centres of excellence, as Lord Vallance put it, there are centres of excellence across the country, in Cardiff, Durham, Edinburgh, Leeds, Manchester, Milton Keynes and Newcastle – amongst others. Traditional innovation hubs like London, Oxford and Cambridge are limited in physical space, housing costs and facilities, which other locations can offer in abundance and often at lower cost. Utilising their potential has the additional benefit of supporting greater regional economic growth. (Conclusion, Paragraph 30)
8. The Government should incentivise complementarities between institutions in London, Oxford and Cambridge and those in other regions, such as through programmes to help spinout companies to scale up elsewhere in the country. Good practice examples include the partnership between the Universities of Cambridge and Manchester. The Government should put in place a mechanism for identifying these opportunities, setting out the details in its response to this report. (Recommendation, Paragraph 31)
9. The Government should publish a strategy setting out how it plans to exploit the full potential of the Oxford-to-Cambridge Growth Corridor – including locations outside these cities. This strategy should identify the existing and potential strengths of places between Oxford and Cambridge and set out plans to support them. (Recommendation, Paragraph 32)
10. The Government should publish an assessment of whether funding to Golden Triangle institutions should be made contingent on projects having a quantifiable economic impact elsewhere. (Recommendation, Paragraph 33)

11. The Government should appoint a minister to champion innovation in each region of the UK – not just the Golden Triangle. These ministers should be tasked with ensuring that regional needs, opportunities and interests are considered in decisions on investment and infrastructure. (Recommendation, Paragraph 34)

Data and transparency

12. The UK is flying blind when it comes innovation policy. It is unacceptable that the Government and UKRI cannot properly measure and map R&D spending and the accompanying private sector investment. Without clear, transparent measurement of what is being done and its impact, it is impossible to assess existing policies or identify improvements. We welcome the Government's agreement to release departmental R&D spending plans and outturn data in response to our previous request. This will help to support more effective innovation policy, ensure greater accountability and ultimately contribute to regional economic growth. (Conclusion, Paragraph 42)
13. Future disclosures of departmental R&D spending should include breakdowns by region and cluster. The Government and UKRI should also develop a framework for tracking impact and publish annual regionally disaggregated reports that set out how public R&D funding supports innovation across the country. These should include company-level data on funding, innovation diffusion and take-up, and geographic distribution. (Recommendation, Paragraph 43)
14. The Government and UKRI should, in response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out how the R&D budget will be allocated by sector, region and cluster. The Government should also, in its response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out the current level of private sector R&D investment by sector, region and cluster. This should include detailed mapping of not just total investment but key metrics such as company formation, job creation and intellectual property filings. (Recommendation, Paragraph 44)
15. The Government should in its response to this report set out how it intends to ensure the Secretary of State's mandate to use public spending to unlock private sector investment is taken up by Government departments, UKRI, Innovate UK and other public funders of R&D to inform their funding allocations. (Recommendation, Paragraph 45)

Commercialising innovation

16. University spinouts play an important part in ensuring that the UK's research base contributes to economic growth. However, academics at some institutions would benefit from greater flexibility in working structures as they start and grow their spinouts, and universities should be prepared to accept smaller returns on IP if it encourages greater levels of innovation and delivers wider economic benefits. This would help rebalance the risk-reward dynamic that is essential to delivering an innovation-driven economy; and support greater regional growth. (Conclusion, Paragraph 53)
17. The Government should accelerate delivery of the University Spinout Dashboard and commit to making it an annual publication. The dashboard should include standardised data on equity terms, intellectual property agreements, institutional support, and regional outcomes. (Recommendation, Paragraph 54)
18. Some university technology transfer offices have made a significant contribution to their local economies. Others, however, are underperforming, leaving academic founders without the support and expertise needed to scale. (Conclusion, Paragraph 57)
19. The Government should consider making funding to build the capacity of technology transfer offices contingent on their ability to deliver significant volume of throughput and provide evidence of success in building capacity and developing skills in their local economies. (Recommendation, Paragraph 58)
20. In its response to this report, the Government should set out how it plans to support the establishment of a Northern Gritstone or Midlands Mindforge for every region of the UK. (Recommendation, Paragraph 61)
21. The Government should establish a series of regional branches of the British Business Bank, with a substantial presence on the ground in undercapitalised regions, to ensure that the Bank's policies are aligned with the needs of innovative businesses across the UK. (Recommendation, Paragraph 74)
22. Taking risk and being rewarded for doing so are essential components of a dynamic, innovative economy and capital is essential to driving national, regional and local growth. Whilst the Government is limited in what it can do to influence the flow of capital across the economy, London, Oxford and Cambridge dominate venture capital flows and angel investor networks, leaving high-potential early-stage businesses in other parts of the UK underfunded. The Government's additional Proof of Concept funding,

