Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Survey response for Norway

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Norway 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

CLIMIT	Research Programme for Accelerating the Commercialisation of Carbon Capture and Storage
ERA	European Research Area
ERC	European Research Council
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
INTPART	International Partnerships for Excellent Education and Research programme
NOKUT	Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
RCN	Research Council of Norway
SFU	Centres for Excellence in Education Initiative
SIU	Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
TTOs	Technological Transfer Offices

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
Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the **scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations** for a) HEIs and b) PRIs? 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.). *(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.)* 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)?	a) Mostly HEIs themselves b) Ministry of Education and Research, partly the Research Council of Norway c) The decisions on priorities for budget allocations, and specifically for competitive funding, are also partly made by the Parliament, partly by the ministries, and partly by the Research Council of Norway (RCN). The formal decisions on the main budget priorities are made by the Parliament, and follow to a very large extent the budget proposal of the government. (The budget proposal for the competitive funding through the RCN is again partly based on a recommendation from the RCN.) The main decisions on priorities after the budget has been approved are made by national ministries (in many cases including allocations to individual programmes). The level of specificity of the ministries' priorities varies. Some allocations, the largest being an allocation from the Ministry of Education and Research for strategic programmes, give the RCN more room for defining priorities. The RCN may also decide on more specific sub-priorities within the programmes and the priorities set by the ministries. The main allocations for competitive funding through the RCN are not directed towards specific sectors. d) The Long-term plan for Research and Higher Education (2015–2024) presented to the Storting (the parliament) in 2014 represented a change in the government's decision on the priorities of budget allocations in general, but the mechanisms for deciding on the orientation of individual programmes have not changed significantly. Allocations to programmes are still decided annually, and decisions partly made by the ministries in the allocation letters to the RCN and partly by the RCN as mandated by the ministries. The annual allocations reflect the long-term policy priority.

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) The Ministry of Education and Research allocates institutional block funding to HEIs. b) The Ministry of Health and Care Services; the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries; the Ministry of Defence; the Ministry of Education and Research; the Ministry of Agriculture and Food; the Ministry of Climate and Environment; and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs allocate institutional block funding to PRIs. c) With regard to project-based funding, the major channel is the RCN (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses B1 and C6). d) The main transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs is the European Commission, and specifically through the framework programmes for research and innovation, currently Horizon 2020 (of which the European Research Council is part). NordForsk is an organisation under the Nordic Council of Ministers that provides funding for and facilitates Nordic cooperation on research and research infrastructure.. e) In the Norwegian R&D statistics for the Government sector and Higher education sector in 2013, the reported funding from the European Commission was 2.45% of public R&D funding. In 2016, the total volume of NordForsk was 5% of public R&D funding. f) No major changes made.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Responses B1, B4 and C6.	

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 to f) The introduction of performance contracts with HEIs was announced in 2016, and the instrument will be piloted in 2017 with five institutions. The aim is that all HEIs will have performance contracts by 2019. In the 2017 pilot exercise there is no funding subject to the performance contract, but the government plans to lay out a proposal for this in 2017. g) Block grant funding systems with performance-based components are in place for HEIs, hospitals, and research institutes. 30% of block funding for HEIs and between 2.5% and 10% of block funding for PRIs is performance-based (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C6). h) *Changes over 2005-2016* Recent changes to institutional block funding of HEIs and PRIs include the Long-Term Plan for Research and Higher Education 2015–2024 launched in 2014; the revision of the block grant funding system for research institutes launched in 2013; and the revision of the block grant funding system of HEIs that took place in 2015 and comes into force in 2017 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response C6).
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Response C6.	
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?	a) In terms of evaluation of HEIs, the Ministry of Education and Research defines performance criteria to be used for evaluations of HEIs (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses C6 and B12_a). b and c) The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT) conducts evaluations of HEI performance. d) The RCN sets criteria to be used for performance evaluations of PRIs. The system for public block grant funding of PRIs was evaluated in 2012. It was commissioned by the Ministry of Education and Research and carried out by the consultancy firm DAMVAD Norway (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B12_c). e and f) The RCN also conducts evaluations of its funding schemes and continuous monitoring of the outcomes from the business-oriented open research arena (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B12_c). h) No major changes made.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Responses B12_a, B12_c and C6.	
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?	In 2014–2016, there was a structural reform of the higher education sector. The number of state higher education institutions was reduced from 33 to 21 through seven mergers that took effect in 2016/2017.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
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? – 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)? b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees? c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?	a and b) There is no research and innovation council in place in Norway. Policy advice on STI falls under the mandate of the RCN which is a funding agency. c) Since 2001 Norway has appointed several strategy committees for STI policy in different sectors/areas (eight so far). These so-called 21 Forums (STI for sector X in the 21st century) serve as advisory bodies and stakeholder forums, with representatives from businesses, research institutions and public administration. They formulate strategies for R&D and innovation which are submitted to the government, and serve as forums for strategic collaboration. For some of the strategies the committees function as permanent advisory bodies that advise the government on the implementation of the strategic recommendations, and may be given the task of updating the strategies. The Research Council of Norway is the main funding agency for R&D in Norway, and is also mandated with the tasks of providing input to government as basis for the formulation of research policy, to ensure the evaluation of research, and to achieve cooperation and cohesiveness between public agencies within the research and innovation system.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Response B4_2. Research Council of Norway (2016). Organisation (web page). Retrieved from http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Organisation/1138785841802, accessed 06.10.2016.	
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?	a to e) Norway does not have a Research and Innovation Council/Committee.
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	a to j) Norway does not have a Research and Innovation Council/Committee
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. 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?	a to c) Norway does not have a Research and Innovation Council/Committee

