



Public Engagement Innovations
for Horizon 2020

D6.2 Consortium, Steering Committee, and Advisory Panel Meetings Minutes

Editors

Minna Kaarakainen
Mikko Rask

January 2017



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no [611826]

The PE2020 Project

Year of implementation: February 2014 – January 2017

Web: <http://www.PE2020.eu>

Project consortium:



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

UH

University of Helsinki, Finland



VU IBS

Vilnius University International Business School,
Lithuania



LSC

Laboratorio di Scienze della Cittadinanza, Italy



UL

University of Lapland, Finland

Contact information: Mikko Rask

Grant agreement no: 611826

Project acronym: PE2020

Project full title: Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020

Project funding scheme: Seventh Framework Programme, Collaborative Project, Small or medium scale focused research project, SiS.2013.1.1.1-6: Tools and instruments for a better societal engagement in “Horizon 2020”

Project co-ordinator: Mikko Rask, Consumer Society Research Centre at the University of Helsinki

E-mail: mikko.rask@helsinki.fi

Project website: www.PE2020.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no [611826]

The PE2020 project

PE2020 will identify, analyse and refine innovative public engagement (PE) tools and instruments for dynamic governance in the field of Science in Society (SiS). PE2020 analyses the PE tools and instruments through a systemic and contextual perspective, and contributes to the potential and transferability of new governance innovations. PE2020 will create new knowledge of the status quo and trends in the field of public engagement in science, refine innovative PE tools and instruments and propose new ones.

The project will do this by (1) further developing a conceptual model that provides a systemic perspective of the dynamics of public and stakeholder engagement; (2) creating an updated inventory of current and prospective European PE innovations; (3) context-tailoring and piloting best practice PE processes related to the grand challenges of the Horizon 2020 and (4) developing an accessible net-based PE design toolkit that helps identify, evaluate and successfully transfer innovative PE practices among European countries.

New tools and instruments for public and societal engagement are necessary to boost the quality, capacity and legitimacy of European STI governance and to solve the looming problems related to the grand societal challenges of the Horizon 2020. In order to ensure practical relevance, the project will work through intensive co-operation between researchers and science policy actors. PE2020 will expand the capacity of European and national science policy actors to integrate better societal engagement by providing an easy access to new PE tools and instruments, to be included in the requirements and implementation of research in Horizon 2020 and beyond.

Acknowledgements

The authors and the whole project consortium gratefully acknowledge the financial and intellectual support of this work provided by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration. This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no [611826].

Legal Notice

The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the author/s. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



Content

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Consortium meetings	2
2.1.	Consortium meeting description.....	2
2.2.	Memoranda.....	3
2.2.1.	CM1 Helsinki.....	3
2.2.2.	CM2 Aarhus	19
2.2.3.	CM3 Vilnius.....	22
2.2.4.	CM4 Rome	32
2.2.5.	CM5 Brussels	44
3.	Management committee (MAC).....	50
3.1.	Memoranda.....	52
3.1.1.	MAC 7.3.2014	52
3.1.2.	MAC 13.5.2014	56
3.1.3.	MAC 1.9.2014	59
3.1.4.	MAC 2.10.2014	63
3.1.5.	MAC 12.11.2014	67
3.1.6.	MAC 16.12.2014	71
3.1.7.	MAC 30.1.2015	74
3.1.8.	MAC 26.3.2015	78
3.1.9.	MAC 2.6.2015	83
3.1.10.	MAC 25.6.2015	89
3.1.11.	MAC 20.5.2016	94
3.1.12.	MAC 15.11.2016	97
4.	Advisory panel	100
4.1.	Memoranda.....	102
4.1.1.	Notes of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board 7.3.2014	102
4.1.2.	Advisory group meeting – PE2020 – March 7, 2014, notes from Suzanne de Cheveigné	104
4.1.3.	Some general points of view and some suggestions for the Project leaders By the Scientific Advisory Board 17.3.2014	105
4.1.4.	Useful information to PE2020 from SAB 17.2.2015	106
4.1.5.	Letter to SAB members from coordinator 21.8.2015.....	110
4.1.6.	SAB meeting memo 2. – 3.11.2015	111



1. Introduction

The aim of this delivery report D6.2 “Consortium, Steering Committee, and Advisory panel meetings minutes” is to describe the internal working of the PE2020 by reporting the memoranda of the core meetings among the partners and the advisors of this project.

D6.2 is delivery of Work package 6: Management, which aimed to provide the necessary management services to the project and by so doing, to provide the best possible conditions for the research activities in PE2020. Management services included both the external activities (esp. resources and administrative communications) as well as internal activities (planning, organizing, motivating, coordinating and controlling). WP6 paid particular attention to the continuous monitoring and evaluation of project progression and to the timely submission of project deliverables, even in some adaptation had to be done in certain stages of the project, without risking, however, the accomplishment of the overall mission in time. WP 6 started M1 and continued during the whole project until W36.

There were five consortium meetings that were organized in the following places, according to the original plan described in DoW: Helsinki, Aarhus, Vilnius, Rome, and Brussels. The minutes of these meetings are reported in a separate section 1 of this report.

PE2020 consortium didn't have a specific 'steering committee', but instead, a Management committee that consisted of the work package leaders (occasionally replaced by colleagues from their home institution). The minutes of these meetings are reported in section 2 of this report. (The minutes are reported following the structure of the agenda that was sent in advance to the partners.)

As regards to the meetings of the advisory panel (SAB), the SAB convened in each of the consortium meetings, for which reason the feedback by SAB is reported in the consortium memoranda. Furthermore, they provided some additional feedback, in written form. This feedback can be found in section 3 of this report. SAB also gave some less formal feedback during the process, but as this information is not systematically documented, it is neither reported in this publication.

Finally, the PE2020 consortium organized more regular working meetings among the partners, in about 3-4 weeks intervals. These meetings were called 'skype meetings' and they were essential in ensuring smooth progression in the work of this project. As these meetings were less formal and no binding decisions were done in them, they are not reported in this report, but can be requested from the coordinator of the PE2020 project.

This document does not contain appendixes that were send as attachments through email to partners before the meetings.

2. Consortium meetings

2.1. Consortium meeting description

There were five consortium meetings during the project:

CM1 Helsinki 5. – 7.3.2014

CM2 Aarhus 28. – 30.5.2014

CM3 Vilnius 2. – 3.11.2015

CM4 Rome 19. – 20.5.2016

CM5 Brussels 14. – 15.11.2016

The meetings lasted two to three days. All active partners were represented in each of the meeting. In order to support effective working, the agenda was sent well in advance, generally 2-3 weeks before the meeting.

Advisory panel members took part in these meetings to a varying level, ranging from one to five members per consortium meeting. Occasionally some of them participated through a Skype connection. The external evaluator of PE2020, Göran Melin, participated in the two last meetings, as agreed by the consortium and requested by the contract.

It was the scrutiny of the project to circulate the memoranda to the partners soon after the meeting, and after receiving and implementing comments, they were considered finalized in two weeks after circulation of the draft minutes.

The memoranda of the consortium meetings are included in the following sub-sections.

2.2. Memoranda

2.2.1. CM1 Helsinki

Kick-off Meeting

Helsinki 5 – 7th March 2014

MINUTES

Attendees:

Luciano d'Andrea (LSC/IT)

Ian Dobson (UH/FIN)

Maria Pietilä (UH/FIN) 5th – 6th March

Timo Aarrevaara (UH/FIN)

Markku Mattila (UH/FIN)

Marie Louise Jørgensen (Engage2020/DK) 5th – 6th March

Niels Mejlgaard (UA/DK)

Tine Ravn (UA/DK)

Maija Sirola (Bonus programme/Finland) Wednesday 5th March

Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene (VU IBS/LT)

Martin Hynes (European Science Foundation/BE) 6th - 7th March

Suzanne de Cheveigné (CNRC/FR) 6th – 7th March

Erja Pylvänäinen (NCRC/FIN)

Mikko Rask (NCRC/FIN)

Kaisa Matschoss (NCRC/FIN)

Minna Kaarakainen (NCRC/FIN)

Via skype:

Eleonore Pauwels (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars) on Wednesday 5th March

Simon Burall (Involve) on Friday 7th March

DAY 1

Partners' introduction

Day 1 started with partners' introductory round, including a discussion on their expectations of the PE2020 project. Partners hoped that PE2020 will become a sound research project with practical relevance to the development of public engagement.

Project officer's presentation (Karen Fabbri)

Mikko Rask presented the slides of the EU project officer Karen Fabbri (**Presentation1_Fabbri**). Fabbri's presentation included a discussion of the rationales and changing concept of SiS and RRI. It was remarked that public engagement is one of the five action lines of RRI (other four: gender equality, science education, ethics and open access). European Commission's expectations of the PE2020 project are following:

- 1) *Synergy with similar activities* (especially EC-funded ones) and avoidance of duplication with past and ongoing activities;
- 2) *Clear EU policy dimension* and engagement in R&I by maintaining close links with relevant the EC activities and seeking coordination with the European policy agenda;
- 3) *Strong outreach and dissemination*;
- 4) *Civil Society engagement*;
- 5) *Financial responsibility*;
- 6) *Focus beyond academic output*, including an orientation towards concrete actions, capacity building, support to European policy recommendations, real societal impact, etc.;
- 7) *An early development of a "business plan"* for how the network/research outcomes may be sustained/taken up beyond the lifetime of EC Funding.

Decisions and clarifications:

- The consortium identified ENGAGE2020 as the closest 'sister project' since it is from the same specific topic of the SiS call, and substantially very close to PE2020. The coordinator of ENGAGE2020 participated in the PE2020 kick off meeting thus ensuring that synergies will be found and duplication will be avoided. It was considered important to also collaborate with other on-going SiS projects, but necessary to prioritize such collaboration to use resources effectively.
- It was remarked that PE2020 will focus primarily on 'engagement' among the five RRI action lines.
- Close collaboration and continued dialogue with the EU project officer was deemed important to ensure that PE2020 can effectively and realistically respond to the expectations of the EC.
- The PE toolkit (storing the results in a user friendly manner) was identified among the primary means of sustained lifetime of PE2020 beyond EC funding.

Project overview (Mikko Rask)

Mikko Rask gave an overview presentation of the PE2020 project (**Presentation2_Rask**). Mikko reminded that as resulting from the negotiation in Brussels, PE2020 decided to use a similar framework than ENGAGE2020 to distinguish PE activities at four levels of science policy (policy formation, programme development, project definition and research and innovation activities), and that the previous project officer recommended to mainly focus on the levels of programmes and projects. Mikko also reminded that the consortium is committed to report the results of PE2020 for academic audiences through at least four peer reviewed articles.

Collaboration with Engage2020 (Marie Louise Jørgensen)

Marie Louise Jørgensen gave a presentation of the Engage2020 project (**Presentation3_Joergensen**). Engage2020 (Sept. 2013 – Nov. 2015) will provide an overview of potential praxis in Horizon 2020 for societal engagement in research and innovation and related activities, with the aim of increasing the use of such praxis. The overview will cover praxis of existing policies and structures, of methods, approaches, tools and instruments, of promising new or adapted policies / methods, and of praxis which is specifically suited for engaging society in R&I activities related to the six Grand Challenges. The project will set up a frame, which can embrace all potential approaches to engagement by treating all four levels of complexity in R&I activities,

including 1) research policy formation, 2) program development, 3) research project definition, and 4) engagement in the concrete research or innovation activity. For each of these levels praxis will be structured according to which types of participants the specific praxis can include (CSO's, citizens, affected persons or groups, consumers, employees, users and others).

Engage2020 includes a strong dissemination and communication strategy in order to ensure proper uptake of the results by the broad range of user groups. The Engage2020 consortium consists of experts and practitioners of participation in STI related issues at all levels of engagement.

Decisions and clarifications

It was remarked that Engage2020 is a parallel project to PE2020, and it is important to avoid duplication and be open minded and discuss with each other. Following collaboration opportunities were identified:

- *Scanning of PE practices.* PE2020 WP1 is the most relevant counter-part in coordinating data collection, and the leader of WP1 (Niels Mejlgaard) will continue discussion with Marie Louise to inquire possibilities of sharing data. Engage2020 will publish their report on PE practices in June 2014.
- *Generating policy options and action catalogues.* This was found to be a relevant theme to be discussed in several seminars and workshop organized by Engage2020, where PE2020 partners will be invited, including **a workshop on promising practices in London in September 2014**. Collaboration opportunities were also considered in the preparation of the webtool (WP4 in PE2020), and practical possibilities will have to be further explored, however, keeping in mind that both projects have committed to produce their own specific web tools. PE2020 conceptual WP2 will also be interested in collaborating in this theme.
- *Contributing to PE in the context of societal challenges.* It was remarked that EC has now identified 7 instead of 6 societal challenges. PE2020 partners will be invited to **an ENGAGE2020 Grand Challenge Workshops on Jan/ Feb 2015**, which was found to be a very relevant context of thinking about the WP3 pilots in PE2020.
- *Knowledge sharing and dissemination.* Collaboration opportunities were identified in 1) sharing networks and contacts for dissemination, 2) collaboratively preparing and disseminating policy briefs, 3) helping share project reports and other deliverables (WP5 in PE2020); and 4) in collaboration in the organising of seminars and workshops (an especially interesting opportunity is the **ENGAGE2020 European conference 2015 in Brussels, in October 2015** – to which PE2020 can potentially create continuity by arranging a similar conference at the end of the project).

Collaboration with BONUS programme (Maija Sirola)

Maija Sirola gave a presentation of the BONUS programme and its PE activities (**Presentation4_Sirola**). Bonus supports policy-driven strategic research for a better future of the Baltic Sea region (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden). The European Parliament supported the European Council's decision that launched a new research and development program to protect the Baltic Sea, BONUS, worth of EUR 100 million for the years 2010-2016. The vision is an economically and ecologically prosperous Baltic Sea region where sources and goods are used sustainably and where the long-term management of the region is based on sound knowledge derived from multidisciplinary research. BONUS integrates the Baltic Sea

system research into a durable cooperative, interdisciplinary and focused multinational program in support of the regions sustainable development.

Bonus has established a progressive stakeholder platform for defining its research strategies and priorities (over 800 stakeholders were consulted in previous strategy work). BONUS+ public engagement award was nominated 24th October 2011, in BONUS Forum, Gdansk, Poland to ECOSUPPORT's GEODOME – stakeholder decision support tool (<http://www.baltex-research.eu/ecosupport/>).

Decisions and clarification:

Bonus is committed to best knowledge and best innovation which is also the commitment of PE2020. From this commonly shared standpoint it was considered important to continue collaborations between these projects. Especially:

- PE2020 is interested in identifying best PE practices (WP1) in BONUS and disseminating them through its publications and networks.
- Bonus could possibly provide a context for more than one PE pilots (WP3) to be collaboratively conducted. Bonus has also a sister project in the Mediterranean Sea (Italy), which could be contacted (by Luciano) at the stage when the concept of PE2020 pilots is more elaborated.

Public engagement in SYNERGE program, expectations and ideas about PE2020 (Eleonore Pauwels)

Eleonore Pauwels, a member of the PE2020 SAB, gave a presentation of an EU MML project SYNERGENE (<http://www.synnergene.eu/>). SYNERGENE supports responsible research and innovation in the field of synthetic biotechnology. The project aims to build bridges between laboratories, publics and policy makers and identifies mechanisms and practices of knowledge sharing. Eleonore raised the issue that epistemology and metaphors are important issues in communicating science to policy makers, scientists and to the public. Eleonore also discussed the rationales of PE that are related to societal responsiveness and adaptability of research. She remarked that 'citizen science' is an increasingly important concept in referring to new type of PE activities in the U.S.

Decisions and clarifications:

- It is important to take 'citizen science' perspective and activities into account in PE2020 case studies and analytical work.
- Collaboration opportunities (e.g. seminar/ conference in the future) between SYNERGENE and PE2020 will be explored, and Eleonore will match the coordinators of these projects (this already done). SYNERGE has also contacts to Brasil, where PE2020 is presenting its research in May 2014, and Eleonore will help find these contacts.