to help bridge the first part of the ‘valley of death’ between research and commercialisation, falls far short of what is needed to drive real change, at just £40 million over five years. (Conclusion, Paragraph 77)

- 23.** The Government should expand the Proof of Concept Fund and ensure it meets the needs of existing or emerging clusters of innovation. It should also increase the size of available awards to £1 million. (Recommendation, Paragraph 78)
- 24.** The Government should introduce a mechanism for businesses that ‘graduate’ from proof of concept funding, to funnel them directly through subsequent stages of investment. (Recommendation, Paragraph 79)
- 25.** The Catapult network has the potential to help drive innovation and economic growth across the UK’s regions, but in regions with low R&D intensity and limited public investment, Catapults risk competing with local bodies for funds rather than fostering knowledge diffusion. (Conclusion, Paragraph 82)
- 26.** In its response to this report, the Government should set out how it intends to ensure the Catapult network is more effectively targeted at addressing regional disparities, including its assessment of whether removing the imperative for Catapults to raise private funds would increase their impact in the UK’s regions. (Recommendation, Paragraph 83)
- 27.** The Government and Innovate UK should develop a standardised and transparent set of performance indicators for the Catapults. These should include measures of industry engagement, commercialisation outcomes, support for technology and innovation adoption, regional economic impact, and wider societal benefits by region. (Recommendation, Paragraph 84)
- 28.** There should be a minister in the Cabinet Office responsible for innovative procurement, supported by a dedicated unit and responsible for exploring new approaches to engaging SMEs, spinouts, and scaleups, particularly those developing UK-owned intellectual property; and making use of testbeds to trial emerging technologies and new procurement models. (Recommendation, Paragraph 88)
- 29.** The Government should encourage the development of specialist investor capability in science and tech across the UK, particularly in strategic deep tech sectors such as quantum. It should support the development of regional investor and investment readiness training programmes, expand partnerships between technical experts and investment networks, and reduce business rates on lab space for early-stage companies. It should create investor envoys for key deep tech sectors, modelled on the existing trade envoys, to liaise between stakeholders and the Government. (Recommendation, Paragraph 93)

30. Infrastructure deficits can be a major barrier to scaling up innovation, commercialising research, and ultimately to regional growth. Planned reforms to the Green Book offer an opportunity to rebalance regional investment, but their impact will depend on effective implementation. Scientific infrastructure plans should be aligned with those for services such as transport that facilitate the necessary concentrations of people in individual regions. (Conclusion, Paragraph 100)
31. The Government should publish a long-term strategy for science infrastructure investment. It should instruct the British Business Bank to ring-fence a percentage of its funds to support the development of innovation infrastructure in partnership with the private sector. (Recommendation, Paragraph 101)
32. UKRI should revise its Infrastructure Roadmap to include a detailed mapping of existing capabilities, identify underserved regions, and prioritise infrastructure development that supports economic resilience and long-term growth. (Recommendation, Paragraph 102)
33. We are concerned by an apparent tendency to place major new scientific institutions in London by default. This compounds the challenges other regions face in attracting and retaining graduates and skilled professionals, despite their world-class universities and thriving innovation hubs. Disparities in salaries, access to funding, and quality of public services contribute to the ongoing migration of talent to London. Infrastructure support can help address this imbalance. (Conclusion, Paragraph 103)
34. The Government should publish a Regional Graduate Retention Strategy, backed by investment and cross-department coordination. This should include support for university-industry collaboration to create high-skilled local employment, linked to analysis of public services such as housing, transport, and education – which are needed to create the conditions for graduates to build careers throughout the UK. (Recommendation, Paragraph 104)

