

## Minute of the Technology Group, 05 Feb 2010

**BIS Conference Centre, 1 Victoria Street, London, SW1**

### **Attendees:**

Jerry Hardcastle, Nissan (Chair)	Jane Whewell, BIS
John Batterbee, ETI	Andrew Everett, TSB
Jon Beasley, GKN	Robin Haycock, OLEV
Hugh Blaxill, MAHLE	John Kell, UKTI
Catherine Coates, EPSRC	Paul Mullins, BIS
Brian Collins, DfT/BIS	
John Cooper, BP	
David Densley, Scottish and Southern	
Andrew Everett, TSB	
Erik Fairbairn, Infracharge	
Steve Faulkner, Caterpillar	
Nick Fell, TATA	
Miguel Fragoso, Millbrook	
Tony Harper, JLR	
Graham Hoare, Ford	
David Hytch, Greater Manchester PTE	
Neville Jackson, Ricardo	
Allan McKenzie, SMMT	
Charles Morgan, Morgan	
Don Newton, AXEON	
Theo Quick, Logica	
Tony Spillaine, SAIC	
Stephen Stacey, Toyota	
Calvey Taylor-Haw, Elektromotive	
Henri Winand, Intelligent Energy	
Simon Wood, Lotus	

### **Apologies:**

Kevin Austin, GLA  
Tudor Brown, ARM Holdings  
Robert Evans, CENEX  
Andrew Graves, University of Bath  
Brian Gush, Bentley  
Jim Sumner, Optare

### **Agenda Item 1: Chairs' Introduction**

The **Chair** opened the meeting and thanked members for their time and commitment to the Technology Group. The Chair set out that the Group and Council is working jointly with Government to ensure the UK develops a strong position in the development and exploitation of emerging automotive technologies.

### **Agenda Item 2: HMG Update/Test Bed UK**

**Jane Whewell** noted the strong support of Ministers for the objectives of the Group. The Group's work will help inform Government priorities.

The Test Bed UK concept was developed by NAIGT, but needs clearer definition. The discussion paper (TC050210/01) was intended to provide a high level starting point - but the Group will have a key role in developing it further, particularly in

relation to the low carbon agenda. However, TestBed UK is not limited to low carbon and other stakeholders will have an important role in shaping the concept.

During the discussions the following points were made:

- TestBed UK will be a powerful statement of the UK's capabilities
- Were there to be a wish for a web-site, OLEV has acquired the relevant domains;
- The set up cost for an R&D intensive company can be very high. Providing or signposting methods for low cost entry into the UK would help. Also important to ensure that potential investors are aware of the existing infrastructure that would support any investment and ensure there are ongoing policies to reduce investment costs
- The TestBed UK paper should also reflect that major manufacturers from China are investing in the UK

[**ACTION 1:** Members to forward comments on draft TestBed UK paper to Automotive Council Secretariat].

### **Agenda Item 3: Technology Group – The Way Forward**

The **Chair** presented Paper TC 050210/02 to the Group setting out four proposed priority areas for UK automotive industry technology development, identified on the basis of the TSB 'UK Capability Study'.

During discussions the following points were made:

- The UK has a wide range of companies conducting R&D on electric motors. However, by promoting collaboration amongst many of the smaller companies working in this area the UK could significantly enhance its capabilities.
- The TSB promotion of consortia bidding should be effective in encouraging such collaboration.
- Increasing demand in the developing world will lead to a greater emphasis on developing efficiency in heavy duty vehicles.
- Medium and heavy duty commercial vehicles do not currently feature in the roadmaps
- The Technology Group needs to set some specific outcome targets for its work
- Energy conversion devices could be added to the strategic technologies identified in Paper TC 050210/02. The UK has existing strength in this area and it is one where the City is willing to invest
- Infrastructure development should remain an issue for the Group
- Where possible the Group should work to link its priorities with existing EPSRC funding streams and vice versa
- Although other countries have a competitive advantage vis-à-vis electric powertrain development, the UK does have good capabilities in some areas such as transmission systems.
- Innovative small manufacturers often get overlooked for funding support due to their small scale and therefore find it very difficult to cover development costs
- Need to ensure Local Authorities and other wider stakeholders share automotive technology priorities
- ITS could be added to the 4 strategic technology areas

#### **Agenda Item 4: TSB UK Capability Study**

The Chair invited Dave Greenwood of Ricardo to set out the strategy for publishing the TSB UK Capability Study.

[**ACTION 2:** Auto Council Secretariat to distribute details of Dave Greenwood's presentation to Group members alongside meeting minutes. Members to provide feedback directly to Dave ([David.Greenwood@ricardo.com](mailto:David.Greenwood@ricardo.com)) and copy replies to Auto Council Secretariat].