DAY 2

WP1 Updated PE inventory (Niels Mejlgaard)

Niels Mejlgaard gave a presentation of the preliminary research strategies for the collection of innovative PE cases in WP1 (**Presentation5_Mejlgaard**). MASIS data base will be the starting point of data collection and other data sources, including recent European PE projects and a literature review, will be studied. An explorative and inductive approach will be used, combined to a tentative pre-categorisation of different PE activities. Nvivo programme will be used to code and analyse PE practices. The first task of WP1 is to create an extensive and systematic catalogue of PE practices from which the 50 most innovative cases will be chosen for further analysis.

Niels proposed that the work at University of Aarhus for WP1 could be done in an accelerated rhythm so that a draft version of the inventory (Deliverable 1.1) would be ready for comments in early April (M3) and the catalogue would be ready already in July 2014 (M6) instead of the planned timing (months M4 and M12). It was considered that the accelerated rhythm is helpful for presenting the preliminary results of WP1 in the PCST conference in Brasil, Salvador, in May 5-8 and also supportive of effective planning of the pilots in WP3.

Currently the most critical questions for WP1 are related to the definition of 1) relevant research data, 2) scope of PE practices to be explored, 3) level of aggregation used in the reporting of the PE practices, 4) criteria of innovativeness used in the selection of the 50 case studies, and 5) categories used in the analysis of the cases.

Decisions and clarifications:

- It is the responsibility of WP1 leader to make a specified work plan, where a proposal is done to specify a research strategy answering these questions. Since many of these questions are definitional in nature, this work should be done in a close collaboration with WP2 leader.

WP2 Refinement of the conceptual model (Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene)

Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene presented her ideas and plans about WP2 (**Presentation6_Maciukaite-Zviniene**). An important part of this WP is to provide definitions for key concepts and categories that will be used in the analysis of PE case studies. At this point working definitions are needed for the concepts such as typology, categorization, classification, public engagement, innovation/innovativeness, PE tool, capacity, competence, dynamic governance etc. The work of WP2 will be based on a literature review using a specific selection strategy specified by the WP leader.

There was a lively discussion of the direction and purpose of WP2. Saule asked who are our target groups in the area of PE, and she proposed that they could be e.g. children. Mikko reminded that since there are five different RRI action lines and our work is related to 'engagement' whereas 'science education' is linked to children, it is unlikely that children could be our primary target group (there will be many other projects focusing on that area). Markku Mattila proposed that target group could be one variable in the conceptual model.

Mikko reminded that it is important to keep in mind the purpose of this WP as it is described in the proposal. The purpose is basically to help understand 'participatory performance', especially in the context of research programmes.

It was also discussed whether we can keep on the current general definition of PE or whether we need a new one. It was concluded that the current broad definition can be used as a starting point and a new definition can be considered after case study analyses and literature review. It was considered especially important to define PE so that formal, informal and new innovative forms of PE can be taken into account. Martin Hynes proposed that new social media could be included in the analysis of PE, and he also mentioned examples where interesting forms of PE and popular science dissemination can be found, e.g. global source of research news Alpha Galileo (www.alphagalileo.org/), an intersectoral knowledge sharing platform Atomium culture (<http://atomiumculture.eu/>) and ESF media center (<http://www.esf.org/media-centre.html>).

Markku Mattila asked whether WHY public engagement should be answered in PE2020. Mikko replied that much is already known about the democratic, societal and practical rationales of increased public engagement, but this is certainly an important question, not least because PE tools can be used for different purposes in different contexts.

Resulting from the discussions, it was agreed that a very important task for WP2 is analyzing how 'innovativeness' has been defined in the projects/articles that will be analyzed. This will help WP3 to identify and justify pilots. It was considered especially interesting to develop our own criteria for innovativeness that are not based on self-assessment.

Decisions and clarifications:

- It was agreed that a broad definition of PE will be taken as a starting point.
- The purpose of the conceptual work in WP2 is mainly to help explain (successful or less successful) participatory performance especially in the context of research programmes.
- 'Innovativeness' is among the key concepts to be defined in this WP.
- A 'project library' will be based in Wrike where relevant literature can be uploaded.
- Conceptual work should be done in close collaboration with WP1.
- WP2 leader will prepare a specified work plan, where the focus and method of analysis is elaborated.
- A couple of tentative and alternative conceptual models can be presented in the conference in Brasil in May 2014.
- Martin Hynes promised to keep PE2020 consortium aware of the COST evaluation, where evaluation of PE activities can be a relevant dimension.

WP3 PE pilots

WP3 was presented by Timo Aarrevaara (**Presentation7_Aarrevaara**). The purpose of the pilots is to test and refine 2-6 innovative PE tools and processes in the context of research programs closely linked to the Horizon 2020 Challenges. WP3 starts with discussions on relevant science policy actors, and such discussions have already been started with BONUS programme. Identification of pilots practices can start in June-July when results of WP1 are available (planned timing for the identification of transferable practices is M9-M14 i.e. Oct. 2014- March 2015). It was remarked that EC requested that the pilots cover 6 societal challenges.

The consortium considered it important to agree on the nature of pilots. Since the pilots will be chosen among the innovative PE tools that are scanned in WP1, at this stage of the project, however,

it is impossible make a choice. What can be done at the moment is to acknowledge the boundary conditions for the pilots, including the limited resources: 22,5 man months (3,75 mm per pilot) and 45 000 € (7 500€ per pilot). Therefore it was deemed important to conduct the pilots in collaboration with research programmes/actors that have their own budgets for doing PE. It was also considered important to frame and understand the nature of pilots in a way that is both realistic and contributing to the research done in PE2020 and in Horizon2020 planning. It was further considered important for the project to communicate the plan of organizing the pilots to the project officer before moving ahead.

Considering the focus on research programmes, the topic of *prioritization of research* was considered an especially interesting theme for pilots. Mikko mentioned participatory budgeting and software supported participatory budget simulations (as previously informed by Eleonore Pauwels from Woodrow Wilson Center) as examples of PE processes that might be tested with a relatively small budget.

Suzanne de Cheveigné proposed that in order to provide additional value to the development of PE practices, the pilots should be chosen on the basis of *cutting edge* development in the field. Mikko proposed that interesting recent development has been taken place in the context of science museums that have been interested in testing interactive models and expanding this concept to participatory decision making (e.g. Boston and Paris Science museums organizing policy debates around World Wide Views citizen consultation). So, cutting edge in the selection of PE pilots could mean new types of collaboration between institutions that have not been closely linked (e.g. science museums, science policy makers and the public). – Markku Mattila proposed that we could contact Anneli Pauli who is currently the director of science museum Heureka in Finland. – It was also reflected that we might make a survey of ‘cutting edge’ in PE by asking PE2020 partners to throw in their own best examples of PE, or surveying some other experts in the field.

From the research point of view, it was remarked that pilots should test at least two different types of PE tools. For example, face-to-face vs. web/social media based PE tools could be tested in 6 pilots. To make the testing purposive, it was also considered critical to reduce variation, now induced in the levels of 1) sites, 2) challenges and 3) methods. Conducting several pilots in one programme context was considered a potential way of limiting variation that threatens learning from the PE pilots.

Early identification of the test sites was considered important. In addition to BONUS programme, it was suggested that the Mediterranean counterpart of that programme could be contacted by Luciano. Joint Research Programs were considered another relevant context for pilots, since they provide access to international research programmes. Saule suggested that smart specialization (<http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>) could be one possible case. Luciano reminded that it is easiest to start collaborating with institutions that are already progressive in the area of PE.

Timo proposed a tentative framework for analyzing the pilots: 1) historical description, 2) analysis of research themes, 3) goals, mode of operation, results and utilization, 4) stakeholders’ role.

Overall, the organization of pilots was considered both a challenging and a most innovative part of PE2020 project. It resembles product development, where on-going PE practices are boosted with the knowledge gained from the research in PE2020.

Decisions and clarifications:

- It is important to keep in mind the limited resources devoted to pilots.
- Project coordinator will talk in due time with the project officer to ensure common understanding of the nature of pilots.
- International research programmes and prioritization of research were acknowledged as interesting context for pilots.
- Collaboration with Engage2020 project help find linkages to PE in the field of societal challenges.
- Pilots should be chosen on the basis of cutting edge PE activity. New types of institutional collaboration and hybrid activities were considered particularly interesting themes.
- WP3 leader will develop a specified work plan, where he will further elaborate the first stages of WP3 and the framework for analyzing the pilots.

WP4 PE design toolkit

Luciano d'Andrea presented WP4. The key point about the toolkit emerging from the presentation is that of understanding which will be its **added value** in the “crowded market” of toolkits, guidelines, handbooks, etc. on PE in S&T. An **internal discussion** on aims and features of the toolkit could be therefore promoted just from the outset of the project, since it could contribute to shape the other WPs (1, 2 and 3).

Luciano presented a short analysis of a set of 26 toolkits and guidelines (13 on PE in general and 13 on PE in S&T) allowed to identify a first **set of options** to be taken into consideration in the internal discussion: 1) **Toolkit vs. Handbook** (Toolkit as a mere organized set of resources on PE, Handbook as a structured approach to PE). 2) **Critical approach vs. Neutral approach** (Critical approach as an approach to PE also highlighting limits, problems, risks and obstacles; Neutral approach as a proactive, smooth and non-problematic approach to PE). 3) **Targeted vs. Untargeted text** (Targeted text as a text addressing specific users and organizational contexts; Untargeted text as a text addressing many users and attaching a lesser or no importance to the organizational contexts). 4) **Model- vs. Non-model-based product** (Model-based product as a product which is based on a clear theoretical and/or methodological model or typology on PE; Non-model-based product as a product which is not based on any model or typology). 5) **Degree of exhaustiveness** of the text (To what extent the text is aimed at presenting all the tools and methods available, providing case studies or giving information on the different national contexts). 6) **Innovation criteria** (Since PE2020 is focused on PE innovative methods and tools, it will be necessary to define innovation criteria to apply in the toolkit). 7) **Toolkit components** (Which components to include in the final product).

In the discussion, the need to connect from the outset WP4 with the first three WPs was recognized. Especially it was noticed that the conceptual model (WP2) should inform the structure of the toolkit.

Decisions and clarifications:

- It was considered important that an early “business plan” for the toolkit will be prepared. Therefore it was proposed that LSC could draft a short document where a first proposal on aims and key features of the toolkit is presented. The document could be used for triggering an exchange process among the PE2020 consortium members on the toolkit.
- Reflecting the idea of building on the conceptual model created in WP2, it was considered that the toolkit could be a model-based product.

- It was stressed the need to develop, not a mere organized set of resources, but a more structured product (more similar to guidelines or a handbook, rather than to a toolkit in the strict sense).
- Finally, a first orientation was given to develop a toolkit which adopts a critical approach, i.e., aware of the problems, obstacles and critical points of PE-oriented initiatives as well as of the broader European changing context for what concerns science and technology and science-society relationships.

Stakeholder analysis

The stakeholder analysis workshop was held during the meeting excursion to Orimattila near Helsinki March the 6th, 2014. In the workshop participated all partners and a member of the SAB, i.e. Suzanne de Cheveigné, Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, Tine Ravn, Timo Aarrevaara, Luciano d'Andrea, Niels Mejlgaard, Minna Kaarakainen, Kaisa Matschoss and Mikko Rask. The workshop was organised with the world café –method and it produced following list of stakeholder groups.

I Key stakeholders:

- Scientific associations, esp. SiS experts (e.g. EAST, Society for Social Studies of Science 4S public consultancies e.g. Involve, Demos)
- Academic journals, Science magazines
- Science education (for children)
- NGOs (citizen/science actors)
- National and international funding agencies
- BIG national research institutes (e.g. Frahofer, Max Planck, Welcome trust)
- Regional and local authorities
- Governmental agencies
- National S&T policy councils
- Associations of universities (EUA, IAU, LERU)
- European Science Foundation
- European Commission (e.g. DG R&I, European Joint Research Institute)
- Joint research programme
- Science museums (e.g. Ecsite)

Channels to reach key stakeholders:

- media
- publishing in academic and international journals, conferences, associations (journal articles or reviews)
- research reports (e.g. EUA, IAU)
- personal communication, meetings/appointments, personal contact networks of partners
- networks, like Ecsite, lobbies in Brussels, the network of funding agencies, ESF, EUA
- conferences/websites of major organisations (aiming the hub of these)

- workshops (ESF, EUA, LERU)
- organisation of thematic seminars in collaboration with key stakeholders
- national science events' organizers
- homepages
- head of university departments
- social media, such as: twitter/facebook
- information events
- policy briefs
- newsletters
- exhibitions in science museums

II Influential but less-informed stakeholders:

- Municipalities & regional authorities & regional authority for municipalities
- Parliaments
- Ministries (education, culture, science and technology)
- Technology assessment bodies (aware, EPTA (European parliamentary technology assessment))
- National councils of science
- CSO's (Trade unions)
- Industry confederations
- High-tech industries
- National Media
- Ethic councils
- Universities & higher education institutions
- Technopolis group (company)
- Political parties
- Football clubs
- Patient groups
- Academics and learned societies

Channels to reach influential but less-informed stakeholders:

- conferences and other meeting points of these groups of stakeholders (such as "European R&D"/ "Research Europe")
- "mind blowing" events, showcase international, best practices in a national context
- special events & information for citizens (e.g. football clubs)
- social media: twitter/facebook
- professional SiS-practitioners
- journal articles

- EU-wide PE2020 broadcast news channel
- personal networks & communication
- information letters via email
- local and regional media
- quality assurance council (QAC)

III Other stakeholders:

- Women's associations
- Newspaper readers
- News "consumers"
- Local authorities
- schools
- Activists/CSOs/NGOs from other policy fields
- "discontented" citizens
- religious institutions
- local media
- SMEs
- Journalists
- famous citizens + artists + intellectuals
- farmers, in general population from rural areas
- university researchers
- patient groups

Channels to reach other stakeholders:

- personal communication
- information events
- newsletters
- general/mass/local media (e.g. articles on PE2020 in newspapers or popular science magazines)
- appearance in some "specialised" media or network (e.g. farmers', activists', local authorities networks; unions, associations, professional networks)
- presentations in seminars, events, meetings
- produce arguments/evidence for the added value of public engagement
- produce polemic articles resisting BAU-policy
- science events' organisers
- social media: twitter/facebook
- professional SiS-practitioners
- consumer organisations

- student organisations
- internet hubs

Risk analysis

A brainstorming- based risk analysis was organized. Following risks for the project were identified. Partners were also asked to prioritize most severe risks that need most attention and propose measures for mitigation. Identified risks are presented below in a decreasing order of priority (based on the voting).

1. Difficulties in pilots (3 votes)
 2. WP-WP detachment risk (2 votes)
 3. Not having partners for pilots (2 votes)
 - no institutional support
 4. Conflict of procedure /process (eg. WP n-1 not useful to WP n) (2 votes – not high risk)
 5. Inner risks of the scientific process (2 votes)
 6. Lack of uptake of the toolkit (1 vote)
 7. Risk of taking “the wrong first step” (1 vote)
 - not the same “common ground”
 - going into wrong direction
 - have differing definitions/target groups
 8. Inflation of “requirements” (1 vote)
 - over ambition
 9. In conducting pilots (internally) and with the projects being “piloted” (1 vote)
 10. EC doesn’t accept the toolkit (1 vote – fatal risk)
-
11. Individual partner risk of crossing the budget (no votes)
 12. Risk of not reaching the intended stakeholders (no votes)
 - negligence of project after 6 months
 13. Not reaching the impact foreseen (no votes)
 14. Understanding of “pilot” (no votes)

Ideas for the mitigation of the risks:

- regarding the pilots (1): the pilots should be chosen as soon as possible and involve them tightly to the project.
 - starting to find partners for the pilots in good time
 - thinking carefully the arguments for the pilots to show the external partners what they would benefit from the pilots
 - try to reach the 6 challenges so that one pilot meets several challenges
 - not to have too high expectations for the pilots
- regarding conflict of procedure/ process (4) Continues : there should be continuous communication & interaction with partners.
 - skype contacting regularly to make sure we are going to a right direction

DAY3

WP5 Dissemination

WP5 was presented by Kaisa Matschoss. Kaisa reminded that the objectives of dissemination include 1) communication of the results and insights to academic and broader communities, 2) interaction and dialogue with science policy actors and related societal stakeholders and 3) contributing to an increased awareness of best PE practices and to the implementation of better societal engagement in Horizon 2020.