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
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?	a and b) The Long-Term Plan for Research and Higher Education 2015–2024 (2014) is the main national STI strategy.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Responses A2, B1 and F3.	
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? – 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? – 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?	a) The Long-Term Plan for Research and Higher Education 2015–2024 addresses the following societal challenges and themes (no order of preference): Ocean economy, climate, environment and clean energy; public sector renewal, better and more effective welfare, health and care services. b) The Long-Term Plan for Research and Higher Education 2015–2024 addresses the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields (no order of preference): biotechnology, nanotechnology, ICT, and new manufacturing technologies. c) No specific regions addressed. d) In terms of supranational objectives, the national STI strategy aims at increasing Norwegian participation in Horizon 2020. e) Increase in R&D intensity to 3 % of GDP by 2030, and increase of government budget allocations to R&D to 1 % of GDP by 2019/2020 f) The Long-Term Plan for Research and Higher Education 2015–2024 was introduced in 2014.
References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Norway. Responses A2, B1 and F3. Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (2013). Strategy for Research and Innovation Cooperation with the EU: Horizon 2020 and ERA, p. 25. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/4c96155c697f47cabc2c4ea23e0507ec/, accessed 29.09.2016.	

Q.2.7. What **reforms** to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?	Since 2001 Norway has appointed several strategy committees for STI policy in different sectors/areas (eight so far). These so-called 21 Forums (STI for sector X in the 21st century) serve as advisory bodies and stakeholder forums, with representatives from businesses, research institutions and public administration. They formulate strategies for R&D and innovation which are submitted to the government, and serve as forums for strategic collaboration. For some of the strategies the committees function as permanent advisory bodies that advise the government on the implementation of the strategic recommendations, and may be given the task of updating the strategies. Since 2014 there has been held annual high-level summits on specific topics in STI and HEI policy- The summits have been chaired by the prime minister with participation from ministers and leaders from academia, businesses, the public sector and organisations in the civil sector. The composition of the summits have varied according to the topic, which have reflected the goals of the governments long-term plan of research and higher education.

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

Question	Response
Q.2.8. Does **inter-agency joint programming** contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy? *(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.)*	Inter-agency joint programming exists in the following cases: – The business cluster programme Norwegian Innovation Clusters, which is led by Innovation Norway, in cooperation with the RCN and Industrial Development Corporation of Norway – The INTPART programme (International Partnerships for Excellent Education and Research), which is a cooperation between the RCN and the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education (SIU) – The Centres for Excellence in Education Initiative (SFU), which is a cooperation between NOKUT and the RCN – The CLIMIT programme (carbon capture and storage), which is a cooperation between state-owned enterprise Gassnova and the RCN – The PILOT-E programme for eco-friendly energy technology, which is a cooperation between the stat-owned enterprise Enova, Innovation Norway and the RCN.
Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the **mandate of agencies**? 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?	a) The Research Council of Norway is mandated with the task of achieving cooperation between public agencies within the research and innovation system. b) No major changes made.
Q.2.10. What **reforms** of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?	The mergers of higher education institutions that took effect in 2016 and 2017 (also mentioned in Q.1.5) has been a change in the institutional context, but it is too early to tell what impacts they have had.

