

Survey response for Japan

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Japan 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

CSTI	Council for Science, Technology and Innovation
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
IP	Intellectual Property
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
MIC	Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
R&D	Research and development
S&T	Science and technology
STI	Science, technology and innovation

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: CSTP (2016), About the CSTP, Available at: http://www8.cao.go.jp/cstp/english/panhu/1_p1-2.pdf (accessed 10 November 2016)</p>	<p>a and b) The Council for Science and Technology Policy (CSTP) sets policy priorities for STI and budget allocations for HEIs and PRIs in Japan. Ministries and agencies design programs based on the priorities and policies set out by the CSTP.</p> <p>c) The CSTI provides policy advice, evaluations of policies, discusses budgets, and is in charge of planning, strategic guidance and policy coordination with regard to STI policy across the Japanese government.</p> <p>d) No major changes made.</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) Block funding for HEIs (so called Management Expenses Grants) is allocated by MEXT based on, among other criteria, the number of students, and the university's status of reform. The criteria are decided by MEXT.

b) Sectoral Ministries allocate budget to PRIs.

c) The MEXT provides project-based funding. Some of the grants are provided to the grantees directly by the ministries themselves, and some are provided by the agencies under the ministries. In 2003, agencies that used to be subsidiaries of ministries ("quasi-governmental or subsidiary organisations") became independent. However, it is still the ministries that set up competitive R&D programs, in particular MEXT (around 55% of overall government appropriations for research and development).

d and e) HEIs do not receive significant funding from transnational bodies.

f) Based on the structure of the funding agency DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Bureau) in the United States, programme managers at the MEXT and its agencies received greater autonomy over research topics and budgets in 2013.

References:

MEXT (2016), website,

www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chousa/koutou/062/gijiroku/icsFiles/afidfile/2014/11/10/1353375_3_2.pdf, p.18, (Japanese), (accessed 11 February 2016).

Cabinet Secretariat (2016) website, www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/doppou_kaikaku/dai3/siryu1-1.pdf, p. 1, (Japanese), (accessed 29 September 2016).

Application Guidelines of Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (2016), website,

www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shinkou/hojyo/boshu/icsFiles/afidfile/2015/09/01/1361248_1.pdf, (Japanese), accessed 30 September 2016

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.)

a) Performance contracts are in place.

b) Missing answer.

c and d) They include quantitative indicators. Each HEIs prepares a strategy with concrete steps for the achievement of its targets and defines indicators. They mainly include number of graduates, research outcomes in fields with competitive advantages of the university, excellence in education and research excellence, international scientific collaboration, etc.

e) Contracts are made with each university separately.

f) Criteria and targets apply to individual HEIs.

g) Competitive funding of research and research projects commissioned by Ministries

h) No major changes made.

<p>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?</p>	<p>a, c and e) The National University Corporation Evaluation Committee which part of MEXT sets criteria used for institutional evaluations. b, d, and f) Missing answer.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>h) University reforms 2004 and 2015: In 2004, Japanese public universities were transformed into corporations. Every University has to pass medium-term plans which specify their objectives with regard to education and research, and monitor and evaluate their performance for a five year period (term), i.e. first mid-term (2004- 2009), second mid-term (2010-2015), and third mid-term (2016-2021).</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>In 2015, the National University Reform Plan redefined the mission of universities, including a stronger emphasis on science-industry linkages. The plan requires changes to university governance, in particular strengthening the powers of the university president. It introduced changes to the salary system at HEIs giving them more powers over setting of salaries.</p> <p>With regard to PRIs, Incorporated Administrative Agencies were established in 2001, such as e.g. the National Research and Development Agency. Their mandate includes bridging the gap between research and the market.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> MEXT (2016), www.mext.go.jp/component/b_menu/shingi/toushin/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2013/12/06/1342119_1.pdf, (accessed, 03 October 2016). MIC (2016), website, www.soumu.go.jp/main_sosiki/hyouka/dokuritu_n/index.html, (Japanese), (accessed, 03 October 2016). Cabinet office (2016), http://www8.cao.go.jp/hyouka/dokuritsu/iinkai/057/shiryu1.pdf, p. 2, (Japanese), (accessed 14.October 2016).</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>University reforms 2004 and 2015 (see response to question 1.4.h)</p>
<p><i>References:</i> MEXT (2016), www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/detail/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2015/10/01/1362382_1.pdf, pp. 3 & 9, (Japanese), (accessed 07 October 2016). MEXT (2016), www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/qijiyutu/qijiyutu22/siryu/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2014/11/27/1353348_4_1.pdf, p. 28, (Japanese), (accessed 07 October 2016).</p>	