Dissemination activities include policy briefs (at least three), seminar and conference presentation, news (based on blogs). The blog or project website (www.PE2020.eu) will be updated monthly.

Kaisa reminded that dissemination activity belongs to all partners, and partners should also contact their national stakeholders and contacts.

Some practical guidelines were informed. First, the following information should be included in all deliverables and publications: 1) project full name and acronym, 2) text informing the reader that the project is financed by FP7 (*This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no: 611826*), if possible, the European Flag (not possible e.g. in scientific publications). Second, as specified in CA, no prior notice to the partners is required from conference abstracts and presentations, non-refereed, dissemination oriented publications; for other intended publication (e.g. scientific papers) a prior notice should be sent to the partners 45 days before publication. In case of objections, these must be done within 30 days to the coordinator and the concerned party.

Decisions and clarification:

- The blog will be updated monthly.
- The logo for the project is decided:



- Kaisa will give PE2020 leaflets and encourage partners to spread those in proper places. When partners are talking and lecturing about PE2020, they should keep record of such activities and inform Kaisa, so that she is able to update reports of dissemination activities.
- First results of WP1 and WP2 will be presented in **Public Communication of Science and Technology Conference (PCST 2014) in Salvador, Brasil on 5-8 May 2014.**

WP6 Management

WP6 was presented by Mikko Rask. He presented the objectives, activities and structure of PE2020 management, as well as the roles of the partners and scientific advisory panel. It was reminded that the coordinator is the single point of contact between the Commission and the Consortium as specified in GA and CA.

The management committee (MAC) consists of one representative of each partner, as specified in the GA. In the GA, the management committee is specified to consist of the work package leaders. The consortium defines the leader not to mean a person but the organisation. Therefore, instead of 6 representatives (according to the amount of WPs) there are 5 representatives in the MAC (according to the amount of partners). The MAC will be responsible for all major decision-making and the overall execution of the project. The MAC shall meet at least annually during the project life upon the request of its chairperson or at any other time when necessary upon the request of one or several of the consortium partners. The chairperson shall convene meetings, with at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior notice with an agenda. As a normal procedure, the MAC meetings will be organised in the context of regular Consortium meetings. Minutes of the meetings of the MAC shall be transmitted to all PE2020 partners within fifteen (15) calendar days after the meeting. To ensure proper quality check of all Project Deliverables by the Management Committee, the internal deadline for submission of each Deliverable by the responsible Partner to the Coordinator is set at 30 calendar days before the Deliverable submission date as specified in GA and GA.

Mikko reminded about important financial issues. All the costs necessary for the implementation of the project are eligible (no business class and only 2 drinks at meals). VAT is not an eligible cost. Explanations of the personnel costs, subcontracting, travelling and any major costs should link to DoW and explained in form C. All the invoices, timesheets, work specs and other related documents should be saved for a minimum of five years after the end of the project!

Decisions and clarifications:

- The members (and vice members) of MAC were nominated: Mikko Rask, NCRC (Kaisa Matschoss); Niels Mejlgaard, AU (Tine Ravn); Luciano d'Andrea, LSC (Fabio Feudo); Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS (Loretta Tauginiene); Timo Aarrevaara (HU) (Ian Dobson).
- Attendance to consortium meetings is required from each partner.
- The time schedules of the next consortium meetings were specified: **M2: January 2015, Aarhus, Denmark (AU); M3: June 2015, Vilna, Lithuania (VU IBS); M4: January 2016, Rome, Italy (LSC); M5: November 2016, Brussels, Belgium (NCRC).** All consortium meetings will be 2-3 days long.
- Partners are expected to send quarterly reports on their expenses (in a template provided by the coordinator) and time used (based on the party's own time registration system) to the coordinator within one month of the end of each quarter of the project.
- Work progress reports pertaining to each work package need to be submitted semi-annually to the coordinator. A specific template will be provided later.
- In email communications, insert "PE2020" should be add at the beginning of your subject line (when sending mail to any member of the consortium in relation to PE2020). All PE2020-related emails should be addressed asap and respecting the requirements of effective working of the consortium.
- Skype meetings will be regularly used to support the working of the consortium. Materials should be sent at least 2 calendar days before such meetings. Skype meetings will be organized on a regular basis on the first Tuesday of each month at 10:00 o'clock EET (9 CET). Next skype meeting will be April 1st at 10.00 EET.

- Wrike project software will be used as the project extranet for document archiving, contacts, time scheduling, sending reminders and as a working space. Partners are requested to test the system and start using it in the management of working documents and processes.
- Specific deadlines for each Deliverable will be listed in the Specified work plans (prepared by WP leaders and accepted by MAC), and will be considered binding to all Project Partners. Each Project Deliverable is subject to internal quality check prior to submission to the European Commission. The procedure for quality check is specified in GA and CA. Exceptions in quality checks should be described and justified in specified work plans. Deadlines for partner that are defined in the specified work plans need to be inserted in Wrike (project extranet).
- The Coordinator needs to be allowed 3 days for uploading the Deliverables in the Participants' Portal.

Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board

Markku Mattila chaired a separate meeting with the SAB, where physically present were Suzanne de Cheveigné and Martin Hynes, in addition to Markku, and Simon Burall participated through skype. Markku had an opening presentation, where he reminded the SAB about its tasks in 1) Assessing the scientific quality and especially practical relevance of the work, 2) Advising the Steering Committee and the Coordinator on issues relating to the progression of the research activities, 3) Providing advice and support in terms of external communications and dissemination, and 4) if needed, in discussing strategies and contingency plans in case of obstacles or delays to the envisioned implementation of the project.

Markku invited the SAB to discuss 1) the SAB members' expectations of PE2020, 2) criteria of success for PE2020, 3) suggestions of themes for PE pilots, 4) rationales for increased PE in the context of research programmes related to societal challenges and 5) ideas of collaboration and dissemination. SAB was also asked to inform the consortium about its preferred way of working in this project.

The results of the SAB meeting were reported and deliberated collectively with the PE2020 consortium, see below.

Meeting with the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB)

The discussion with SAB was a lively exchange of views. SAB was really active in providing insights and advise to the consortium, reported below in regard to their expectations, criteria of success for PE2020 and suggestions for pilots.

Expectations

- Public engagement is necessary when traditional forms of representation are broken.
- Policy makers are interested not only on new methods, but also on new type of evidence needed in institutions. To change policy makers thinking not only talk about tools but goals of action is necessary.
- It was considered important to keep on discussing what is public engagement for – is it policy oriented, science focused, or aiming at increased interaction between different actors.
- PE2020 should focus its communication – are the targets of the project are EC, academia, national governments or PE practitioners?
- PE2020 should be carried out in a close collaboration with Engage2020.

- The toolkit has to get into what really works or doesn't work in PE, and this could be done under the so-called 'critical approach'.

Criteria of success

- **Policy impact** – that policy makers are able to listen to what the public is saying and (in theory at least) impact on policy. Link to policy world was considered essential, since it is generally challenging to affect policy making through public engagement exercises.
- **Publicity** – that we are genuinely getting to the public (or at least some publics).
- **Continuity** – that we are attempting more than a one off engagement (often actually just information extraction) and aiming for something more persistent that is really about wider governance than it is about a specific policy decision at a particular policy moment.
- **Innovativeness** – we are dealing with an innovation where there is considerable uncertainty about the right direction to take, where there are significant moral, ethical, economic and social questions arising (although some board members expressed to be relatively ambivalent with this aspect in the context of a scientific project).
- **Research and evaluation** – that we are testing not just the method, but the factors that make the method successful.

Suggestions for pilots

- SAB was worried about the limited resources devoted to pilots, and therefore the consortium should define and communicate 'pilots' in a realistic way.
- It was considered to a good idea to conduct the pilots together with some European research programmes, to whom new PE tools could be suggested, and the programmes could do the main body of work themselves.
- The SAB members were particularly taken by the idea of the science museums and centres and flipping the idea of the hard to reach on its head to see if it is possible to pilot different ways to get policy makers into spaces where the public (or at least some publics) already go. This is in contrast to the usual way of doing things which is to try to get the public to go to places where policy makers want to be.
- It is important to treat 'symmetrically' the science and the citizen sides. This means having a view of public engagement initiated from producers or brokers of science information – typically Science museums or projects – but also from the side of the public – typically CSO's. So among the pilot studies, some should be cases initiated on that side.
- It was considered essential to find out, through the pilots, what is working, what are the obstacles and reasons of why something is not working.
- Success criteria should be defined (e.g. process quality, substantial improvement, policy outcomes), and criteria should be used when cases are selected and studied.
- Access to 'cutting edge' type of development through was considered important.
- The place of the media (old and new) should be thought about. Social media should be present in some – not necessarily all – pilots.

Management committee meeting

A formal management committee meeting was hold with a separate agenda. Many of the detailed decisions were taken in the context of discussing separate work packages, and only major decisions were taken in that meeting (see a separate memorandum).

2.2.2. CM2 Aarhus



Public
for Horizon 2020

Engagement

Innovations

Minutes of the consortium meeting

M2, 28-30 January 2015, Aarhus, Denmark
DRAFT

Written and reviewed by:

Mikko Rask

11. February 2015

Introduction

PE2020 project has been going on for one year, and the consortium meeting was organized to discuss how the project is running globally and how the work of individual work packages is progressing. A preliminary agenda of the meeting was sent to the consortium members, members of the advisory board and PO one month beforehand. Background materials consisting of coordinator's progress report (5 pages), draft of D1.2, working documents of WP2 and WP3 were sent to the participants one week beforehand to support discussions.

The meeting was hosted by the University of Aarhus in a beautiful campus area. A get together dinner was organized on 28 Jan. the meeting took place between 29-30 Jan.

Following partners from all organizations involved participated in the meeting:

- Niels Mejlgaard, AU
- Tine Ravn, AU
- Luciano d'Andrea, LSC
- Fabio Feudo (28-29 Jan.)
- Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS
- Loreta Tauginiene, VUIBS

- Timo Aarrevaara, UH
- Maria Pietilä, UH
- Kaisa Matschoss, CSRC/ UH
- Mikko Rask, CSRC/ UH

Members of the advisory board were also invited. Present were the following members:

- Martin Hynes, ESF
- Suzanne de Cheveigné, Centre Norbert Elias
- Edward Andersson, Involve UK (replacing Simon Burall)

Other two members of the advisory board, Markku Mattila and Eleonore Pawls, were not able to participate in this meeting.

The coordinator intends to keep this memorandum of the consortium meeting short, since the main decisions are summarized in the minutes of the MAC meeting that was organized at the end of the consortium meeting to confirm main decisions.

Discussions and decisions during the consortium meeting

The morning of 29 Jan. was devoted to WP1 issues. Discussions took place both as a plenary and in small groups, and the main issues concerned the number of cases, the quality of case descriptions and the ways to complete the following deliverables. The consortium found a consensus on the ways to complete research activities leading to D1.2-1.4 (see the Minutes of the MAC meeting).

The afternoon of 29 Jan. was devoted to WP2 issues. The consortium heard a presentation by the WP2 leader about the literature analysis done thus far. The discussion was supported by a working document on the conceptual model.

Unlike planned to focus on a discussion on how a model of “research policy cycle” could be adopted at the programme level, the consortium preferred to keep the discussion on a more general level. For this purpose a facilitated debate about what makes public engagement successful was organized instead. This led to an interesting list of pre-conditional and outcome factors of successful engagement. The discussion was generally considered very useful in contributing to a more common vision of this important issue (e.g., “balanced inclusion” and “transparency” were considered most important pre-conditions, and “improvement of policies”, “enlarged capacities” and “continuity and trust” as most important outcomes of PE. Overall, the consortium reminded of the importance of focusing the work package on the main issues under investigation (dynamic governance, innovativeness of PE, participatory performance). Links to other WPs were discussed, and in particular, it was decided that the content analysis of the 50 innovative PE cases will be carried out under WP2. For other decisions, see the Minutes of the MAC meeting.

The morning of 30 Jan. was planned to be started with SAB’s feedback, but the SAB wished to postpone this session after discussion of WP3 and WP4 to get a more complete understanding of the project status.

The morning of 30 Jan. then started with a discussion on WP3 issues. The nature of “pilots” or “pilot initiatives” as they are now called was discussed extensively. Even though literature acknowledges the concept of “retrospective pilots”, the consortium considered it more vital to organize 6 pilots as active interventions instead. The limited resources for organizing the pilots were reflected, and for the very same purpose the potential of carrying out retrospective pilots. The idea of pilots based on active interventions got support, however, since they were considered more familiar in the context of participatory research. In addition, such pilots are effective ways of disseminating knowledge of PE activities through collaboration and “nudging” current PE activities to a more participatory direction. The resource limitations were considered a critical issue, and the consortium supported the idea that the coordinator communicates the plans to PO.

The afternoon of 30 Jan. continued with a presentation by the WP4 leader, who gave a broad presentation about public engagement in the context of EU RRI policies. The analysis was considered very useful also for WP2. In addition, the work of WP4 has continued in the clarification of a strategic niche in the area of PE toolkits that are already available. It was agreed that a more concrete plan of the toolkit will be prepared for the next consortium meeting.

The SAB gather together to formulate their recommendations on the PE2020 project. Overall, they considered that the project is proceeding well, and it is very promising yielding interesting results to the field. Better liaison with the PO was among the main recommendations, and the coordinator promised to take actions to this direction. Other recommendations are listed in the Minutes of the MAC meeting.

Remainder of the second day afternoon were spent in discussing WP5 and WP6 issues. The main message of WP5 was that partners should effectively work toward publishable peer reviewed papers. Resulting from brainstorming in small groups, a paper on “dynamic governance” was initiated. Other papers were also discussed and conferences were considered important channels to support paper development. For other news on WP5 see the MAC minutes.

News of WP6 were sparse, since the REA process resulting in the acknowledgment of the merger of NCRC with UH was in process. (Now, during the writing of these memorandum the REA had finally acknowledged this merger and the process leading to an amendment of the GA can move forward.)

The consortium ended up with a MAC meeting where the main decisions were confirmed (see a separate document: “Minutes of the MAC meeting”).

2.2.3. CM3 Vilnius

Consortium Meeting Memorandum Vilnius, November 2-3, 2015

Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020 (PE2020)

Venue: Vilniaus universiteto Tarptautinio verslo mokykla (VU IBS)

Address: Saulėtekio al. 22, Vilnius, Lithuania

Participants

Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė, VU IBS

Loreta Tauginiene, VU IBS

Vytautas Dikčius, VU IBS

Timo Aarravaara, UH

Luciano d'Andrea, LSC

Kaisa Matschoss, UH, secretary

Mikko Rask, UH, coordinator

Martin Hynes, ESF, SAB member

Edward Andersson (skype participation on Day 1 at 10-11 am), representing SAB on behalf of Simon Burall

Agenda

The meeting followed the agenda that was sent in advance to the participants (see Annex 1). Deviations were that the brainstorming of Day 1 was replaced with a continued discussion on WP2 issues lasting until 18:30 o'clock. Preliminary SAB feedback was given by Dr. Martin Hynes, who was the only SAB member present; it was agreed that the SAB will send its written feedback in a couple of weeks after consulting other members.

Morning - WP5 issues

WP5 leader Kaisa Matschoss gave an overview of dissemination activities. Several dissemination activities have taken place, as reported in the periodic report. The emphasis on the discussion was in the planning of future activities.

Production of at least 4 peer reviewed articles remains a priority. Currently there are two full manuscripts under revision. It was concluded that promising seeds for papers can be found in WP1, 2 work as well as WP3 and WP4. It was considered appropriate to first finish analysis and then move toward reporting in the form of journal articles. Since the latter process can take much time, it was considered prudent that the coordinator raises this issue with the PO.