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
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)* – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in **council/governing boards of HEIs**? *(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)* – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations)	a) Norway does not have a Research and Innovation Council/Committee. b) Representatives from the private sector, civil society and HEIs/PRIs also participate in governing boards of HEIs and PRIs taking decisions on strategic issues informing thematic and scientific priorities of HEIs and PRIs.
References: University of Oslo (2016). University Board representatives [WWW Document]. Retrieved from http://www.uio.no/english/about/organisation/board/members.html, accessed 29.09.2016. University of Bergen (2016). The University Board [WWW Document]. Retrieved from http://www.uib.no/en/ledelsen/73856/university-board, accessed 29.09.2016. NORUT (2016). About Norut: norut.no [WWW Document]. Retrieved from http://norut.no/en/about-norut, accessed 29.09.2016. Institutt for samfunnsforskning (ISF) (2016). Board, About us, socialresearch.no - Institutt for samfunnsforskning (ISF) [WWW Document]. Retrieved from http://www.socialresearch.no/About-us/Board, accessed 29.09.2016. IFE (2016). IFE Board — IFE [WWW Document]. Retrieved from https://www.ife.no/en/ife/details/ife/ife-styre-en, accessed 29.09.2016.	
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)? c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?	a and b) All regulation, official reports and major policy initiatives are normally subject to public consultations, regardless of the policy area. The consultations are open to both invited bodies and the general public. Comments can be delivered through and are published on the government's website. c) Missing answer.
Q.3.3. Which **reforms** to consultation processes have proven particularly important?	Since 2001 Norway has appointed several strategy committees for STI policy in different sectors/areas (eight so far). These so-called 21 Forums (STI for sector X in the 21st century) serve as advisory bodies and stakeholder forums, with representatives from businesses, research institutions and public administration. They formulate strategies for R&D and innovation which are submitted to the government, and serve as forums for strategic collaboration. For some of the strategies the committees function as permanent advisory bodies that advise the government on the implementation of the strategic recommendations, and may be given the task of updating the strategies.

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
Q.3.4. Who decides about **allocations of institutional block funding** for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? *(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.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)*	a and b) Institutions themselves allocate funds to broad categories (i.e. personnel, operational costs, infrastructure, and equipment). HEIs and PRIs are free to move institutional funds between those categories. For HEIs and public PRIs constraints on the use of block grants follow from their general missions/statutes. The block grant funding system for the independent research institutes also has some general conditions for what the funding can be used for, but no constraints on the distribution among these purposes (multiannual research projects expected to be relevant for the institutes' mission or customers, publication and dissemination, professional networking and research infrastructure).
References: Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015). Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016. European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016.	
Q.3.5. Who decides about **recruitment** of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? *(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.* *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.)* Who decides about **salaries** of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? *(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.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)* Who decides about **reassignments** and **promotions** of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs? *(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.* *Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)*	a) HEIs are free to hire academic staff, but there is a general requirement that selection committees should be used, and that open posts should be announced as a main rule. b) The largest part of the PRI sector is made up of the independent research institutes, which can hire, promote and reward staff freely. c) Salaries are also decided freely by universities in Norway. d) Some PRIs are part of the public sector, and the Act relating to civil servants and national salary bands applies. e and f) With regard to reassignments and promotions of academic staff at HEIs in Norway, the law specifies the composition of the promotion committee for academic staff.

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.)*	a to d) HEIs and PRIs are essentially free to determine their internal academic structures, such as the creation of departments and technological transfer offices (TTOs). There are some restrictions on the HEIs' creation of legal entities and participation in partnerships that are stipulated by law or regulation from the Ministry or Education and Research. The general requirements are that the participation must be relevant to the institution's academic activities and beneficial to society, and must not limit its independence in academic matters. The HEIs cannot subsidise other participants in partnerships. The boards of the HEIs make decisions on the creation of legal entities, on the authority of the ministry. In some cases HEIs need approval from the ministry to create legal entities (entities with the aim of owning property or infrastructure). The ministry may order the institutions to withdraw from partnerships if this is considered necessary out of regard for the primary responsibilities of the institution.
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 b) HEIs and PRIs can set their own schemes for IP revenues. The most widespread model is an equal share between a) the HEI, b) the researchers and c) external partners. c) A new act relating to universities and university colleges took effect in 2005. Since then there has been no major changes in the legal framework for the autonomy of HEIs. With respect to IPR, in 2003 the exception for teachers and scientific staff of HEIs was removed from the act relating to the right to employee's inventions ("professor's privilege"), which made it possible for the HEIs to transfer to themselves the rights to the inventions of the staff. Between 2001 and 2004, Norway introduced net budgeting for all HEIs, and institutions can therefore both make a profit and their own investments.
Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?	The mergers of higher education institutions that took effect in 2016 and 2017 (also mentioned in Q.1.5) has been a change in the institutional context, but it is too early to tell what impacts they have had.