During the discussions the following points were made:

- The UK needs to be careful not to exclude some areas of valuable research that are currently only on a small scale and may not be categorised by the study as an area of key strength.
- The UK should seek to re-aggregate raw materials to enhance downstream industries.
- The data set used to identify areas of strength and less developed capabilities in the UK Capability Study may need to be refreshed to ensure the ongoing validity of the data.

#### **Agenda Item 5: Collaboration with Universities**

The Chair invited Brian Collins to present Paper No TC050210/03.

During the discussions the following points were raised:

- John Armitt, EPSRC Chair is keen to engage with the Technology Group
- EPSRC will soon release a single source of data concerning what R&D is being carried out by which universities.
- Lord Adonis has asked Brian Collins to conduct a strategic review of ITS
- Universities have in the past shown some resistance to being guided by industry regarding their research focus. There is a need for universities to focus on where there will be the most impact from their research
- Brian Collins and EPSRC to organise a number of show and tell events around the 4 strategic technology areas
- Important to get universities to collaborate more rather than compete.

[**ACTION 3:** Brian Collins/EPSRC to develop approach to 'show and tell' events aligned to 4 strategic technologies areas]

#### **Agenda Item 6: Discussion Groups**

##### **Group 1: Roadmaps and Testbed UK**

###### Roadmaps

- Currently passenger-car centric
- Recommendation: consider working up adding commercial vehicles
  - Medium and Heavy Duty, including off – road

###### Test Bed UK

- Issue to be aware of when considering "Testbed UK"
  - Co-ordinated action to focus resources
  - Create most attractive centre for investment
  - Be aware of the competition

- Listen to the needs of the investors
- Need strong leadership
- Publicise

Focus on ITS as a specific Testbed

## **Group2: Collaboration with Universities**

### **Situation**

- £10's of millions being spent in universities but there is a need to focus on the 4 Technology Group priority areas
- Some "structures" (e.g. Composites centre) being formed which have relevance but D&T not fully connected
- Too many Universities claim to have relevance. Industry struggles to engage
- No one university department has the critical mass to compete globally
- Sometimes poor quality capability from an industry perspective
- No focus on delivery. Not run as "R&D" departments
- Little people/skills transfer from Universities to Industry or visa versa
- Little or no "eco-system" for Industry/University innovation

## **Group 3: Energy and Infrastructure**

- ROI is over the long term. Govt policy can provide certainty to allow investment
- Legislation driven policy
  - i.e. Co2
- Broad choices need to be made
- Capital and money to make change [ 20-30 year time frame]
- Engagement with capital markets vital
- Is the business case good?
- Is setting standards early the way to go?
- Social change

## **Technology and Supply Groups Joint Working**

### **Current**

- Supply Chain Group has met – now starting to develop work plans [next informal meeting 25/02]
- Re-Industrialisation opportunity
- But in which areas = Technology group feedback
- Recognise different engagement between Research and Design and normal business supply
- Recognition of OEM – SME Research and Design "Bridge" gap
- Supply chain previously focussed on efficiency, low cost, lean, cost reduction, down sizing and therefore it is now harder to become R&D focused

### **Issues**

- How do OEMs assess capability /identify best players?
- OEM = good idea "bridge" Tier 1's??
- Framework for "joint research" [big and little working together] – multiple partner interest = issues with integrated complexity
  - ↓
- Core research verses differentiating controls
  - ↓
- Technology incubators

- Leveraging – Aero/Auto Niche/Motorsport

[**ACTION 4:** Chair to send to members a proposal setting out working group topics but will aim to assess worth of pursuing each topic from response to Action 4.

[**ACTION 5:** Members to reply to Chair re their willingness to participate in and/or lead working groups]

The meeting closed at 12.00pm

**Automotive Council Secretariat**  
**05 February 2010**

**Summary list of actions**

Action	Responsibility	Date Action Created	Deadline
<b>ACTION 1:</b> Members to forward comments on draft TestBed UK paper to Automotive Council Secretariat	Members	<b>5 Feb</b>	<b>26 Feb</b>
<b>ACTION 2:</b> Auto Council Secretariat to distribute details of Dave Greenwood's presentation to Group members alongside meeting minutes. Members to provide feedback back directly to Dave ( <a href="mailto:David.Greenwood@ricardo.com">David.Greenwood@ricardo.com</a> ) and copy replies to Auto Council Secretariat	Secretariat/Members	<b>5 Feb</b>	<b>26 Feb</b>
<b>ACTION 3:</b> Brian Collins/EPSRC to develop approach to 'show and tell' events aligned to 4 strategic technologies areas	Brian Collins/EPSRC	<b>5 Feb</b>	<b>5 Mar</b>
<b>ACTION 4:</b> Chair to send to members a proposal setting out working group topics	Chair	<b>5 Feb</b>	<b>26 Feb</b>
<b>ACTION 5:</b> Members to reply to Chair re the willingness to participate in and/or lead working groups	Members	<b>5 Feb</b>	<b>5 Mar</b>