Newspaper articles: It was noted with delight that Timo had just published a news about PE2020 in Horizon Portal 8 (p. 22) <http://www.horizon2020publications.com/H8/files/assets/common/downloads/Pan%20European%20Networks%20-%20Government.pdf>. Each partner should write at least one newspaper article by May 2016. Martin suggested that a subscription service called 'Meltwater news' could be used as an instrument supporting identification of relevant regional newspapers and opportunities for publication, as well as a tool analyzing the impact of dissemination.

It was noted that the first policy brief is under finalization and will be soon published, reporting mainly about WP1 and WP2 findings. It was agreed that the opportunities to translate the policy brief to the following languages will be explored: Lithuanian, French, Italian and Finnish.

Website: it was agreed that a short notice on the withdrawal of Aarhus will be published in the blog in the same context as the University of Lapland will be introduced as a new partner.

A workshop on policy conference was organized. Kaisa reported about the co-design of the policy conference together with the CASI project. Martin highlighted the need to share the conceptual implementation with CASI/PE2020 final policy conference. Luciano also emphasized the need to clarify strategic purposes (e.g. if we want to say something controversial) and on this basis start thinking who will be invited (e.g. university rectors). An adequate collaboration between CASI and PE2020 will be ensured by the coordinators of these projects who will meet soon and also discuss with the POs of these projects (actually done 9-10 Nov. in Engage 2020 policy conference in Brussels); further, representatives from both projects will be included in the conference steering committee.

- Mikko reported about his experiences and difficulties with a ‘conference panel’ that was tested in the Deliberation democracy R&D day in Finland recently. Martin also reflected that the on-line deliberation format of such method can be risky and it requires extremely high quality of facilitation and communication skills. It was considered important to take into account these difficulties while proceeding with the planning of the policy conference; the conference steering committee could perhaps adopt a similar role as previously planned for the panel.
- Edward reported about the forthcoming Engage2020 policy conference that has been prepared in close collaboration with the EC SWAF team. The core message of that conference is the “need for deepening and widening PE across Europe”. The number of organizations and institutions in this field are increasing, while the field itself remains fractured; therefore there is the need to share practices between different sub-communities such as TA and citizen science. Edward also mentioned that their Twitter campaign was effective in reaching participants. Mikko reminded about the salience of creating continuity between Engage2020 and PE2020 policy conferences, in order to support continuity and network building.
- It was discussed that an important function of the PE2020 policy conference could be in reaching such research actors who are not yet in the field of PE but who will be forced to adopt such practices. For example, university leaders (and those that change the perceptions in research institutions) researchers, and industry. Other stakeholders include e.g. European association of social scientists, PE2020 sister projects and national and EU R&I policy makers and financiers. It would be important to ‘testimony’ about the benefits of PE in the context of different societal challenges as well as critically discuss bottle necks in adopting new practices.
- Following insights about the policy conference were reflected in the workshop
 - Lessons to be learned from other domains where PE has been long applied or been mandatory
 - Invitation of the most innovative case representatives (for inspiration!)
 - Covering EU’s societal challenges (all areas?)
 - Continuity with other PE projects and programmes
 - Different functions of PE highlighted
 - Hindrances of PE, in different levels

- Invitees: pilot testing people, sister project people, national, EU-level policy makers, companies
- TARGETS: 100 people, 1,5 days

Noon - WP6 issues

Coordinator Mikko Rask gave an overview presentation and update about the PE2020 project. He reminded about the primary objectives of the project, and then presented the GANTT charted time schedule of the project, including how different work packages are planned to be implemented and what is their current status.

WP1 is ready. The two remaining deliverables of WP2 have been submitted as draft versions but still need to be refined to ensure high quality. WP3 is basically following the time schedule, however, D3.1 still needs further elaboration to ensure that lessons from context tailoring workshops can effectively be drawn. WP4 has started even before originally planned, but reflecting the suggestion of the PO to start this work a bit earlier, this WP is now at the state of definition of the criteria for the web tool. WP5 has developed dissemination plans and implemented them accordingly, as was discussed in the morning session.

The coordinator also presented the current budget based on the latest figures collected for the periodic report. It was agreed that Timo will once more check the use of WP1, WP2 and WP5 person months, as there is still the possibility to correct the budget before submission of the periodic report in the participant portal.

Mikko presented the current status of amendment 1, which had not yet been signed, at the time of the meeting, by the EC due to some technical problems. He also explained that technical problems were a reason why it has not yet been possible to submit the periodic report. He promised to check the status from the administrative officer and let the partners know about it.

The coordinator also explained his contacts with the PO, including a visit to meet the current and future POs of PE2020 in Brussels in April 2015. Additional contacts have been e.g. through the MORRI workshop in Brussels and discussions about the policy conference planned to be organized with the CASI project. The consortium and its SAB member Martin Hynes were delighted about the deepened exchanges between the PE2020 coordinator and PO and Commission's SWAF team.

The coordinator discussed the forthcoming amendment 2 confirming the exit of Aarhus University from the consortium as well as the entrance of the University of Lapland in the consortium as a new partner. In addition to these issues, the consortium needs to re-allocate 1.0 person months remaining from AU among its partners.

The coordinator also paid attention to the challenges ahead. For WP2 he reminded that the various functions of PE should be better described and illustrated, success and innovation aspects highlighted and links to Horizon 2020 issues reinforced.

Finally, a workshop for conducting an external evaluation was organized, including brainstorming of the criteria and possible format of the evaluation as well as new candidates for conducting the evaluation. It was agreed that a 'developmental' or 'formative' approach to evaluation should be adopted. The evaluation should help the consortium to develop a better quality of remaining deliverables, and ensuring their relevance, dissemination and longevity, and otherwise ensuring that the project will be effectively shared and networked to relevant stakeholder groups. Materials

for evaluation could include interviews, document reading, and participating in the policy conference and consortium meetings.

The evaluation call for tenders could be sent to the following experts: Mike Saks, Göran Melin, Gema Revuelta, Anneli Pauli, Peter Tindemans.

Afternoon, WP2 issues

WP2 leader Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė gave an update about the current status of WP2. Both D2.2 and D2.3 are still under work, and need some further elaboration and comments by the partners. It was agreed that D2.2 will be first finalized, focusing it more clearly on the analysis of the 38 innovative PE cases using both the survey analysis and cognitive map analysis. It was agreed that D2.3 will draw some more general lessons and insights based on the content analysis and literature review.

Following themes were discussed:

- What issues should be studied further in WP3.
- Loreta's presentation about obstacles for PE might be an interesting topic to be included in a policy brief, including PE2020 suggestions for solutions.
- Luciano: Dynamic governance is needed, because everything changes continuously, dynamic governance cannot be reached without PE, PE is needed to be structurally embedded in all of the levels of projects, PE could support a governance that is dynamic which further supports RRI and long term interests of the EU - "you need a contextualized PE in order to reach dynamic governance".
- Trust as a building block for continuity, when hierarchical relations have disappeared, like in science. Trust could also be seen as a characteristic of RRI rather than a capability.

There was also a long discussion about the conceptual model developed in the current D2.2 draft. It was scrutinized from many angles, and finally considered a viable way to report findings on the PE cases and draw lessons and attention on the dynamic governance aspects of PE.

In order to finalize D2.2, following **Task list and restructuring strategy was agreed among the partners:**

1. Chapter 2 (Data) & 3 (Methods), Timo writes together with Loreta and Saule according to the missing topics that he mentioned in the discussions.
2. Making sure that the survey and maps are explained and used at a similar level of detail, Saule & Loreta will check the survey against the description of maps made by Mikko.
3. Additions to the explanations and interpretations of the conceptual mapping, Mikko.
4. Elaborate on the concept of dynamic governance and relate it to the context, Luciano.
5. Shift the two new models on page 12 into D2.3, Saule.
6. Edit the text for criteria of innovativeness to make it more understandable and readable, Kaisa.
7. Deletion of percentages in all D2.2, Loreta & Saule.
8. Combination of sections 5 and 6, Mikko.

9. Successfulness and obstacles: from the right hand side of the maps (output), Saule & Loreta success, Challenges for Luciano.
10. Performative functions: from the left hand side of the maps (focus and approach), make a strong link to anticipation, reflection, transdisciplinarity, continuity, Saule & Mikko.

Following time schedule was defined:

- Analysis by the end of Nov. 2015
- Next full version by mid Dec. 2015
- Final version by mid Jan. 2016

In order to facilitate the writing process, it was agreed that the most recent versions will be uploaded in either Wrike/ DropBox (possibly in Evernote collective writing tool), and changes indicated with track changes. Changes should be done directly in the document, and if possible, avoid mere commenting since it tends to hinder effective writing.

The afternoon session was continued until 18:30 as it was necessary to make a clear plan for finalizing WP2. There was not time to organize the brainstorming about open science and innovation.

Discussions were continued in a working dinner in a beautiful country side restaurant.

DAY 2

Morning session - WP3 issues

The second day began with the presentation of WP3 leader Timo Aarrevaara. Timo presented the work related to the context-tailoring workshops that were organized in Finland (Apr 9th) and Italy (May 6th). He also presented the preliminary evaluation framework of the 6 pilots, and then moved on to giving an overview of the following three pilot initiatives organized by the Finnish WP3 team:

- Promotion of science-society dialogues among the Baltic Sea early-career scientists
- Piloting of societal interaction plans in the context of JPI More years, better life and the Academy of Finland strategic research programme
- Town hall meetings organized by the global change research programme

A presentation of the following three Italian pilots was given by Luciano d'Andrea:

- Involving researchers in education on public engagement
- Public forum on mobility and transportation
- Empowering young researchers on PE in energy efficiency

In order to conclude D3.1, the following plan was agreed:

1. Luciano creates a programme of the Italian context tailoring workshop.
2. Description of the context: the type of people who were present, in appendix the list of participants for the report that goes to the commission, but not to the public deliverable.
3. Bring back the original title of the deliverable as required by the Commission.
4. The structure: 1. what was the idea of the context tailoring workshop, 2. How did you organize the workshops in Finland and Italy, report the way you organized the context

tailoring in the other two cases and why did you decided not to have a context tailoring, 3 lessons learned.

5. Find out whether there is literature on context-tailoring.
6. Two weeks for D3.1, Luciano provides material, Timo delivers the report for partners to comment.

Finally, a brainstorming was launched to collect criteria that can be used in the evaluation of the societal interaction plans of the Academy of Finland strategic research proposals. Many criteria were suggested, and the following four were considered most relevant:

- Contribution to the capacities of dynamic governance (e.g. foresight, reflexivity, transdisciplinarity)
- The stage of research (policy) cycle where intended PE activities are aimed
- Nature of proposed public engagement mechanisms (e.g. hearing, consulting, dialogue, deliberation, participation, activism OR methodological mix)
- Targeting at scientific, policy, or other societal objectives
- (Other identified criteria included: model of organization – bottom up vs. top down; reference to either scientific vs. practical base of PE activity)

Afternoon session - WP4 issues

WP4 leader Luciano d'Andrea gave an update of WP4 work. He reviewed existing PE toolkits, and observed that most of them provide an 'event based' approach. Such toolkits are problematic since they are detached from the policy context and reflect an uncritical attitude. PE2020 toolkit should make a betterment to these issues. Luciano also presented other important factors related to the culture of PE and RRI, including detachment of universities of this development, obstacles of positive development in this sector, as well as ideas about the current status of this area. He recognized a strong role by the EC, an on-going bottom-up movement including volunteer organizations, and the high expectations about a 'structural reform' through PE. Compared to the high expectations, current practice of PE seems weak.

Luciano then presented the planned toolkit approach. It includes ideas about framing PE in line with perceiving science as a complex social institution, emphasizing governance instead of communication aspects of PE; as well as highlighting the proactive role of PE in pushing through structural changes to current practice of science and scientific citizenship.

Luciano proposed that the TARGET of PE toolkit should be research institutions (leaders and staff) and, secondarily, policy makers. The AIMS should include providing a set of guidelines (handbook-type) and a set of resources (toolkit-type) on how to develop PE in one's own institution. Proposed main components of the toolkit include: strategic framework (putting PE in context), methods and tools, 'institutional anchorage' (ideas linking PE to research system) and 'societal anchorage' (ideas and measures relating PE to even broader societal context).

In the discussion ensuing the presentation, following issues were reflected:

- Relation of PE2020 toolkit to Engage2020 toolkit. These were considered complementary, since Engage is more method oriented, whereas PE2020 could contribute to contextual issues.
- The proposed targets (research institutions primarily, also policy makers) were welcomed as relevant.
- It was considered relevant to consider whether some kind of ‘context tailoring workshop’ or tests with target groups should be organized to help define user requirements.
- Martin suggested that the cognitive maps produced in WP2 could be used as a material in the toolkit. He had also a relevant web tool design company in mind, and he promised to send a link to it.
- Kaisa suggested ‘decision tree’ as a potential structure of the toolkit.

Following work plan was proposed for WP4:

First draft of the D1 by the WP leader	October
Consultation with the consortium members at the Vilnius Consortium Meeting	November 2
Meeting with Engage2020 for possible forms of cooperation in developing the Toolkit	November 4
Definition of users’ and technical requirements of the Toolkit	November 15
Finalisation of the Toolkit Design Document	December 30
Revision of the Toolkit Design Document by the project coordinator	January 15
Uploading of the Toolkit Design Document (D4.1) on the EU Participant Portal	January 30 2015
First draft of the Toolkit text	March 31, 2016
Revision of the first draft of the text	May 15
Final version of the Toolkit	June 15

SAB feedback

Martin Hynes gave some early feedback on the progression of the project, and promised to send further feedback in written form after consulting other SAB members. He made the following observations about the PE2020 project:

- Work is going well, there is increasing maturity in the project
- Periodic report is fine (suggestion of a minor correction)
- Mind maps are useful and convincing
- Improved engagement with the PO, encouragement to continue toward the finalizing of promised output
- Timeline and milestones plans should better be approached

Next consortium meeting

Next consortium meeting planned to be organized in Rome in April / May 2016

APPENDIX 1
Consortium Meeting Final Agenda
Vilnius, November 2-3, 2015

Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020 (PE2020)

Venue: Vilniaus universiteto Tarptautinio verslo mokykla (VU IBS)

Address: Saulėtekio al. 22, Vilnius, Lithuania

DAY 0

TIME	Sunday 1 November 2015
20:00 – 21:00	Get together Meat Lovers Pub, Šv. Ignoto str. 14, Vilnius (in the old town, just few steps from the President House)

DAY 1

TIME	Monday 2 November 2015
09:45 – 10:00	Warm up and orientation
10:15 – 11:45	WP5: A review and discussion of dissemination activities WP Leader Kaisa Matschoss Workshop on the policy conference in Brussels in Nov. 2016
Flexible	Break and coffee
11:45 – 13:00	WP6: A project overview and discussion of management issues - collaboration with ENGAGE2020 and other sister projects Coordinator Mikko Rask Workshop on external evaluation
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break

TIME	Monday 2 November 2015
14:00 – 17:00	<p>– WP2: A review and reflection of the main conceptual issues WP Leader Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene and Dr Loreta Tauginiene</p> <p>Workshop on lessons learned from the analysis of innovative PE processes</p>
Flexible	Break and refreshments
17:00 – 17:45	<p>– A deliberative brainstorming Coordinator Mikko Rask</p> <p>How can PE, and in particular, “societal interaction plans” contribute to “open innovation, open science, open to the world”?</p>
17:45 – 17:50	– A closing reflection: message to day 2
19:00 – 21:00	– Working Dinner Restaurant

DAY 2

TIME	Tuesday 3 November 2015
9:30 – 12:00 Flexible break and coffee	<p>WP3: Review and discussion of the work-in-progress WP Leader Timo Aarrevaara</p> <p>Pilots</p> <p>Analysis and reporting of the pilots</p> <p>Workshop: stabilization of the evaluation frame - including the concept of the workshop in Lapland</p>
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch break
13:00 – 15:00	<p>WP4: Update and discussion of the webtool WP Leader: Luciano d’Andrea</p> <p>Workshop on the co-development of the Webtool with Engage2020</p>

TIME	Tuesday 3 November 2015
15:00 – 15:15	Coffee break
15:15 – 16:00	SAB reflections
16:00	Closing of the meeting

Happened after the meeting

First policy brief published on 10 Nov. 2015. This is translated in Lithuanian.

