SCIENCE AND INNOVATION: FUTURE RELATIONS WITH EU INSTITUTIONS

Thank you for your letter of 16 May concerning the current state of negotiations regarding our membership or access to science-related EU institutions and agencies. Your letter raised questions about a wide number of EU bodies and agencies, and I hope you will appreciate I am unable to reply in detail about each of them at this point in the negotiations.

We are seeking the broadest and deepest possible partnership with the EU, and our relationship with the EU’s agencies and bodies upon exit is being evaluated on this basis. Where there is a clear national interest in a future relationship with an agency, the Government is considering how we will pursue this. The terms of any possible association, including provisions for UK participation in associated agencies and bodies, will form part of the negotiations in the next phase.

As the Prime Minister set out in her speech on science and modern Industrial Strategy in May this year, the UK would like the option to fully associate ourselves with the excellence-based European science and innovation programmes – including the successor to Horizon 2020 and Euratom Research and Training. The Government has also published a slide pack entitled Framework for the UK-EU partnership: Science, Research and Innovation since then. This presentation sets out the UK’s desire for a far-reaching science and innovation pact with the EU, covering dialogue, programmes, infrastructure, information exchange, and regulation and ethics.¹

You refer to the Prime Minister's Mansion House speech in March this year. In this speech she also emphasised that we must ensure that, as now, products only need to undergo one series of approvals, in one country, to show that they meet the required regulatory standards. That is one particular reason that we want to explore with the EU the terms on which we could remain part of EU agencies such as those that are critical for the chemicals, medicines and aerospace industries: the European Medicines Agency (EMA), the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), and the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA).

Associate membership is one option we are considering. The UK would, of course, accept that this would mean abiding by the rules of those agencies and making an appropriate financial contribution. This would be one way to meet our objective of ensuring that these products need to undergo only one series of approvals, in one country. We also believe that it is of benefit to both sides for the UK to have a close association with Euratom.

A number of the agencies listed in your letter, such as the European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA), the Research Executive Agency (REA), and the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI), for instance, are intimately related to the ongoing participation in EU programmes for research and innovation, such as Horizon 2020 and its successor programme Horizon Europe.

Additionally, many of the agencies listed in your letter already have established precedents for third country participation. Of course, we would also need to ensure that UK access was provided on a fair basis, including looking beyond existing third country precedents where appropriate and recognising the potential scale of UK involvement. We welcome the constructive discussions that are starting to take place.

Thank you for taking the time to write and I do hope that you find this information useful.

Yours ever,

STEVE BAKER MP
PARLIAMENTARY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXITING THE EUROPEAN UNION