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> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Japan. Response B4_2. Act for Establishment of the Cabinet Office (2016), Article 26, http://law.e-gov.go.jp/htmlldata/H11/H11HO089.html, (Japanese), (accessed 12 February 2016). Brochure of the Council for Science, Technology and Innovation (2016), website, www8.cao.go.jp/cstp/english/panhu/index.html, (accessed 12 February 2016)</p>	<p>a and b) The Council for Science, Technology and Innovation (CSTI) is the main research and innovation council in Japan. The CSTI is part of the Cabinet Office. It decides on research programmes and related budgets, innovation programmes and related budgets, as well as policies supporting framework conditions of innovation.</p> <p>c) No other research and innovation councils are in place.</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>a to e) The Council's mandate includes coordination across government, the preparation of national STI strategies, decision-taking with regard to budgetary allocations for STI, evaluation of policy implementation and provision of policy advice to the government.</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>a to j) The Prime Minister, ministers, government officials, HEI and PRI representatives, and representatives from the private sector participate in the CSTI.</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>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>a and b) In 2017, the CSTI had around 100 staff and a budget of USD 1.266 million in purchasing power parities at 2017 prices (JPY142 million).</p> <p>c) No major changes made.</p>

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan?</p> <p>b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p>	<p>a and b) The 5th Science and Technology Basic Plan is the main STI strategy in Japan. Japan has used these five-year planning cycles for twenty years.</p>
<p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Japan. Response B1. Cabinet Office (2016), Outline of 5th S&T basic plan, http://www8.cao.go.jp/cstp/english/basic/5thbasicplan_outline.pdf, (accessed 04 October 2016)</p>	
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?</p> <p>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?</p> <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) <p>b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?</p> <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) 	<p>a) The S&T basic Plan for the current five year period addresses the following specific themes and/or societal challenges are (no order of preference): Sustainable growth and self-sustaining regional development; safety and security of citizens along with a high-quality, prosperous way of life; responsiveness to global challenges and contribute to global development.</p> <p>b) The Plan further addresses the following specific scientific research, technologies and economic fields are (no order of preference): Sustainable growth and self-sustaining regional development (i.e. ensuring stable energy and improving energy efficiency; securing a stable food supply; medical technology; building infrastructure for sustainable cities and regions; extending service life for efficient, effective infrastructure; and improving competitiveness in manufacturing and value creation); ensuring safety and security of citizens and a high-quality, prosperous way of life (i.e. addressing natural disasters; ensuring food safety, living environments, and occupational health; cybersecurity; Addressing national security issues); addressing global challenges and contributing to global development (i.e. addressing global climate change; and responding to biodiversity loss).</p>

c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)	c) Specific regions are addressed by the strategic document "Society 5.0" ("Super Smart Society").
d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)	d) The national STI strategy does not address supranational or transnational objectives.
e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)	<p>e) The Fifth S&T Basic Plan includes quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluations for the period 2016-2021 (no order of preference):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase combined public and private sector R&D investment to at least 4% of GDP; government R&D investment to at least 1% of GDP - Increase the number of young full-time teaching staff at universities by 10%; - Increase the number of top 10% cited scientific papers; - Increase the number of researchers transferring between from science to industry by 20% and the amount of collaborative research funds received from industry by universities and National R&D institutes by 50%; - Increase proportion of domestic patent applications by small and medium-sized companies to 15% and increase the number of license agreements of university patents by 50%.; - Increase the number of license agreements on university patents by 50% - Increase the proportion of female researchers among new hires to 30% of the total in the nature sciences overall
f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?	f) No major changes made beyond the introduction of the current S&T Plan in 2016.

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Japan. Response B1.

Outline of 5th S&T basic plan, http://www8.cao.go.jp/cstp/english/basic/5thbasicplan_outline.pdf, accessed 04.10.2016

Q.2.7. What **reforms** to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?

Fifth S&T Basic Plan (2016); reinforcing the budget and powers of the CSTI as stated in the 2015 Comprehensive Strategy on Science, Technology and Innovation

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Japan. Response B4_2.

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>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Japan. Response B6.</p>	Inter-agency programming is in place.
<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) Agencies do have the mandate for coordination.</p> <p>b) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?</p>	No major reforms made.