Engage2020 policy conference was hold on 9.-10.11. in Brussels

Amendment 1 was accepted just after the meeting.

2.2.4. CM4 Rome



Public
for Horizon 2020

Engagement

Innovations

Minutes of the consortium meeting M4

19-20 May 2016, Rome, Italy

Mikko Rask
University of Helsinki, Finland

Introduction

PE2020 project is running toward its end, with eight more months of effective work left. The consortium meeting was organized to discuss how the project is going globally and how the work of individual work packages is progressing. A preliminary agenda of the meeting was sent to the consortium and SAB members two months beforehand. Key documents, including e.g. draft of D2.2, D4.1, external evaluator's report and four completed pilot reports were sent to the participants three weeks beforehand to support discussions. Some other working documents materials (especially remaining D3 documents and a consultancy statement on the webtool subcontracting in WP4) were still under preparation and only belatedly delivered to the participants.

The meeting was hosted by the Laboratorio di Scienze della Cittadinanza at the hotel Domus Australia, in Rome, Italy. A get together dinner was organized on 18 May for those who arrived the day before the meeting.

The following partners representing all partner organizations participated in the meeting:

- Luciano d'Andrea, LSC
- Fabio Feudo, LSC
- Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS
- Timo Aarrevaara, LAY
- Kirsi Pulkkinen, LAY
- Kaisa Matschoss, UH
- Mikko Rask, UH

The following members of the advisory board also participated in the meeting:

- Martin Hynes, ESF
- Suzanne de Cheveigné, Centre Norbert Elias
- Edward Andersson, Involve UK (replacing Simon Burall)

Other two members of the advisory board, Markku Mattila and Eleonore Pawls, were not able to participate in this meeting (and actually it has become clear that Eleonore Pawls is not an active board member any more).

In addition, the external evaluator of the PE2020 project, **Göran Melin** from the Technopolis group also participated in the meeting during both days.

Discussions and decisions

DAY 1 (Thu 19.5.2016)

Warm up and agenda

The meeting started with a warm up and agenda. All invited participants were present. The agenda was accommodated by shifting some WP2 items to day 2. WP3 leader (Timo) could only stay during the first day but he was present when WP3 issues were discussed.

WP6: Project overview (Mikko)

The coordinator gave an update of the status of the project (Slides in Appendix II). He observed that the project is developing well despite some delays, especially in WPs 2 and 3. He listed key activities since the consortium meeting M3 in Vilnius, including the following ones:

- WP2: D2.2 is now substantially ready, and will be soon published in the PE2020 website, as soon as the layout is ready. D2.2 is an important publication of the results of PE2020, including a conceptual model of PE in the context of R&I governance. The report also elaborates a new **'footprinting method'** for the analysis of PE activities, and provides findings about the characteristics and trends of innovative PE.
- WP3: Pilots are now completed. Reporting is still in process about the three Finnish cases. The pilot processes have been successful, and activities have expanded in Finland, including seminars and spin off activities. **'Societal interaction plans'**, in particular have raised much interest.
- WP4: Design and content production for the webtool is proceeding well. There has been exchange with Engage2020, RRI toolkit, and other RRI conferences in Brussels.
- WP5: Timo and Mikko were in a JPI meeting in Brussels, in Jan. 2015, and Mikko has participated and contributed in several meetings in Brussels and beyond. There are expanding interactions with EU and Finnish PE actors. For example, seminar on participatory decision making was founded at UH in the autumn 2015, and it has led to interesting activities, e.g. **piloting of the Demola concept** (www.demola.net) in Helsinki, and other collaborations with Finnish R&I policy actors (e.g. presentation in Tutkas, the Finnish

association of researchers and members of the parliament). Preparations of the policy conference with CASI are going on. Production of academic papers and newspaper articles need further attention.

- WP6: External mid-evaluation was conducted. Periodic review is completed, and next pre-payments under processing. Second amendment to be formally initiated, as it is now possible.

In the discussion ensuing Mikko's presentation following **connections were suggested** by the advisors of PE2020. Martin proposed connections to the Atomium culture (<http://www.eismd.eu/>), European Institute for Science, Media and Democracy, which has PE on its agenda. Suzanne proposed connections to Climate action (<http://www.climateaction2016.org/#about>), which is for the implementation of the climate treaty and where public engagement is high in the agenda, and where advisory groups need more concrete ideas about the participatory methods. PE2020 could be included as a speaker there, as well as Marie Curie actions, including perhaps researchers' night.

WP2: Presentation and discussion on the key results of D2.2 (Mikko)

Mikko presented the results and status of Deliverable 2.2, which is an analysis of innovative PE processes and an elaboration of a conceptual model of PE in the context of R&I governance. The publication of D2.2 is delayed, but consciously so to ensure high quality. The key findings are summarized in the slides of Mikko's presentation (Appendix III).

The discussion included many reflections about the quality of the results and their implications. Following observations were made:

- The sample is 'skewed' in at least two senses: First, the studied projects are not as much intended to change academic world as they are intended to change decision making, second, they are geographically skewed as most of the innovative cases come from western Europe (Edward).
- Perhaps resulting from the 'skewed' focus of the studied PE sample, innovative PE was not found to be effective in producing new scientific knowledge, except in the cases of citizen science and science shops. It was considered interesting that the U.S. AAAS is producing a logic model of PE (with whom Mikko had been in contact), where changing academic practices are on the focus. Saule reminded that there is currently less and less effect on quality of policy making through academic results, and perhaps PE could have a role in contributing to this.
- It was noted that some of the categories used are general and difficult to apply to specific cases. For example, citizen science is difficult to locate under the category of public communication or public activism only (Suzanne). On the other hand, occasionally it is clear that some projects may be even deliberately directed at AVOIDING public activism (Edward).
- Edward considered it important ask what do the findings of this report mean practically. For example, there are certainly different messages for different countries that have different cultures of PE. Extensive public engagement do not necessarily serve good deliberation, such as e.g. Chatham house rules applied by chief scientists (Martin). More generally, it is important to ask what can be concluded from an analysis of a set of innovative PE processes,

for example, are the challenges of PE processes to be avoided or better addressed? Perhaps something general to be concluded is the need for increased boundary work between different institutions and actors (Suzanne).

As there were no further substantial comments on D2.2 manuscript, the consortium considered it ready for publication.

WP2: D2.3 Summary report (Saule)

Saule as the WP2 reader presented her thoughts on how to finalize D2.3, which is a summary report of WP2 (Slides in Appendix IV). The planned discussion on ensuing articles and dissemination activities was shifted to WP5 issues in the next day.

- Saule raised some issues that were explored through the literature review that was carried out under WP2. Such issues included e.g. notions of PE as a chaotic process across different stages of the policy cycle; the role of PE in increasing conflicts; notions of policy making as multi-layered and subjective activity; the importance of different socio-economic contexts; difficulty of predicting the results of PE; the importance of networking.
- Ideas were developed about what themes should be included in D2.3, and how to frame the whole report. Saule proposed to focus the aspect of successfulness. Edward observed that focusing on successfulness is interesting, as it raises up to another, more general, level of deliberating PE issues. Another proposal was to draw recommendations for the EC. This was considered, however, a task that could better fit the final report of PE2020 project (Suzanne). Timo proposed that the report should **focus on what value PE adds to whom**.

As there were more questions than answers, e.g. about the intended audience and focus of D2.3 report, the consortium decided to postpone the discussion on remaining WP2 issues for the next morning.

WP3: Overview of piloting activities WP3 (Timo & Kirsi)

WP leader Timo Aarrevaara and Doctoral candidate Kirsi Pulkkinen gave an overview of the pilots and gave their ideas about the content of D3.2 (Slides in Appendix V). In the ensuing discussions decisions were taken about the content, structure and deadlines of D3.2 as well as individual case reports.

Bonus-case included an intervention where blog writing was instructed to young scientists. Their activities were followed up as well as changed blog writing activity. The report is close to ready, final comments needed.

JPI MYBL –case has two stages. First stage is the negotiation between PE2020 and JPI MYBL related to the piloting of societal interaction plans. Second stage is the implementation of the plans. There has been issues about whether to frame JPI MYBL analysis on ‘societal interaction plans’ or ‘societal engagement and stakeholder analysis’. Data allowing analysis of the second stage is still missing.

- Due to time constraints, the consortium decided to focus the report of this case only on the first stage. The second stage can be reported in academic articles ensuing this research.

The interaction plans of the Strategic research council (linked to the Finnish Academy) forms the seventh pilot case. The interaction plans are a most topical, important and highly sensitive issue in Finland. There seem to be both formal and informal rules about what to include in the plans. The pilot study has conducted interviews and analysed the plans. The focus has been on themes discussed in D2.2, including e.g. what capacities do interaction plans offer to dynamic science governance; and what kinds of objectives are included (scientific, political, social).

There were interesting preliminary findings emerging from the early analysis of the interaction plans. E.g., a vision of co-design is a key to understanding how reflexivity is manifested; despite requests of new approaches, there is a strong trust in institutions and old partners; the analyses confirms the categories developed in WP2 (Timo); the whole funding instrument is political and Finnish researchers find the instrument a big strange; Martin reminded that underlying there are different understandings of what counts as real science. Further, lessons on what worked and what didn't work in this process were considered interesting for the EC in its potential piloting of similar interaction plans in future Horizon calls.

After the discussion on separate pilots, it was considered important to agree on the way to complete D3.2, and what to include in it. Timo referred to the ideas and categories that were used in the preparation of the WP3 pilot interviews and analysis, including e.g. identification of different types of public engagement methods and engagement frames (see Appendix V).

Some points raised in the discussion that we didn't manage to test innovative PE processes in new context according to our original plans, and perhaps one reason is that there is a 'cultural gap' for research institutions which complicates such activities (Edward). Luciano mentioned that all the pilots were focused on capacity building, and we should remind that we didn't have much resources for activities. Mikko mentioned that as D2.2 and WP2 analysis does not give much information on contextual issues, pilot experiences can potentially do so.

Encouraged by the external evaluator (Göran), the consortium preferred to deliver D3.2 report sooner than spending much more time waiting for new data. For this reason **it was decided about the following time schedule and plan for D3.2**

- The report of the JPI MYBL will be available within a week (**DL 27 May 2016**)
- D3.2 should be ready by end of June (**DL 30 June 2016**)
- Following guidelines were agreed on D3.2. The report should include a) Introduction, b) 7 case reports, and c) discussion focusing on the potential of PE2020 interventions in contributing to new capacities for public engagement.

WP4: Overview of activities and working on the web tool development (Luciano)

WP leader Luciano d'Andrea gave an applause worth presentation on the on-going work on the toolkit development. He reminded that the target groups are primarily research institutions (leaders and staff) and, secondarily, policy makers. The aim is to provide a set of guidelines and resources on how to develop PE in one's own institution. The context is that of RRI. While a majority of existing toolkits limit to policy: how to make PE, our approach is to show how to motivate (critical approach).

There was a lively discussion on the changing research environment. There are many changes that are characterized by Mode 2, Postnormal science and similar theoretical notions. While many forces

support increasing engagement of citizens and society in the making of research, apart from UK, it is difficult to find national systems for PE, another exception is Australia, where there is a national policy for PE.

We discussed practical issues related to the webtool building.

- It was considered important to ensure by email to the authors that we have a right to use literatures that are included in the webtool.
- **Result of PE2020, D2.2 in particular, should be better used in the next version of the webtool.**
- It was considered useful to have the content of the toolkit also available in PDF format.
- It was considered important to check whether the toolkit can be mobile optimized.
- We decided to adopt a **simple technical structure for the webtool**, with visual navigation support.
- Luciano promised to develop the first full draft of the webtool that will be tested and complemented by the partners.
- Mikko promised to help in the preparation of the tendering process and organizing the test of the toolkit. Luciano has already experience of such a testing process with a toolkit on gender issues. (Critical design approach as raised as an alternative by a Finnish ICT consult, Mikael Johnsson, was considered too challenging in this stage and with limited resources).
- The advisors considered it important to identify relevant audiences for the toolkit (by conducting stakeholder analysis), and also to clarify the purpose. Possible context where the toolkit could be linked include e.g. Atomium Culture, Mendeley. In any case, providing the webtool as a resource for existing communities was considered more effective than building new communities.
- Inclusion of videos was considered as one option in enriching the toolkit (Edward).
- Some application were mentioned that could be helpful in some way or other, including Yammer, Evernote, Tinderbox, Onenote, Research gate.
- Collaboration with Engage2020 was considered an interesting option, even though not without challenges on how to practically link the two webtools.
- Some ideas about the afterlife of the toolkit were discussed. A 5 year perspective for ensuring that the toolkit is available was considered a relevant target. Publishing the toolkit as a 'creative commons' was considered also supporting further deployment of the work, however, an option that need to be checked form the PO.

Following time schedule was agreed. Testing as soon as possible, and organizing two rounds of feedback from users was considered useful.

- Luciano can deliver complete draft by June 15
- Revision by August 31
- New version Sept 31
- Toolkit website Oct 30
- Test Nov 30
- final text Dec 31
- WP4 summary Jan 31

Finally, Edward, Luciano and Mikko had a meeting for preparing the tendering process on Sat. 20. May.

DAY2 (20.5.2016)

WP2: Discussion on D2.3 (Mikko and Saule)

It was considered necessary to make an effective plan for the finalization of WP2 through the summary report and other publications. To this end, existing draft of D2.3 was discussed and an updated plan was generated.

The plan is as follows:

- The summary report will be a short, e.g. 5 pages reflection of the main implications of D2.2 findings for the development of R&I policies. Such implications should not be direct recommendations to the EC but more general observations that may have relevance on R&I policy making.
- **Saule will be responsible in drafting the D2.3 draft according to the following time schedule: first draft ready by 3.6.2016, 8.6. comments from partners, 13.6.2016 final version ready.**
- As the current draft of D2.3 includes a literature review, which however is not targeted to the current arguments elaborated in D2.2, and as such a literature review is a requested contribution from the PE2020 project, it was decided that Saule will modify the existing draft toward an independent report of the project. Deadline for the **literature review** one month from now, 20.6.2016, comments by the 27.6., final 4.7.2016.

WP5: Overview and planning of dissemination activities (Kaisa)

Kaisa gave an overview presentation of dissemination activities. Policy conference preparations are going on, and a save the date message has been sent e.g. to EASST and PCST –networks. Preparations are in collaboration with CASI project, and on 31 May there is a one-day preparation workshop in Helsinki. Kaisa reminded that the consortium needs to publish remaining two policy briefs, partners should write newspaper articles and peer reviewed academic articles. We heard that PE2020 has had over 16 000 web page visitors.

Göran Melin gave a comment on dissemination activities based on the evaluation. He recommended to avoid doing too many different things in the policy conference. He also reminded that we are supposed to involve a dialogue about PE with stakeholders. Melin reminded that as there are not yet academic articles, this is an argument for framing the policy conference less academically and instead aiming at a thematic session in some conference in 2017.

The consortium had extensive discussion on dissemination opportunities and ideas about the policy conference. Following **potential stakeholders and invitees** for the policy workshop were identified:

- First of all, **relevant Horizon 2020 sections should be identified (<https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/h2020-sections>)**, including

- European Research Council
- Future and Emerging Technologies
- Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions
- Research Infrastructures, including e-Infrastructures
- Industrial Leadership
- Societal Challenges
- Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation
- Science with and for Society
- Cross-cutting activities (focus areas)
- Fast Track to Innovation Pilot
- European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT)
- Euratom
- Smart Cyber-Physical Systems
- Other potential stakeholders were identified, including
 - European industrial association
 - European Science Foundation
 - IBM
 - European university association
 - Int. association of universities
 - OECD
 - STOA committee and foresight section could be segmented (Martin knows the chairman)

There was discussion on the academic vs. policy orientation of the conference. It was observed that a call for papers communicates that the conference is academic in orientation. Considering also other factors, the consortium inclined to **propose that there will no call for papers** (a matter to be negotiated with CASI). Such factors include the notion that the timing is perhaps too late, and by directly inviting presenters instead of selecting through a call for papers allows more control on the speakers and thus more coherence.