Diffusion and absorption

35. The UK's strengths in cutting-edge science have been hampered by low rates of technology and innovation adoption, particularly among SMEs and in non-tech sectors. This is the low-hanging fruit of innovation policy: the investment needed to support businesses in adopting technologies could have a transformative economic impact in regions and sectors where adoption has been low. (Conclusion, Paragraph 113)

- 36.** Strategies to support increased industry adoption of technologies must have a regional focus, just as industries are largely regionally focused. This will require targeted interventions that identify high-potential clusters, provide long-term investment to deliver the infrastructure for them to flourish, foster the development of expert networks, and support regional economic growth. (Conclusion, Paragraph 114)
- 37.** The Government should prioritise the diffusion and adoption of innovation and technologies across the UK. This will require greater emphasis on building skills for smaller businesses; increased advice and support on regulatory matters for smaller businesses; making finance available to companies to adopt technologies, such as AI; and facilitating engagement between universities and local businesses. In its response to this report the Government should set out its plans to do this, including how it intends to scale up support for the Made Smarter Adoption programme to better engage SMEs and non-tech businesses across all regions. (Recommendation, Paragraph 115)
- 38.** The establishment of the Regulatory Innovation Office is a welcome recognition of the need to tackle regulatory barriers to innovation, particularly at the cutting edge. We believe that it can play a significant role in ensuring that innovation benefits the whole of the UK, beyond the and we will be closely tracking its development and impact. (Conclusion, Paragraph 118)
- 39.** The Regulatory Innovation Office should work with universities, SMEs, and spinouts to map the full pathway from research to market, identifying where disproportionate burdens or barriers exist. It should also publish a regional support strategy with measurable objectives and deliverables. (Recommendation, Paragraph 119)

Devolution

- 40.** Local leaders, including but not only mayoral authorities, are pivotal to regional innovation ecosystems and regional growth. Their proximity to stakeholders, understanding of their areas, and ability to convene cross-sector partnerships position them uniquely to drive growth. Devolved national, regional and local authorities could play a greater role in funding early-stage businesses, such as through initiatives to match UKRI funding. (Conclusion, Paragraph 129)
- 41.** The Local Innovation Partnerships Fund's ambition to give regions more control over innovation policy is welcome, but it falls short on scale, with just £500 million over five years, or around 0.5% of the science budget. (Conclusion, Paragraph 130)

42. The Government should, in its response to this report, and on an annual basis thereafter, set out a framework to clarify the roles and responsibilities of sub-national authorities in the innovation landscape, particularly in areas that do not yet have formal devolution arrangements. This framework should include guidance on strategic planning, data-sharing protocols, and mechanisms for cross-regional collaboration. It should create a model that ensures all regions, regardless of devolution status, can access strategic planning tools, funding, and representation in national innovation policy. (Recommendation, Paragraph 131)
43. The Government should commission an independent review examining the link between R&D, new businesses and growth in jobs and GDP since 2008, and task it with recommending how to make public investment in R&D increase productivity, growth, and jobs. This should use examples such as Greater Manchester as case studies in raising productivity, to identify lessons for other regions. (Recommendation, Paragraph 132)

Formal minutes

Wednesday 25 February 2026

Members present

Dame Chi Onwurah, in the Chair

Dr Allison Gardner

Kit Malthouse

Adam Thompson

Freddie van Mierlo

Martin Wrigley

Daniel Zeichner

Flying Blind: Innovation, Growth and the Regions

Draft Report (*Flying Blind: Innovation, Growth and the Regions*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

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

Paragraphs 1 to 132 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Third Report of the Committee to the House.

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

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134).

Adjournment

Adjourned till Wednesday 4 March at 9.00 a.m.