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>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRI and/or their associations <p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? <i>(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) 	<p>a) Representatives from the private sector (large firms) and HEIs/PRI participate as members of Council for Science, Technology and Innovation.</p> <p>b) Representatives from the private sector are part of governing boards of universities. This includes representatives from major companies, banks, and agencies (e.g. the National Research and Development Agency)</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>References: Public comment website, http://search.e-gov.go.jp/servlet/Public?CLASSNAME=PCMMSTDETAIL&id=095151350&Mode=0, (Japanese), (accessed 27 September 2016).</p>	<p>a and b) Online consultation platforms are in place. During the elaboration of the 5th S&T Basic Plan, for instance, public online consultation was open to all citizens.</p> <p>c) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	No major reforms made.

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>References: MEXT (2016), www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingji/chousa/koutou/062/gjiroku/_icsFiles/afieldfile/2014/11/10/1353375_3_2.pdf, p. 18 (Japanese), (accessed 11 February 2016). Act of General Rules for Incorporated Administrative Agency (2016), Act 35-5, http://law.e-gov.go.jp/htmldata/H11/H11HO103.html, (Japanese), http://www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp/law/detail/?vm=&re=02&id=2361&lv=02, (English translation), (accessed 04 April 2016).</p>	<p>a) HEIs themselves decide about allocations of institutional block funding to internal teaching, research and innovation activities.</p> <p>b) Missing answer for PRIs.</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>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>a, c and e) HEIs decide about recruitment, salaries and promotions of staff.</p> <p>b, d and f) Missing answer for PRIs.</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>	

References:

The National University Corporation Law (2016), Art.21.(3) 4, <http://law.e-gov.go.jp/htmldata/H15/H15HO112.html>, (Japanese), <http://ad9.org/pegasus/znet/docs/TheProposedLaw.pdf>, (English translation), (accessed 01 April 2016).

The University of Tokyo (2016), Regulation, Part.2 Sec. 2-3, website, www.u-tokyo.ac.jp/gen01/reiki_int/kisoku_mokuji_j.html, (Japanese), www.u-tokyo.ac.jp/en/about/rules_main.html, (English translation), (accessed, 17 February 2016).

The National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (2016), Regulation, website, www.aist.go.jp/Portals/0/resource_images/aist_j/outline/comp-legal/pdf/jinji_iinkaitei.pdf, (Japanese), (accessed 11 February 2016).

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.)

References:

The Standards for Establishment of Universities (2016), Art.19, 20, website, www.japaneselawtranslation.go.jp/law/detail_main?re=&vm=04&id=1864, (English translation), (accessed 01 April 2016).

The University of Tokyo (2016), Regulation, website, www.u-tokyo.ac.jp/gen01/reiki_int/reiki_honbun/au07403761.html, (Japanese), (accessed 17 February 2016).

The National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (2016), Regulation, website, www.aist.go.jp/Portals/0/resource_images/aist_j/outline/comp-legal/pdf/kyoudou.pdf, (Japanese),

Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (Riken), Regulation, website, www.riken.jp/~media/riken/pr/topics/1998/19980331_1/19980331_1.pdf, (Japanese), (accessed 11 February 2016).

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?

a and c) HEIs themselves decide about the creation of legal entities including spin-offs and joint R&D partnership with industry.

b and d) Missing answer for PRIs.

a) HEIs set the revenue schemes themselves.

Example include:

- The University of Tokyo sets 0% of revenues for HEIs, 60% revenues for research units/laboratories, and 40% of revenues for researchers;
- The Kyoto University sets a share of 25% for HEIs, 25% for research units and 50% for researchers (for less than 10 million yen revenues) as well as 33% for HEIs, 33% for research units and 33% for researchers (for more than 10 million yen revenues).

b) Missing answer for PRIs.

c) No major changes made.

References:

The University of Tokyo (2016), Regulation, Art. 26, website, www.ducr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/rules_and_forms/patent.html, (Japanese) (accessed 07 October 2016)

Kyoto University (2016), Regulation, website, www.saci.kyoto-u.ac.jp/?page_id=63#3-5, (Japanese), (accessed 07 October 2016).

The National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (2016), Regulation, Art. 26, website, https://www.aist.go.jp/Portals/0/resource_images/aist_j/outline/comp-legal/pdf/syokuhatsu.pdf, (Japanese), (accessed 15 February 2016).

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

University reforms in 2004 and 2015 increased autonomy of HEIs and set incentives for performance (contracts with targets, evaluations)