The discussion on the conference programme and format resulted in the following ideas

- **The aims of the conference include the objective of putting PE in action and reaching new audiences for PE**
- Target audience for each session should be identified (Edward: worried about far too broad audiences)
- Different types of presentations can be welcomed
 - e.g. different types of actions considered by policy, business, research and civil society
 - poster session or some innovative forms of activity, e.g. TED ex talks
- High level key note speakers should be invited, e.g. Robert Jan Smith, Taina Turkkinen???, Nokia (Martin),
- Zoya and Mikko should give talks about PE2020 and CASI projects
- It should be ensured that both projects have streams in both days
- Active researchers should be attracted
- Martin: unrealistic to expect that there will be many people for 2 days

- First day should focus on the European level, second day national or local level
- **A memorandum of the conference should be prepared.** EU could invite press and act upon the memorandum
- Policy options and priorities should not perhaps be left at the end of the second day, they should be earlier (on the other hand, a round table at the end of the meeting could attract to stay until the end)
- The themes of the conference should focus on topics that are familiar in policy making, e.g.
 - o Evidence based policy making
 - o Foresight
 - o PE in municipal/ urban planning
 - o (possibly: science diplomacy)
- Fabio will be included as a member in the conference committee, to provide contacts to Brussels and other institutions
- We agreed that we should **collaborate with the Commission** and ask from our PO how they might take part in the organisations, or perhaps co-organising the conference.
- important to use the conference as dissemination channel

Other possibilities for dissemination were suggested, e.g.

- MSCA Marie Curie events, including anniversary conference 29 Nov. 2016
- ESOF Euroscience Open Forum conference 24-27 July in Manchester, big events (one of the partners of CASI from Manchers), <http://www.esof.eu/home.html>

External Evaluation (Göran Melin)

Göran Melin gave a presentation about the mid-term external evaluation that Technopolis had carried out, by interviewing PE2020 researchers and familiarizing with key documents. Overall, the evaluation was rather positive. The project consortium has recovered from the difficulties that culminated in the withdrawal of Aarhus University. Coordination works. Interesting contributions by partners. Following recommendations and insights were given:

- **There is no room for further delays, instead, a need to catch up delayed activities.**
- All partners need to engage in dissemination, and support WP 5 leader in such activities.
- Improvements on the website are needed.
- It was asked whether there enough touch with relevant stakeholders; it was mentioned that SAB can help in taking contact!
- **There is a risk that published journal articles will not appear by the end of the project, for which reason there can be need to include a notion on this in the following amendment.** According to the evaluator on argument is that perhaps the goal of having 4 published articles was unrealistic from the beginning.
- Another concern was whether it is clear to all partners that their active support is needed to tie together the project during its final months.
- It was considered a risk that there can be too few participants in the policy conference.

As the consortium was already aware of the mid-term report, some issues had already been addressed, and it was agreed that these are relevant concerns that need further attention be all.

SAB reflections and feedback (Martin Hynes, Edward Andersson, Suzanne de Cheveigné)

Three members of the SAB had participated, full time, in the M4 consortium meeting of the PE2020. This way they were in a very good position to give insight and recommendation on the working of this project. Following comments were made by the SAB, and the SAB will deliver a written evaluation statement afterwards.

- SAB considered each of the individual WPs interesting, but they noted that work packages need to be better tied together. In particular, WP3 should be informed about D2.2 findings, WP4 should be linked to both WP2 and WP3 results.
- **Each WP leader responsible for scientific quality.** WP3 leader should articulate the case selection, analyse the underpinnings of cases, Finnish and Italian cases should be compared.
- **Coordinating team needs to organize the frame for the final report** and a deadline for providing the input. There was discussion about the final summary report, including ideas that a draft version could be ready by the final policy conference; each WP leader should propose 3 most important ideas; length could be about 100 pages including an executive summary.
- The consortium should do **more work on stakeholder analysis** and choice of the aims accordingly. Such a work is especially relevant in the context of the policy conference, webtool and final report. Cross cutting and horizontal issues should be identified, e.g. environmental concerns and grand challenges.
- Life of the project could be prolonged by identifying existing communities of interest that could find the results useful.
- More focus on dissemination during the final stages of the project, and even afterwards. Potentially useful connections include
 - o all national contact points
 - o EU presidency conferences (Slovakia in January 2017). Actually Saule is giving a presentation in such an occasion including references to PE2020
- The aim and main constituency of the policy conference should be better acknowledged.

MAC meeting Separate memorandum

END OF THE MEETING

APPENDIX I

Consortium Meeting M4

AGENDA

Rome, May 19-20, 2016

Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020 (PE2020)

Venue: Hotel Domus Australia

Address: Via Cernaia, 14/b, Rome, Italy

DAY 0

TIME	WEDNESDAY 18 MAY
19:30 – 21:00	Get together Place to be announced later

DAY 1

TIME	Thursday 19 May
09:15 – 09:30	Warm up and agenda
09:30 – 10:00	WP6: Project overview Coordinator Mikko Rask
10:00 – 11:00	WP2: Presentation and discussion on the key results of D2.2 (“A conceptual model of PE across the dynamically governed research cycle and related participatory performance factors”) WP2 leader Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene and coordinator Mikko Rask
Flexible	Break and coffee
11:00 – 12:00	WP2: Summary report, articles and dissemination activities WP leader Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene and Dr Loreta Tauginiene
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch
13:00 – 14:30	WP3: Overview of piloting activities, findings on the analysis of the societal interaction plans WP leader Timo Arrevaara and Doctoral candidate Kirsi Pulkkinen
Flexible	Break and coffee
14:30 – 15:00	WP3: reporting, articles, further collaboration
15:00 – 18:00	WP4: Overview of activities and working on the web tool development WP leader Luciano d’Andrea

TIME	Thursday 19 May
19:00 – 21:00	Social Dinner Restaurant La Carbonara, Piazza Campo de' Fiori, 23

DAY 2

TIME	Friday 20 May
9:00 – 12:00	WP5: Overview and planning of dissemination activities WP Leader Kaisa Matschoss <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - policy conference - academic articles - newspaper articles - other dissemination activities - final plan of using the knowledge (together with WP6)
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch break
13:00 – 14:00	External evaluation Dr. Göran Melin, Technopolis
14:00 – 14:30	PE2020 Management committee meeting (Separate agenda) Coordinator Mikko Rask
14:30 – 15:00	SAB reflections and feedback Dr. Martin Hynes, Mr. Edward Andersson, Prof. Suzanne de Cheveigné
15:00	Closing of the meeting

2.2.5. CM5 Brussels

Consortium Meeting M5

Notes

Brussels, November 14-15, 2016

Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020 (PE2020)

Venue: Leopold Hotel Brussels EU - Brasserie Leopold, seminar room "Italy"

Address: Rue du Luxembourg 35 - B-1050 – Bruxelles

Web: www.hotel-leopold.be/

PROGRAMME

DAY 1

TIME	Monday 14 November
10:15 – 10:30	Warm up and agenda
10:30 – 11:00	WP6: Project overview Coordinator Mikko Rask
11:00 – 12:00	WP4: Work on WP4 (Appendix 2) WP4 leader Luciano d'Andrea
Flexible	Break and coffee
12:00 – 13:00	WP4: Still work on WP4 WP4 leader Luciano d'Andrea
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:30	WP3: completion of the WP3 (Appendix 3) WP leader Timo Arrevaara
15:30 – 16:00	WP2: completion of the WP3 including literature review WP leader Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė
Flexible	Break and coffee
16:00 – 18:30	WP5: articles, brochure, policy briefs, summary report (Appendices 4-5) WP leader Kaisa Matshoss
18:30 – 19:00	Other issues Preparation to the NCP networking event (Appendix 6)

TIME	Monday 14 November
19:30 – 21:00	Social Dinner Quartier Leopold http://quartier-leopold.be/ <i>Place du Luxembourg 9</i> <i>1050 Bruxelles</i> <i>+32 498442678</i>

DAY 2

TIME	Tuesday 15 November
9:00 – 10:30	WP5: Preparation and rehearsal of the policy conference (Appendix 7) WP Leader Kaisa Matschoss Running through the contributions in the policy conference
10:30 – 12:00	WP5 & WP6: Final plan of using the knowledge (Appendix 8) WP Leader Kaisa Matschoss and coordinator Mikko Rask
12:00 – 13:00	Lunch
13:00 – 13:30	External evaluation Evaluator Göran Melin
13:30 – 14:00	SAB reflections and feedback Dr. Martin Hynes
14:00 – 14:30	MAC meeting (Appendix 9)
14:30 – 15:00	Feedback and final thoughts <i>Open space</i>
15:00	Closing of the meeting
18:00 – 21:00	Evening reception “Opening Science to Society” organized by Network of National Contact Points for Science with and for Society in Horizon 2020 (SIS.net2) <i>Venue: Belgian Representation to the European Commission, Rue de la Loi 61–63, 1040 Brussels</i> Registration by 8.11.2016

Appendices

Appendix 1: Consortium meeting M5 Agenda

Appendix 2: PE2020 Toolkit Beta version

Appendix 3: D3.3 draft (Summary report of WP3)

Appendix 4: PE2020 Brochure

Appendix 5: D5.3 draft (Final summary report of the PE2020)

Appendix 6: Agenda of the NCP reception “Opening Science to Society”

Appendix 7: Agenda of the PE2020/CASI Policy conference

Appendix 8: Example: FISBOAT’s Final Plan for using knowledge

Appendix 9: MAC meeting agenda

NOTES

Warm up, agenda and the participants

Minor changes were done on the agenda, as indicated in the structure of reporting below. Present were in the first day Mikko, Timo, Kirsi, Kaisa, Luciano and Göran Melin (the evaluator). Fabio joined the company in the afternoon. Loreta joined the consortium meeting in the conference dinner of the first day and then participated in the full second day, replacing Saule. SAB members Markku Mattila and Martin Hynes joined the meeting in the afternoon of the second day.

The main decisions per each WP were confirmed in the MAC meeting (Separate memorandum)!

WP6

Mikko gave an overview presentation (Slide set 1). He observed that most likely the project can be finalized in time, and that the consortium has been catching up the slight delays, as recommended by the SAB and the external evaluator. Furthermore, the project has resulted in important insights and developments. There is obviously a high demand for the results of this project.

Following steps have been taken since the previous consortium meeting in Rome, in May 2016:

- WP2: D2.3 Finished. Additional literature review to be published Nov. 30
- WP3: D3.2 finished. D3.3 to be published Nov. 30.
- WP4: Toolkit document finished. Webtool under development, Beta in test. D4.2 and D4.3 to be published in M36.
- WP5: Drafting of several academic articles. Negotiation about the book. Presentations in conferences and seminars (e.g. 4S in Barcelona, Aug.-Sept.). Organizing of the policy conference. Publication of the 2nd policy brief. D5.3 to be published in M36.

- WP6: Amendment 2 substantially completed. 2nd pre-payment implemented. Final consortium meeting organised. Communications maintained with: PO, evaluator, SAB, sister projects, national and international stakeholders, partners.

Following expectations were set to this meeting:

- Reflection on the main lessons of the PE2020 project
- Feedback and feelings about collaboration thus far
- Ideas for future work
- Working and planning for completing remaining tasks
- Rehearsing for the policy conference
- Networking and enjoying from the fruits of our hard efforts!

WP5

Kaisa presented WP5 activities and remaining tasks.

Partners are requested to submit information on their dissemination activities: all partners should do it by themselves

The 3rd Policy brief was outlined. Prospective authors: Kaisa, Kirsi, Luciano, Mikko. Focus: recommendations + webtool.

Newspaper articles

- Horizon portal articles can be included among the deliverables
- more needs to be done

Summary report

- wp leaders send new versions by Dec 5.
- consists of WP summaries + recommendations

Newspaper articles - plan

- At least one from Finland
- Luciano will talk with Fabio to consider options in Italy
- Saule and Loreta

WP4

Luciano presented WP4 activities, which were discussed as shortly reported below:

- Road map of the webtool
- 35 reviewers contacted 14 people replied
- Partners need to test the toolkit
- The work with the WP4 summary report should start now
- Luciano consulted a legal expert: Mikko should ask additional comment by UH legal advisors

- Dec. 10th reviewers' comments should be expected
- One more reviewer: Heidi Howard (Mikko will ask)
- We should better highlight the practical role of Engage2020!
- Author ship issues were discussed, including some arguments.
- Göran: if academic work, then emphasize author, if not, perhaps try to encourage that it is a public tool

Decisions:

- Luciano will propose ways to refer to the creators
- Reference to the EU/ logo
- Check with UH lawyers copy right issues
- To refer to this toolkit, use the following reference: Luciano and Caiati (2016). Kaisa will help with inventing the name.
- All partners should send feedback by 12 Dec.
- Luciano should send a link to OneDrive where all can comment on the same document
- Same instructions should be sent to the partners as to reviewers

WP3

Timo presented WP3 activities. The status of this WP was discussed and the way forward agreed.

- Observation that the pilots not comparative at all.
- There is an expert perspective in the reports.
- Arguments about the following aspects needed from the partners: Cutting edge + feasibility at the same time (+ limited time and resources)
- Timo: no deep reporting of the impacts of the pilots.
- Decision:
- 23 Nov. next version to the partners; 25 Nov. partners feedback

Göran & evaluation

Göran gave an overview of the evaluation activities:

- Major evaluation budget 75% was used in the Spring 2016.
- Two missions: give input from an external perspective + advice and recommendation; second is a 'legitimizing' task towards the EC
- A junior colleague, Helen has collected materials and Göran has taken part in the consortium meeting.
- Small set of follow up interviews to be done in Nov-Dec. 2016. The final evaluation report to be aimed at January 2017.

- Recommendation: connect with university consortio or EUA or LERU. Universitas 21. (EUA= European Univeristy Association). Terhi Rokkala, Jyväskylän Yliopisto.
- Göran asked to send him the missing documents as specified (Mikko).
- Following links were considered potentially relevant for further dissemination: Open science platform (Fabio), European Parliament and STOA.
- The policy brief and toolkit and D2.2 could be send at the end of the project
- It was considered important to dedicate last 15 days for strong communication.
- Mikko concluded that Göran's critical notions have been very helpful.

WP2

Literature review, deadline is end of November. Send it to all partners by 24.11.

It was considered important to indicate both the internal and external motivation to the publication of the review (Mikko will inform Saule on this).

Feedback session with SAB

The final moments of the meeting were spent in a joint reflection of the project. Overall, it was considered quite an adventure, and that it recovered in a fine way after a difficult moment in the middle of the project. The final policy conference was considered a great way to finish the research process.

3. Management committee (MAC)

The management committee (MAC) or the “core team” consisted of the coordinator and WP leaders (who were nominated substitutes for cases that they couldn’t personally participate in the meetings). The MAC was responsible for all major decision-making and the overall execution of the project. It interacted with the advisory board especially at the milestones and made adjustments to the project activities based on the recommendations by the advisory board.

Within the core team, decisions were reached by consensus, but where needed, majority voting, with the Coordinator having the casting vote in case of a tie. The MAC did decisions mainly in the meetings, for minor issues also through email confirmations. And for the sake of fluent performance of the project, more regular and informal ‘Skype meetings’ were organized to handle on-going daily matters.

The management committee meetings dates were as follows:

7.3.2014	26.3.2015
13.5.2014	2.6.2015
1.9.2014	25.6.2015
2.10. 2014	20.5.2016
12.11. 2014	15.11.2016
16.12. 2014	
30.1.2015	

The memoranda of these meetings are included in the following sub-sections.