Witnesses

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

Tuesday 14 January 2025

Professor Irene Tracey CBE, Vice-Chancellor, The University of Oxford;
Dr David McBeth, Vice-Principal (Enterprise & Economic Transformation),
Dundee University; **Professor Ashutosh Tiwari FEng**, Deputy Vice-
President for Innovation, The University of Sheffield Q1-30

Martin McHugh, CEO, Compound Semiconductor Applications
Catapult; **Mike Wright**, Chair, West Midlands Innovation Board;
Professor Lou Cordwell OBE, Professor of Innovation and Chair of Greater
Manchester Business Board (LEP), The University of Manchester Q31-62

Tuesday 11 March 2025

Duncan Johnson, CEO, Northern Gritstone; **Irene Graham**
OBE, CEO, The ScaleUp Institute Q63-104

Henri Murison, CEO, Northen Powerhouse Partnership; **Dr Kath**
Mackay, Chief Scientific Officer, Bruntwood SciTech Q105-127

Tuesday 1 April 2025

Dan Norris MP, Mayor of the West of England, Mayoral Combined Authority;
Councillor Mary Ann Brocklesby, Cardiff Capital Region Chair and Leader,
Monmouthshire County Council; **Mayor Kim McGuinness**, Mayor of the North
East of England, North East Combined Authority Q128-154

Rt Hon Greg Clark, Chair, Warrick Innovation District; **Dr Natasha**
Boulding, CEO, Low Carbon Materials; **Dan Cathie**, CEO, Silveray Q155-186

Tuesday 6 May 2025

Neil Lee, Professor of Economic Geography, London School
of Economics (LSE); **Mathias Rauch**, Director and Chair of the Board,
Fraunhofer UK Q187-225

Louis Taylor, CEO, British Business Bank; **Kristen McLeod**, Chief Strategy Officer, British Business Bank Q226-274

Tuesday 10 June 2025

Professor Dame Jessica Corner, Executive Chair, Research England, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI); **Dean Cook**, Executive Director, Place and Global, Innovate UK, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Q275-312

The Lord Vallance of Balham KCB, Minister for Science, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology; **Holly Yates**, Director for Science, Research and Innovation, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology; **Oliver St John**, Deputy Director of Innovation Ecosystem, Department for Science, Innovation and Technology Q313-388

Published written evidence

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

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

1	AHRC Creative Communities	IGR0004
2	AIRTO - Association of Innovation, Research & Technology Organisations	IGR0083
3	Advanced Research and Invention Agency (ARIA)	IGR0037
4	Alzheimer's Research UK	GR0046
5	Bioindustry Association	IGR0108
6	Bird, Roz (CEO, Anglia Innovation Partners LLP)	IGR0007
7	Boardwave	IGR0030
8	British Business Bank	IGR0107
9	Brown, Dr David (Honorary Professor, Aston University)	IGR0011
10	Bruntwood SciTech	IGR0015
11	Campaign for Science and Engineering	IGR0008
12	Cancer Research UK	IGR0047
13	Careful Industries	IGR0086
14	Charles, Prof David (Professor, Northumbria University)	IGR0096
15	City-Region Economic Development Institute (City-REDI), University of Birmingham	IGR0021
16	Cleantech for UK	IGR0101
17	Competition and Markets Authority	IGR0074
18	Connected Places Catapult	IGR0065
19	Cowling, Professor Marc (Professor of Economics and Productivity, Oxford Brookes University)	IGR0077
20	Department for Science, Innovation and Technology	IGR0051
21	Digital Catapult	IGR0064
22	Engineering Professors' Council	IGR0050

