

Survey response for Chile

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Chile to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <https://stip.oecd.org/resgov>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;

Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CCHEN	Comisión Chilena de Energía Nuclear Chilean Nuclear Energy Commission
CNID	Consejo Nacional de Innovación para el Desarrollo National Innovation Council for Development
CONICYT	Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research
CORFO	Corporación de Fomento de la Producción Foundation for Promoting Development
CRUCH	Consejo de Rectores de las Universidades Council of University Rectors
FIC	Fondo de Innovación y Competitividad Innovation for Competitiveness Fund
FONDAP	Fondo de Financiamiento de Centros de Investigación en Áreas Prioritarias Fund for Advanced Research in Priority Areas
FONDECYT	Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development
FONDEF	Fondo de Fomento al Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico Scientific and Technological Development Promotion Fund
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
INFOR	Instituto Forestal Forestry Institute
INIA	Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias Agricultural and Livestock Institute
INN	Instituto Nacional de Normalización National Institute for Standardisation
MINECON	Ministerio de Economía, Fomento y Turismo Ministry of Economy, Development and Tourism
MINEDUC	Ministerio de Educación Ministry of Education
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).</p> <p><i>(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)</i></p> <p>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?</p> <p>References: CNID (2017), <i>El Consejo</i>, webpage, Available at: http://www.cnid.cl/el-consejo-2/ (accessed 06 March 2017). EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Response B1. OECD (2007), "The Role of Government", in <i>OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007</i>, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 167-173. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en</p>	<p>a and b) In Chile, the National Innovation Council for Development (Consejo Nacional de Innovación para el Desarrollo, CNID) decides on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of research and innovation funding for HEIs and PRIs. The priorities as set out by the Council also define the scientific and thematic scope of public calls for projects by Chilean funding agencies, notably the National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research (Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica, CONICYT) and the Foundation for Promoting Development (Corporación de Fomento de la Producción, CORFO) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B1).</p> <p>c) Missing answer.</p> <p>d) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> In 2005, the National Innovation Council for Strategic Competitiveness was established; it changed its name to National Innovation Council for Development (CNID) in 2006. CNID was established to define national research priorities of STI policy. In 2008, it introduced the national STI strategy in which it formulates national priorities of STI policy.</p>

Q.1.2. Who allocates **institutional block funding** to a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)

c) Who allocates **project-based funding** of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs?
(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)

d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?

e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?

f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?

a and b) In Chile, the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) allocates institutional funding (i.e. block grants) to HEIs while sectoral ministries allocate institutional funding to PRIs.

MINEDUC provides block grants to 25 public HEIs in Chile. Public block grants cover 25% of public HEIs revenues. HEIs finance themselves predominantly from non-government References, notably tuition fees which make up 75% of non-government income (OECD 2007, pp. 139-142).

Regarding PRIs, sectoral ministries provide block grants for public PRIs, notably the Ministry of Agriculture for the Agricultural and Livestock Institute (Instituto de Investigaciones Agropecuarias, INIA) and the Forestry Institute (Instituto Forestal, INFOR); the Ministry of Economy for the National Institute for Standardisation (Instituto Nacional de Normalización, INN) & Instituto de Fomento Pesquero (IFOP); the Ministry of Energy for the Chilean Nuclear Energy Commission (Comisión Chilena de Energía Nuclear, CCHEN); the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Instituto Antártico Chileno (INACH); the Ministry of Mining for Servicio Nacional de Geología y Minería (SERNAGEOMIN); and the Ministry of Defense for Servicio Hidrográfico y Oceanográfico de la Armada (SHOA) (OECD 2007, pp. 139-142, MINECON 2017).

c) Funds for research and/or innovation projects, i.e. competitive grants, are allocated by the national agencies CONICYT and CORFO. Public funding for research and innovation consist mainly of competitive grants.

Competitive grants for research and innovation of CONICYT and CORFO are the main source of income to fund research and innovation at HEIs and PRIs. CONICYT's main funds are the National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development (Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico, FONDECYT) that provides funding for research projects, the Fund for Advanced Research in Priority Areas (Fondo de Financiamiento de Centros de Investigación en Áreas Prioritarias, FONDAP) for research groups and the Scientific and Technological Development Promotion Fund (Fondo de Fomento al Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico, FONDEF) for joint R&D with industry. MINECON's Millennium Scientific Initiative is an important funding source for centres of research excellence (OECD 2007, pp. 139-142).