3.1. Memoranda

3.1.1. MAC 7.3.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – Memorandum

National Consumer Research Centre, Helsinki, Finland

March, 7th 2014, 10.50 – 11.32

Participants

*Mikko Rask, NCRC

*Niels Mejlgaard, AU

*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC

*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS

*Timo Aarrevaara, UH

Tina Ravn, AU

Ian Dobson, UH

Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC

Minna Kaarakainen, NCRC

(*Full members of the MAC)

1. Order of the meeting

Opening

The coordinator opened the meeting at 11.00.

2. Validity and quorum

A quorum was present and the meeting was valid.

3. Role and duties of the management committee

The duties of the management committee were introduced.

4. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was approved.

5. Issues to be discussed

- Status and overview of GA and CA
- GA and CA are ready and accepted by all partners. No questions were raised about these issues.
- IPR practices

At this point, there are no open issues in IPR.

6. Dissemination practices

There is 45 days notification for peer-reviewed papers. In case of objections, these must be done within 30 days to the coordinator and the concerned party. This does NOT concern conference abstracts and presentations, non-refereed, dissemination oriented publications (no prior notice needed).

Kaisa will be responsible of blogging and partners should be committed to helping her.

There will be updated plan for dissemination amended with the results of the stakeholder analysis –workshop from March the 6th.

7. Issues to be decided

Financial issues

Partners are committed to send quarterly reports on their expenses (in a template provided by the coordinator) and time used (based on the party's own time registration system) to the coordinator within one month of the end of each quarter of the project.

8. Working Plan for the next 18 months

Proposal: Acceptance of the issues discussed in context with the WP presentations during the PE2020 kick off meeting.

Decision: WP leaders will prepare Specified work plans reflecting the discussions and decisions done in the context of specific work packages.

Some of the main decisions pertaining to each work package include:

WP1: A broad definition of public engagement will be applied. Masis reports will be used as a main starting point for data collection. A simple pre-categorization model will be applied in the construction of the inventory.

WP2: In early stage of the project, concept of public engagement will be understood and used in broad definition. The purpose of the conceptual work in WP2 is mainly to help explain (successful or less successful) participatory performance especially in the context of research programmes. 'Innovativeness' is among the key concepts to be defined in this WP. Conceptual work should be done in close collaboration with WP1.

WP3: It is important to keep in mind the limited resources devoted to pilots. Interesting contexts for pilots include International research programme (e.g. Bonus programme) and prioritization of research. Pilots should be chosen on the basis of innovativeness and cutting edge PE activity. New types of institutional collaboration and hybrid activities (e.g. between science museums, decision makers, and the public) were considered particularly interesting themes.

WP4: It was considered important to have an early "business plan" for the toolkit. Luciano/LSC promised to draft a short document where a first proposal on aims and key features of the toolkit is presented. A 'critical approach' was considered particularly interesting orientation to the development of the toolkit.

WP5: Kaisa/NCRC will update the dissemination plan on the basis of the stakeholder analysis and of partners' feedback. Dissemination will be active and targeted on the basis of stakeholder analyses carried out in the kick off meeting.

WP6: Decisions done in the discussion of WP6 were confirmed, including

The time schedules of the next consortium meetings (to be later specified): M2: January 2015, Aarhus, Denmark (AU); M3: June 2015, Vilna, Lithuania (VU IBS); M4: January 2016, Rome, Italy (LSC); M5: November 2016, Brussels, Belgium (NCRC). All consortium meetings will be 2-3 days long.

Work progress reports pertaining to each work package need to be submitted semi-annually to the coordinator. A specific template will be provided later by the coordinator.

Wrike project software will be used as the project extranet for document archiving, contacts, time scheduling, sending reminders and as a working space. Partners are requested to test the system and start using it in the management of working documents and processes. Kaisa will add a link to the project software in the PE2020-homepages.

Mikko will contact the project officer about the pilots when the consortium has a proposal about the pilots.

9. Meeting practices

Proposal: Working meetings will be organized monthly intervals as Skype group calls. When necessary, management committee meetings will be arranged as skype calls. However, management committee meetings will be arranged at least every three months.

Decision: Skype meetings will be regularly used to support the working of the consortium. Materials should be sent at least 2 calendar days before such meetings. Skype meetings will be organized on a regular basis on the first Tuesday of each month at 10:00 o'clock EET (9 CET). Next skype meeting will be April 1st at 10.00 EET.

10. Possible changes in project teams

Paula Ranne from the UH does not continue in the PE2020 consortium. Maria Pietilä and Janne Wikström have started as new members of the UH team.

Naming of the substitute members for the management committee meeting

The members (and vice members) of MAC were nominated: Mikko Rask, NCRC (Kaisa Matschoss); Niels Mejlgaard, AU (Tine Ravn); Luciano d'Andrea, LSC (Fabio Feudo); Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS (Loreta Tauginiene); Timo Aarrevaara (HU) (Ian Dobson).

11. The role of SAB

The role of SAB is advisory.

12. Other Issues

No other issues.

13. Next meetings

The MAC shall meet at least annually year during the Project life upon the request of its chairperson or at any other time when necessary upon the request of one or several of the consortium partners. The coordinator shall convene meetings, with at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior notice with an agenda. As a normal procedure, the MAC meetings will be organised in the context of regular Consortium meetings. No meetings before the next consortium meeting were called for.

14. Closing of the meeting

The coordinator closed the meeting at 11.32AM.

3.1.2. MAC 13.5.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – MEMO

Time: 13 May 2014, 10:11-11:41 EET

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

- *Mikko Rask, NCRC
- *Niels Mejlgaard, AU
- *Luciano d’Andrea, LSC
- *Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS
- *Timo Aarravaara, UH
- Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC (secretary)
- (*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening 10:11

1.2 Validity and quorum OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda OK

2 Issues to be discussed

2.1 What’s up

- *progression of the work*
- *collaboration with ENGAGE2020 and other projects*
- *seminars, conferences and other dissemination activities*
- *other issues*

WP 1 going good, D 1.1 draft sent to partners May 1st, 2014. Feedback received. Inventory will go to D 1.1, please send extra cases asap i.e. by 14.5.2014. New version of typology. Procedure to nominate innovative 50 cases under construction, could include a co-nomination by the partners and the scientific advisory board members. For the selection it is important to have an idea of innovativeness. Ideas of innovativeness will be collaboratively generated in WP1 and WP2.

WP 2 D2.1. work on-going. Innovativeness in PE and enrichment of participatory performance model with additional support and demand factors, including new dimensions is also under work. Methodology of validation is under discussion, and the inventory will help to finalise the validation. WP2 is waiting for the WP1 first results. D2.1.draft by the end of May. S proposal to international

conference "Science in Society" was submitted, where results of WP1 and WP2 will be presented if proposal is accepted. A paper was prepared in cooperation with project coordinator for the international conference in Brasil.

WP 3 discussions with Bonus, science museum Heureka (strong focus on Citizen Science), science centre Luma, Future Earth (EU level climate change action), Finnish National Institute for Health, Demos Helsinki. The nature of the pilots under consideration. Trilateral discussion through Skype will be arranged between Luciano, Mikko and Timo to continue discussion on pilots.

WP 4 common form of presenting the pilots under consideration. Extra skype between Timo, Mikko and Luciano in order to enable Luciano to continue with work in Italy. Discussion could concentrate of different societal challenges, not necessary the pilot institutions in this stage. What kinds of pilots are in focus, that will be the first question. Starting to build the road for the pilots, would be necessary to start on time. Continue discussions when the catalogue will be ready. Timo's ideas would be valued. Work plan is very early, at the beginning of next year a new, more reliable, plan of WP4 will be delivered. Document about the toolkit was delivered. Toolkit is important when 50 cases will be analysed (in defining relevant survey questions), and pilots evaluated.

WP5 Specified research plan submitted. Aarhus has the next turn in writing to the blog.

WP6 PO sees no particular problems in joining of NCRC to HU. Several new contacts in the Brazil PCST conference, including e.g. Melanie Smallman in a new ENGAGE project and Richards Holliman modelling cultural change to embed PE in research/science. Mikko is expecting the budget reports from the partners end of May.

3 Issues to be decided

3.1 Specified work plans

Proposal: Plans for updated work plans for WPs 1-5 shall be accepted on the basis of the proposals that are drafted by work package leaders. Specified work plans include 1) updated/ elaborated plan for completing the tasks, 2) detailed time schedule of tasks and sub-tasks (at least for the next 18 months), and 3) requests/responsibilities for partners. In cases where further revisions of the plans are necessary, a procedure and time schedule for completing and accepting the plans shall have to be developed. After acceptance of the specified work plans, they become binding to the partners.

- draft versions of the specified work plans should be uploaded to Wrike asap and commented by partners

- final versions of the plans should be send to the partners four days before the MAC meeting (9 May 2014)

The reason for the specified work plans was to give all partners the idea HOW and WHEN their work will be needed in the future in different work packages to enable the contribution from all project partners.

Plans should be devised at a reasonable level of specificity, informing partners about expected work and contributions, and also supporting collaboration between WPs. Bilateral and trilateral negotiations may be needed to align different plans and make them contributing to the overall project.

Decision: Specified Work Plans will be submitted/ revised by early next week (if not already done). All partners comment on WRIKE on the plans and we agree on them in the next skype meeting. Please include main expectations from other partners in your own plan.

3.2 Submission of the first deliverables

Proposal: According to the PE2020 practice, the internal deadline for submission of each Deliverable by the responsible Partner to the Coordinator is set at 30 calendar days before the Deliverable submission date as specified in the Description of Work (Annex I of the GA). Internal quality check is performed by the Management Committee, which shall review the Deliverable content and send its comments and recommendations no later than 15 calendar days prior to the official deadline for submission to the Commission (i.e. the deadline as defined in the Description of Work). The responsible Partner shall take into consideration the Management Committee's recommendations and submit a version of the Deliverable, which is to be considered final, no later than 5 calendar days prior to the deadline for submission of the Deliverable to the Commission (i.e. the deadline as defined in the Description of Work).

- *Exceptions to this process should be described and justified.*
- *The Coordinator needs to be allowed 3 days for uploading the Deliverable in the Participants' Portal.*

First deliverables include:

D1.1 (Inventory of PE procedures and practices in 37 European countries), **deadline month 4** (31 May 2014)

D5.1 (Project web-pages), **deadline month 4** (31 May 2014)

D2.1 (A refined typology of PE tools and instruments), **deadline month 5** (30 June 2014)

A deliverable: a short, very concise report. D's are public in this project, please remember.

D5.1. established, no problems expected in documenting this in a formal deliverable.

D1.1 basically ready, but to make it more interesting we would need another categorisation. According to the coordinator, the further work should be done in further tasks of WP1 and in WP2, in order to ensure a delivery in time. D2.1 will be ready on time.

4 Other issues

Filled in information of contact lists should be sent to Kaisa by end of May. Can be found under WP5 "dissemination action plan.

Mikko Saule and Niels will discuss work in WP1 and WP2.

5 Next skype meetings

Proposal: Skype meetings shall be organised on a regular basis on the first Tuesday of each month at 10:00 o'clock EET (9 CET). Next skype meetings will be 3 June 2014, 10:00 EET.

6 Closing of the meeting

11:41.

3.1.3. MAC 1.9.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – Notes

Time: 1 September 2014, 10:00-12:00 EET (9:00-11:00 CET)

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

- *Mikko Rask, NCRC
- *Niels Mejlgaard, AU
- *Luciano d’Andrea, LSC
- *Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS morning
- *Timo Aarravaara, UH
- Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC (secretary)
- (*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

Opened 10:06

1.2 Validity and quorum

The meeting is valid to make decisions.

1.3 Approval of the agenda

The agenda is approved and Mikko added an issue on “other issues” requesting the partners on comments & wishes for management services to be received from the coordinator.

2 Issues to be decided

2.1 Amendment to the Consortium Agreement (CA)

Proposal: consortium shall agree on the content of the amendment (on the basis of the draft amendment that was sent to the partners 18 August 2014 for comments) and procedure thereafter.

Aarhus: no comments. VUIBS: minor comments, principally the amendment is ok. LSC and UH no comments yet.

Mikko will find out how the Amendment will be practically signed by the partner institutions. The document will be send to POs review before signatures.

Decision: the consortium accepted the content of the draft amendment to CA with the reservation that within 48 h there might be additional comments from LSC & UH.

2.2 Deliverable 2.1

Proposal: consortium shall agree on the final version of the D 2.1 to be uploaded in the participant portal.

Comments to D2.1. were received only from Mikko, which were not changing any content. Saule will send final draft of the D2.1 to the partners by 3 Sept 2014 at the latest with changes that she has included will be marked by yellow.

There was discussion on the list of authors, contributors, and persons to be acknowledged, how a) partners are acknowledged in this particular case, and b) in the future.

Decision: It was suggested that because the consortium partners will produce the outputs of the project jointly, their work will be acknowledged either in the authors list or in the contributors list, external support will be listed in acknowledgements and therefore Kaisa's name will be removed from the Acknowledgements. Otherwise the current list of authors and contributors remains as they are.

Time schedule for completing the draft of D 2.1: final version by Wednesday 3 Sept, Saule marks corrections with yellow. Final acceptance by email from all partners by Wednesday 10th.

Mikko will draft rules about authorship to avoid situations of confusion.

2.3 Next consortium meeting

Proposal: next consortium meeting is planned to be organized in Jan.-Feb. 2015 in Aarhus, Denmark. Suitable dates are being identified through a doodle survey that all partners are requested to complete. The dates and timing of that meeting will be agreed.

Discussion on the time schedule and arrangement of the next meeting. Niels will help in practical issues; Mikko will draft agenda (together with relevant WP leaders) and informs SAB.

Decision: Next consortium meeting will be 29th-30th January 2015 in Aarhus. Arrival 28 (possible pre meeting); programme last until 30 at 16/17.

3 Issues to be discussed

3.1 Survey of 50 cases

Proposal: The consortium needs to agree on the appropriate approach to design and circulate the survey contributing to WP1 analysis of the 50 innovative PE cases. All partners are welcome to comment on this issue to be decided under WP1 specified work plan.

We had a lengthy discussion on this topic, reported below.

Niels: is this a survey? Aim at rich description aiming at a catalogue. (The best option would be field research + ff2f interviews; this is the 'second best' since the first one is not feasible). Idea: provide a template and ask coordinators complete it. 'Template' rather than 'survey'?

- Motivation will be crucial for the success of this exercise! More encouragement will be needed.

- Qualitative vs. quantitative? Niels prefers qualitative. Saule proposes more quantitative. Is quantitative information non-useful? Problem of combining quali and quanti in the same template/questionnaire is a tendency to only answer quanti.

- Links to other WPs?

- Actual number of cases?

Timo: a quali-quanti combination might work. Quanti would indicate that we have done our 'home work', but quali more important. Digital questionnaire allows adding links to their work (that we can read). To support motivation, we could promise quick feedback/ provision of early result. The difference between traditional survey and our work is that we are not working opinions, but allowing coordinators to reflect what is innovative.

- Niels insists that we should ask coordinators to spend half a day in completing our questionnaire. "You have been nominated among 50 most innovative projects!" This should be fleshed out in an information letter; telephone contacts should be done before to inform about PE2020. The sample size must be raised to 65 and therefore each partner should nominate 3-5 extra cases by Sept 8th.

Luciano: we should have a protocol for contacting the project coordinators. E.g. having a telephone contact, then email etc. The protocol also would help us share the work. This would also lead to additional information on what is happening regarding the cases (which can be crucial for the toolkit). Luciano could help a draft toolkit to better understand expectations. People, who started something new, usually are interested in talking about their initiatives. Phone contact is very effective in contacting.

Saule: focus on the proposed quanti survey is in evaluation, which is important for WP2. Open questions supported. Having too many open question can be too daunting task and focus can be lost. What is feasible, e.g. phone calls are demanding.

Niels and Saule will think about a feasible and fair division of labour in contacting! Perhaps thinking about a slimmer version. A potential second intervention - as an extra round?