23	Farrell, Dr Chris (Innovation Professional, Technology Matters)	IGR0038
24	GW4	IGR0071
25	GuildHE	IGR0053
26	Health Innovation Kent Surrey Sussex	IGR0089
27	High Value Manufacturing Catapult	IGR0082
28	Imperial College London	IGR0098
29	Institute of Physics	IGR0072
30	Institution of Mechanical Engineers	IGR0049
31	Kao Data	IGR0029
32	LabCorp	IGR0020
33	Lancaster University	IGR0009
34	Lee, Professor Neil (Professor of Economic Geography, LSE)	IGR0010
35	London Higher	IGR0100
36	Make UK	IGR0023
37	Mastercard	IGR0085
38	Mazzucato, Professor Mariana (Professor in Economics of Public Value and Innovation, Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose (IIPP), University College London (UCL))	IGR0105
39	McCarthy, Professor Helen (Chief Scientific Adviser, Northern Ireland Executive)	IGR0104
40	McDowall, Stuart (Head of Innovation and STEM, City of Glasgow College - Submitted on behalf of Glasgow City Regional Colleges Innovation programme (CLIC))	IGR0052
41	Midlands Aerospace Alliance	IGR0093
42	Mulligan, Dr Kevin (Lecturer in Strategy, Queen's University Belfast)	IGR0001
43	N8 Research Partnership	IGR0034
44	National Centre for Universities and Business (NCUB)	IGR0084
45	National Composites Centre (NCC), part of the High Value Manufacturing Catapult	IGR0056
46	National Innovation Centre for Rural Enterprise	IGR0092
47	National Network Institutes of Technology	IGR0002
48	National Physical Laboratory (NPL)	IGR0061
49	Newcastle University	IGR0039

50	Nordberg, Mr Tony	IGR0042
51	Norris, Mr Dan	IGR0022
52	Northern Health Science Alliance; and University of Liverpool	IGR0075
53	Northern Health Science Alliance; and University of Liverpool	IGR0090
54	Norwich Research Park	IGR0028
55	Organon Pharma UK	IGR0063
56	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) UK	IGR0041
57	Plexal	IGR0091
58	Policy Evidence Unit for University Commercialisation and Innovation, University of Cambridge	IGR0073
59	Praetura Ventures	IGR0102
60	Royal Academy of Engineering	IGR0014
61	Royal College of Physicians	IGR0024
62	Royal Society of Chemistry	IGR0031
63	Russell Group	IGR0032
64	Salford Business School, University of Salford	IGR0059
65	Satellite Applications Catapult	IGR0055
66	Science Creates	IGR0088
67	Smartkem Ltd	IGR0005
68	Sodali & Co	IGR0097
69	Space Forge	IGR0003
70	Startup Coalition	IGR0057
71	TechUK	IGR0066
72	The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry	IGR0006
73	The D Group	IGR0095
74	The Growing Together Alliance	IGR0062
75	The Institute of Biomedical Science	IGR0027
76	The Pandemic Institute	IGR0068
77	The Research and Development Society	IGR0012
78	The Scottish Government	IGR0099
79	The University of Manchester and the Industrial Biotechnology Innovation Catalyst	IGR0106

80	Treadwell, Ms Jenevieve (Policy Fellow, Leading for London, London School of Economics)	IGR0094
81	UCL	IGR0018
82	UK Research and Innovation	IGR0033
83	UK Tech Cluster Group	IGR0016
84	Universities UK	IGR0060
85	Universities Wales	IGR0025
86	University of Bristol	IGR0078
87	University of Cambridge	IGR0080
88	University of Edinburgh	IGR0043
89	University of Huddersfield	IGR0036
90	University of Liverpool	IGR0070
91	University of Manchester	IGR0019
92	University of Nottingham	IGR0058
93	University of Oxford	IGR0076
94	University of Southampton	IGR0048
95	University of Sussex	IGR0067
96	West Midlands Combined Authority	IGR0054
97	West Yorkshire Combined Authority	IGR0045
98	Western Gateway	IGR0035
99	Whittle, Dr Richard	IGR0079
100	Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership	IGR0017
101	Yates, Mr John	IGR0013
102	Yorkshire Cancer Research	IGR0026
103	Yorkshire Universities	IGR0044

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the publications page of the Committee's website.

Session 2024–26

Number	Title	Reference
2nd	Social media, misinformation and harmful algorithms	HC 441
1st	Pre-appointment hearing for the Executive Chair of Innovate UK	HC 834
3rd Special	Social media, misinformation and harmful algorithms: Government and Ofcom responses	HC 1397
2nd Special	Insect decline and UK food security: Government Response	HC 717
1st Special	Governance of artificial intelligence (AI): Government Response	HC 591