CONICYT is under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education (Ministerio de Educación, MINEDUC). CORFO sits under the Ministry of Economy, Development and Tourism (Ministerio de Economía, Fomento y Turismo, MINECON), and receives funding from the Innovation for Competitiveness Fund (Fondo de Innovación y Competitividad, FIC).

d) Moreover, HEIs and PRIs in Chile are eligible for additional funding from grants from the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) (OECD 2007, pp. 167-173).

e) Missing answer.

f) No major changes made.

References:

OECD (2007), "Innovation Actors in Chile", in *OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007*, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 139-147. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en>

OECD (2007), "The Role of Government", in *OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007*, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 167-173. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en>

MINECON (2017), *Cuadros descriptivos GBARD 2014-2015 (ITP)*, webpage (Spanish), Available at: <http://www.economia.gob.cl/estudios-y-encuestas/encuestas/encuestas-de-innovacion-e-id/creditos-presupuestarios-publicos-para-id/creditos-presupuestarios-publicos-para-id-gbard-2014-2015>

Q.1.3. Do performance contracts determine funding of a) HEIs?

Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)

b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?

c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?

d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?

e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?

f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?

g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?

h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?

(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Response C4.

OECD (2007), "Innovation Actors in Chile", in *OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007*, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 139-147. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en>

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key evaluation criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Response C4.

Ley N° 18956 (Spanish) Available at: <https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=30325&idParte=>

a to f) There are no performance agreements between national ministry or agency level and institutions in place that determine future funding of HEIs and PRIs.

g) Other mechanism in place to allocate funding to HEI and PRI are block grants (AFD [Art. 2 DFL N° 4 from 1981] and AFI [Art. 3 DFL N° 4 from 1981] & competitive funds for HEI; and regular funding (direct funding from the national budget) & competitive funds.

h) *Changes over 2005-2016*

Currently, a major reform of higher education funding is under discussion (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, **response C4**).

a to c) For HEI, the institution responsible of these functions is the Ministry of Education.

d to f) On the other hand, for the PRI the institution responsible of setting criteria, evaluation and monitoring is the ministry in charge of the PRI, e.g: the Ministry of Energy is responsible of these functions in the case of CCHEN.

h) *Changes over 2005-2016*

The current government aims to implement a comprehensive reform of the higher education system which will involve changes in terms of incentives to conduct research at universities (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, **response C4**).

Q.1.5. Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

The National Innovation Council for Development (CNID) was established in 2005 to overcome governance fragmentation. See also responses 2.1 to 2.4

CNID was established to provide a platform for policy coordination within government in order to overcome the fragmentation of governance. CNID sets policy directions and interventions, while CONICYT and CORFO concentrate on the design and implementation of instruments and programmes (NESTA, 2016). In addition, there is a bill that will be processed at the congress to create a Ministry of Science & Technology.

References:

NESTA (2016), *How innovation agencies work: International lessons to inspire and inform national strategies*, NESTA Policy Report, p. 52, Available at https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/how_innovation_agencies_work.pdf (accessed 06 March 2017).

OECD (2007), "The Role of Government", in *OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007*, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 167-173. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en>

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? <p>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p><i>References:</i> <i>CNID (2017), El Consejo, webpage, Available at: http://www.cnid.cl/el-consejo-2/ (accessed 06 March 2017).</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Responses B1.</i></p>	<p>a and b) The National Innovation Council for Development (Consejo Nacional de Innovación para el Desarrollo, CNID) is the main research and innovation council.</p> <p>CNID was established in 2005 to overcome governance fragmentation; it was established as the National Innovation Council for Competitiveness; it changed its name to CNID in 2006.</p> <p>c) Missing answer.</p>
<p>Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?</p> <p><i>References:</i> <i>CNID (2017), El Consejo, webpage, Available at: http://www.cnid.cl/el-consejo-2/ (accessed 06 March 2017).</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Responses B1.</i></p>	<p>a to e) CNID's mandate includes the preparation of strategic priority setting, policy co-ordination within government and the provision of policy advice to the President of Chile with regard to science, technology and innovation policy as well as policies supporting the country's competitiveness and development. It makes proposals to the President with regard to national STI strategies and their implementation. In 2008, it formulated the national STI strategy and reviewed it in 2013 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B4).</p> <p>In terms of policy co-ordination, it serves as a platform for exchange between ministries and agencies, i.e. the MINECON, MINEDUC and its Innovation Division, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Agriculture, CONYCIT, CORFO, InvestChile and the National Institute for Industrial Property.</p>
<p>Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts</p> <p><i>References:</i> <i>CNID (2017), Consejeros, webpage, Available at: http://www.cnid.cl/los-consejeros/ (accessed 06 March 2017).</i></p>	<p>a to j) The Council includes the Minister of Economy, Development and Tourism, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance; government officials such as the director of the Innovation Division at MINECON; representatives from government agencies such as CONYCIT and CORFO; and representatives from HEIs and civil society.</p>

<p>Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) staff and/or its own b) budget? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.</p>	<p>a and b) The Council has a staff of 16 and has its own budget (1,512.208 MM Chilean pesos) in 2016.</p>
<p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?</p>	<p>c) The Council was established in 2005.</p> <p>MINECON and MINEDUC have very different approaches and processes around common themes between CORFO and CONICYT, which has impeded coordination at the agency level. To overcome the fragmentation of governance between CORFO and CONICYT, CNID was established as a platform for policy coordination within government in 2005. It was established as the National Innovation Council for Competitiveness but changed its name to CNID in 2014. CNID sets policy directions and interventions, while CONICYT and CORFO concentrate on the design and implementation of instruments and programmes. The agencies outsource the delivery of many of their support programmes to Chilean public agencies, regional governments, industry associations or public and private research institutes (NESTA, 2016).</p>

References:

CNID (2017), *El Consejo*, webpage, Available at: <http://www.cnid.cl/el-consejo-2/> (accessed 06 March 2017).

CNID (2017), *Secretaría Ejecutiva*, webpage, Available at: <http://www.cnid.cl/el-consejo-2/secretaria-ejecutiva/> (accessed 06 March 2017).

DIPRES (2017) webpage (Spanish), Available at: http://www.dipres.gob.cl/595/articles-152635_doc_pdf.pdf

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Responses B1.

NESTA (2016), *How innovation agencies work: International lessons to inspire and inform national strategies*, NESTA Policy Report, p. 52, Available at https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/how_innovation_agencies_work.pdf (accessed 06 March 2017).

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan? b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p>	<p>a and b) The strategic document “Science, Technology and Innovation for a New Pact of Sustainable and Inclusive Development” the main STI strategy in Chile. It contains policy guidelines for the medium- to longer term and was introduced in 2017 by the CNID (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses B1).</p>
<p><i>References:</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Response B1.</i></p>	
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities? a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; “green innovation”; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.) – Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0) – Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change) – Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science) – Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility) – Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development) b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agriculture and agricultural technologies – Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies) – Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies) – ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy) – Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems) c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies) d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020) e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.) f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?</p>	<p>a and b) The strategy defines STI priorities and makes reference to societal challenges: Energy and global warming; health; and education; demographic change; and the digital economy. In the field of energy and global warming, it identifies research on energy systems and renewable energies as policy priorities; in the field of health it formulates guidelines for research on personalised medicine and regenerative medicine.</p> <p>c to e) Missing answer.</p> <p>f) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> In 2017, the CNID presented the new national STI strategy that covers the period 2018-2030.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> <i>CNID (2018), “Ciencias, Tecnologías, e Innovación Para un Nuevo Pacto de Desarrollo Sostenible e Inclusivo”, website, Available at http://www.cnid.cl/home-cnid/que-hacemos-en-el-cnid/orientaciones-estrategicas-periodo-2014-2018/estrategia/ (accessed 13 September 2018).</i></p>	
<p>Q.2.7. What reforms to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?</p>	<p>Missing answer.</p>

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.8. Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?</p> <p><i>(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)</i></p>	<p>At this moment, there is no inter-agency joint programme between CONICYT & CORFO (the Technology Development and Innovation programme was closed by the reasons explained on the background information).</p> <p>The Technology Development and Innovation programme was implemented in 2001 using joint programming: The director of CONICYT sat in the board of CORFO, while the director of CORFO was represented in the board of CONICYT. The top-down approach to inter-agency joint programming did not show the expected results due to a perceived lack of coordination at the level of programme design, missing arrangements for mutual learning from best practices regarding programme management, and the lack of joint funding arrangements of CONICYT and CORFO which limited the scope of co-ordination (OECD, 2007, p. 183).</p>
<p><i>References:</i> OECD (2007), "The Role of Government", in <i>OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007</i>, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 183. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en</p>	
<p>Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the mandate of agencies?</p> <p>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?</p>	<p>a) Policy co-ordination is not within the mandate of CONICYT and CORFO. CNID has the mandate for policy co-ordination within government. But, there are representatives of CONICYT in the different committees of CORFO, while there are representatives of CORFO in the different committees of CONICYT. This helps in coordination between the agencies.</p> <p>b) No major changes made.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> OECD (2007), "The Role of Government", in <i>OECD Reviews of Innovation Policy: Chile 2007</i>, OECD Publishing, Paris, pp. 167-173. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264037526-7-en</p>	
<p>Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? (i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations <p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? (i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) 	<p>a) Representatives from the private sector, HEIs and civil society take part in CNID and participate in the formulation of national STI priorities informing scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities.</p> <p>CNID includes representatives from academia (Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, University of Talca), small and medium-sized firms (Aguamarina S.A), large firms (Oracle, Resiter S.A.), ministries (the Minister of Economy, Development and Tourism, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Finance), ministry representatives (the director of the Innovation Division of MINECON), government agencies (the president of CONICYT, the vice president of CORFO, the director of InvestChile, and the director of the National Institute for Industrial Property), and civil society (Chilean Business Association, Fundación Chile, Fundación Superación de la Pobreza, Fundación RAD, and Wildlife Conservation Society Chile)</p> <p>b) Public HEIs (e.g. University of Chile and the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile) do not include external stakeholders in their governing councils: The Council of University of Chile consists of the university rector, vice-rectors and faculty deans, as well as a representative of the President of Chile; The Council of The Pontifical Catholic University of Chile does not include external stakeholders.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> CNID (2017), <i>Consejeros</i>, webpage (Spanish), Available at: http://www.cnid.cl/los-consejeros/ (accessed 06 March 2017). Pontifical Catholic University of Chile (2017), <i>Organization</i>, website, Available at: http://www.uc.cl/en/the-university/organizacion (accessed 06 March 2017). University of Chile (2017), <i>Misión y visión estratégica de la Universidad de Chile</i>, website (Spanish), Available at: http://www.uchile.cl/portal/presentacion/institucionalidad/39635/mision-y-vision (accessed 06 March 2017).</p>	
<p>Q.3.2. a) Are there online consultation platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?</p>	<p>a and b) Missing answer.</p> <p>c) Missing answer.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	<p>Missing answer.</p>

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.4. Who decides about allocations of institutional block funding for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)</i></p>	<p>a) It depends on the nature of the university or institute. If the university it is a public institution, this decision is responsibility of the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, if the university it is a private institution, this decisions is responsibility of the institution themselves (autonomy of the institution).</p> <p>b) It depends on the Ministry in charge of the PRI.</p>
<p>Q.3.5. Who decides about recruitment of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)</i></p>	<p>a, c, and e) HEI: It depends on the nature of the university or institute. If the university it is a public institution, this decision is responsibility of the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, if the university it is a private institution, this decisions is responsibility of the institution themselves (autonomy of the institution).</p> <p>b, d, and f) PRI: It depends on the Ministry in charge of the PRI.</p>
<p>Who decides about salaries of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)</i></p>	
<p>Who decides about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)</i></p>	

Q.3.6. Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. **spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

- HEI
- Research unit / laboratory within HEI
- Researchers

c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?

Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?

a and c) HEIs have autonomy to determine the creation of academic departments (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. technology transfer offices). For the rest of the questions, it depends on the nature of the university or institute. If the university it is a public institution, this decision is responsibility of the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, if the university it is a private institution, this decisions is responsibility of the institution themselves (autonomy of the institution).

b and d) Missing answer.

a and b) Both, HEI and PRI, set their own schemes of revenues stemming from IP.

c) A higher education reform is in planning but there have been no major reforms of HEIs since 1982.

The current government aims to implement a comprehensive reform of the higher education funding which is still in development stage. The reform will involve changes in terms of financing and incentives to universities for research (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, **response C4**).

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Chile. Response C4.