Timo: make your own homework. Explain clearly, what is the point in innovative cases selection, because it increases the possibility of us getting truly useful material. Interviews per telephone? (Niels prefers not and prefers second hand information + templates completed by coordinators) Two weeks needed to put in paper what is really the focus of survey.

Time schedule: finish the template by the end of Oct. Collection of data by the end of Dec. 2014. Draft by Feb. 2015.

Strategic orientation (Niels):

Template (main emphasis on open questions)

Protocol

First go, second go?

Niels drafts the next version of the strategy, then contacts Saule, and sends for comments to the other partners within the couple of next weeks.

Mikko: award? an invitation to our final conference? 500 €?

Saule: money does not work, keynote speaker in the final conference would be motivating. But making the questionnaire more attractive might work. Problems in rewarding due to potential biases, and respondents can start exaggerating the benefits.

Decision: Niels, together with Saule will elaborate the next version of the survey and a strategy of circulating it with the help of partners. Consortium will have a discussion on this draft to find the right way to complete the research on 50 innovative PE cases.

3.2 Writing of scientific articles

Proposal: PE2020 project has promised to publish at least 4 scientific peer review articles on the results of the project. All partners are welcomed to propose new ideas for such articles, and plans for authoring existing article ideas will be discussed.

Saule: presentation in Canada conference. Deadline: Sept 15 for submitting a paper. Another deadline is Dec. 15. Saule will inform partner how we can proceed.

Decision: Discussion about other paper ideas postponed due to lack of time.

3.3 Update of the project

Proposal: a discussion of the current status of the project and identification of the next steps.

Postponed

4 Other issues

Partners feedback and expectations of WP6 (management services)

Postponed

5 Next skype meetings

Weeks 39 or 40 (not Monday), Mikko will send a Doodle survey.

6 Closing of the meeting

11:47

3.1.4. MAC 2.10.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – Notes

Time: 2 October 2014, 10:00-12:00 EET (9:00-11:00 CET)

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

*Mikko Rask, NCRC x

*Niels Mejlgaard, AU x

*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC x

*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS x

*Timo Aarravaara, UH x

Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC (secretary) x

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

Meeting was opened at 10:05.

1.2 Validity and quorum

The meeting was valid.

1.3 Approval of the agenda

Agenda was accepted.

2 Issues for information

2.1 Amendment to CA now accepted

Amendment to the Consortium Agreement (CA) has now been accepted by all partners. After receiving the signed version from all partners (VUIBS still remaining), the coordinator will send a pdf copy of the amendment to all partners. Partners are requested to document the original versions of the signatures, and the coordinator uploads the document in Wrike.

A copy will be send this week to partners from the coordinator.

2.2 Deliverable 2.1 now submitted

Deliverable 2.1 was accepted by all partners, and it has now been submitted to the Participant Portal. Deliverables of the first period of the PE2020 (M1-18) will be 'accepted' by the Commission after the reporting of the first period (M18). Due to this way of managing the reports, the consortium can start publishing reports while they are considered ready.

We will start making promotion for the Deliverables as soon as the consortium accepts them.

3 Issues to be discussed

3.1 Amendment to the Grant Agreement

Proposal: consortium shall agree on the content of the amendment on the basis of the draft amendment that will be sent to the partners as soon as possible. The process is under preparation by the coordinators, the layers of UH, with the help of PO. The draft will be circulated asap, and the amendment should be accepted by the end of the year 2014 at the latest.

GA amendment is under construction. It needs to be accepted by the end of this year.

Mikko presented and explained the new budget for the rest of the project after the NCRC has been amalgamated to the UH. Open question: in which WP will the "extra" working month be spend (that emerge due to difference in cost between NCRC and UH)? Mikko will send a proposal, how the one PM will be distributed between the WP's.

Decision: send comments on the draft budget to Mikko by **Oct 7th 2014**, after which it will be considered accepted (unless changes comments require additional changes).

3.2 WP1 and the survey of 50 cases

Proposal: WP1 leader introduces to the appropriate approach to design and circulate the survey contributing to WP1 analysis of the 50 innovative PE cases. All partners are welcome to comment on the draft to be circulated in advance of the meeting. Other issues pertaining to WP1 will be discussed.

Extra nominations received from partners, now 63 cases identified. The final shape of the questions template is to be decided. Final version prepared and circulated by the end of week 41. Niels will send the selection with justifications to the partners; ranking ordering has been removed from that version.

It was discussed whether an interim version of the selected cases should be published. This was not considered feasible, but Niels will compose a document of 63 PE case descriptions for internal use, and send it to the partners by the end of next week (10 Oct.) together with the other documents.

3.3 WP2 and the conceptual model (D2.2)

Proposal: WP2 leader introduces the approach to preparing D2.2 on the basis of a draft circulated to the partners. The approach, links to other WPs and the criteria success for the model will be discussed. Other issues of WP2 to be discussed.

Work is going on and administration of the survey will start in Oct-Nov.

Saule will present some results in Canada next week.

D2.2. is due M16, May 2015. D2.2 will be reserved enough time in meeting in Aarhus.

Timo, Mikko and perhaps other partners might visit Saule at the end of November/beginning of December. Planning will be continued through email.

Saule will a new, compressed plan of D.2.2 to the partners at the beginning of next week (41). Partners should comments on the plan by **Oct 20**.

3.4 WP3 and selection of the 6 pilots

Proposal: WP3 leader introduces to the selection strategy of the pilots. The consortium discusses and accepts in broad terms this strategy on the basis of a draft circulated in advance. Requests for organizing the pilots will be discussed, as well as other issues of WP3.

Timo presented the status of pilot planning based on the discussion with Luciano in Rome. See WRIKE about the different characters of the pilots.

Budget is limited, 2-3 person months + 7500€ for each pilot. So no deep interventions to be expected, but collaboration with progressive actors is supported. 4-6 PE tools suggested and to be discussed with the consortium in the next MAC meeting. Based on the tools the final decision about the pilots will be made in March 2015.

Pilots should feed into the toolkit designed in WP4 i.e. it is necessary to have real stakeholders, real owners, real experiences. Consider the questions that should be answered by the pilots = evaluation of the needed results. Evaluation framework designed in WP1 forms the basis for the evaluation in WP4. What to expect from the pilots? the realism?

For the selection of the pilots, we need to have a set of criteria such as: **innovativeness** is the basis, **feasibility** an important aspect, **scaling up the potential, relevance to societal challenges**.

Proposal send to the partners a week before the next MAC meeting.

Work is continuing as planned.

3.5 WP4 issues

Proposal: WP4 leader gives an update of the issues and working prospects of WP4.

Work is starting as planned.

3.6 WP5 issues

Proposal: WP5 leader gives an update and reminds partners of their duties in terms of dissemination. A plan of publicizing D1.1 and D2.1 will be discussed on the basis of a proposal send in advance.

Saule, Timo and Niels will send partners more information about the planned papers in due time. The organisation of writing etc. will be agreed upon then.

WP 3 is writing 2 scholarly papers. Timo is asked to send details to Kaisa.

Niels has been asked to contribute to a special issue of a journal (name?), details will be send to Kaisa.

ALL PARTNERS: please remember to report to Kaisa about your conference and other activities related to PE2020 dissemination.

3.7 WP6 issues

Proposal: Update of WP6 and partners feedback to the coordinator.

WP6 issues discussed in the context of the first topics of the agenda. No time for additional debates.

3.8 Writing of scientific articles

Proposal: PE2020 project has promised to publish at least 4 scientific peer review articles on the results of the project. All partners are welcomed to propose new ideas for such articles, and plans for authoring existing article ideas will be discussed.

Article issues discussed in the context of WP5

4 Other issues

No other issues were discussed.

5 Next skype meetings

Next meeting planned for 4-6 Nov.

6 Closing of the meeting

The meeting was closed 12.05.

3.1.5. MAC 12.11.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – MEMORANDUM

Time: 12 November 2014, 10:00-12:00 EET (9:00-11:00 CET)

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

*Mikko Rask, NCRC x

*Niels Mejlgaard, AU x

*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC x

*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS

** Loreta Tauginiene, VUIBS x

*Timo Arravaara, UH x

Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC (secretary) x

Ian R. Dobson, UH x

Maria Pietilä, UH x

(*Full members of the MAC, **vice member of MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

The meeting was opened at 10:04.

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

2 Issues to be discussed

2.1 Writing of scientific articles

Proposal (presented by Kaisa Matschoss, relevant material in Wrike): PE2020 project has promised to publish at least 4 scientific peer review articles on the results of the project. All partners are welcomed to propose new ideas for such articles, and plans for authoring existing article ideas will be discussed.

There is a document in Wrike that should be filled by partners by **end of November**.

2.2 WP1 and the survey of 50 cases

Proposal (presented by Niels and Saule, relevant material in Wrike): WP1 leader proposes the appropriate approach to design and circulate the survey contributing to WP1 analysis of the 50 innovative PE cases on the basis of the preceding discussions. The survey approach and circulation method will be selected.

The pros and cons of word based vs. web based survey are discussed. The consortium decides to circulate on-line survey, since it will probably lead to a better response rate and has other professional advantages. This means that the University of Aarhus will be responsible of the implementation of the survey, and they will send instructions for other partners about their roles in the survey process within the next couple of days. **Partners are expected to help in contacting survey respondents by the end of next week (21 Nov.),** which is an important step in the survey process.

The coordinator will negotiate with Aarhus and VUIBS partners about the allocation of person months between WP1 and WP2.

2.3 The status of Amendment to GA

Proposal (by Mikko, draft attached in the email): The Amendment request is proceeding through a) a request to the EC on the recognition of the merger by the REA (request sent last week, no response yet), and b) the lawyer of UH has drafted an amendment request for comments to the partners. Comments on the draft and the process by partners.

The draft is accepted by the partners.

2.4 WP3 and selection of the 6 pilots

Proposal (by Timo and Luciano, draft proposal in Wrike): WP3 leader introduces to the selection strategy of the pilots. The consortium discusses and accepts in broad terms this strategy on the basis of a draft circulated in advance. Requests for organizing the pilots will be discussed, as well as other issues of WP3.

Timo has drafted a document where pilots are contextualized within the project. The pilots will be called 'pilot initiatives'. We also accept the proposed division of work between UH and LSC, keeping in mind that we have to be flexible. The societal challenge areas are currently shared as follows between LSC and UH:

UH:

Health, demographic change and wellbeing

Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the bioeconomy

Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials

Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies

LSC

Secure, clean and efficient energy

Smart, green and integrated transport

Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens

The consortium discuss on the nature and status of piloting process. Some pilot initiatives are already in motion, including e.g. discussions with the Bonus programme Global Change research programme/ Argumenta proposal. Considering the nature of pilots, following points were highlighted:

- feasibility is important, since we have to motivate host organizations to build on their on-going practices. Collaborating with PE2020 provides them additional value, since we can provide input from WP1 and WP2 work to planned PE activities within these programmes
- contacting survey respondents is one possible way of identifying new pilot contexts/ hosts.
- previous history with PE activities is helpful in the study of new pilot processes (against experiences from previous practices)

Considering the protocol instructing the piloting process, following points were discussed:

- pilots should be defined clearly, i.e. what is the focus of piloting (e.g. one practice, several practices)
- our own intervention role should be defined
- evaluation protocol should be defined
- criteria of selection should be defined (e.g. potential of scaling up, in addition to the criteria of innovativeness discussed in WP1 and WP2, esp. D2.1, p. 14)
- learning of obstacles, driving/ initiating factors, changing mindsets are among interesting questions to be specified in the pilot research protocol

The consortium decides to take the Bonus-programme as a 'pilot for pilots' in order to make planning of pilots easier. Timo in collaboration with Luciano will write a proposal on the practical intervention with Bonus by **end of November**, including the idea that further pilots can possibly follow a similar research protocol.

2.5 WP2 and the conceptual model (D2.2)

Proposal (by Saule): WP2 leader gives an update about the situation of D2.2 preparation.

VUIBS will send an updated proposal of D2.2 next week (47).

3 Issues for information

3.1 RRI meeting in Rome in November

Mikko & Niels & Luciano & Fabio will join the RRI conference in Rome next week.

3.2 Pilot visits to the Academy of Finland and Prime minister's council

Mikko, Timo, Kaisa, Minna, Markku participated in a meeting with staff from Prime minister's council. They expressed their interest in PE practices, and working relations were established between the council and PE2020, and our project will be contributing to the discussion about the organisation of strategic research in Finland. Edward Andersson (Involve, UK) participated in discussions in Prime minister's office seminar.

3.3 Visit to Vilna

Mikko and Timo will visit Vilna 19th of December.

4 Other issues

It is time to start preparing the meeting in January 29/30 in Aarhus.

VUIBS is on with the blog in November. Suggestion: text about the conference in Canada?

5 Next skype meetings

Second week of December

6 Closing of the meeting

12:07

3.1.6. MAC 16.12.2014

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – Agenda

Time: 16 December 2014, 10:00-12:00 EET (9:00-11:00 CET)

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

*Mikko Rask, NCRC x

*Niels Mejlgaard, AU x

*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC x

*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS x

*Timo Aarravaara, UH x

Kaisa Matschoss, NCRC

Ian R. Dobson, UH x

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

Meeting was opened at 10:20.

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

2 Issues to be discussed

2.1 Consortium meeting in Aarhus

Proposal (Mikko): Discussion on the agenda (separate document sent to the partners).

Agenda was accepted. Niels proposed that SAB could be invited for Thursday evening and Mikko could send the an update/ overview of the progression of the project, which was welcomed as a good idea.

Any additional comments on the agenda should be sent by today!

Partners expected to be present as follows (and they promised to send information to Niels if changes occur): Timo: no dinner on Wed., all time; Maria for all time; Luciano: all time + clarifies Fabio's participation; Mikko and Kaisa: for all time; Saule and Loreta: Wednesday dinner uncertain

2.2 WP1 and Deliverable 1.2

Proposal (Niels): Discussion on the status of the survey, decisions on the strategy of completing the survey of 50 innovative cases. Plans for Deliverable 1.2 (Catalogue of 50 PE case descriptions).

The survey has been sent to c. 56 informants, 46 have been confirmed. Now 7 completed questionnaires (some through web survey, some through word docs). Expectation that mid-Jan is the provisional end date of the questionnaire. The quality seems high: interesting reflections.

Niels will send cases to Saule and Mikko asap to help elaborating the theoretical mode (done already).

The consortium discussed the methodological and 'political' aspects of reaching 50 cases in D1.2. Our selection strategy will not probably lead to enough cases. The work will be delayed, however, if we start gathering new cases. The quality of the cases is an important aspect. Luciano: important to take into account the political aspect of nominating 50.

Decision: possible completion of cases after the Aarhus meeting.

Additional point of reflection by Niels: our criteria of innovativeness still a bit unclear, and they need to be developed further.

2.3 WP2

Proposal (Saule): Discussion on the status of WP2. Plans to create the conceptual model and links to other WPs. The purpose of the Vilnius meeting 19-20 Dec. 2014.

WP2 continues discussions on barriers for PE, some analysis is done already and will be presented in Vilnius meeting for comments, and starts analyses after discussions on policy cycle in line with dynamic governance models. The main context for D2.2. Integrating PE into the policy cycle means to take a step towards the research institutions and their key actors (researchers, technicians, leaderships, even students). Discussion on integrating part of the results from survey in D2.2.

Mikko emphasized the need to focus the theoretical work in WP2 to the aspect of dynamic governance that is in a salient role in the proposal. The discussion continues in the meeting this Friday in Vilnius.

2.4 WP3

Proposal (Timo): Discussion on the development of pilot initiatives. The concept of the first pilot related to Bonus programme will be discussed and the draft plan accepted. Other pilots in Finland and Italy discussed.

Timo: WP3 starts with discussions on relevant science policy actors, and BONUS online platform was chosen in MAC Nov 2014 as a the first pilot initiative. The other two potential pilots are in Dec. 2014 Global Change and More Years Better Livesin (MYBL) Societal advisory board in (SOAB). The other three potential pilots will be identified based on the negotiations with LCD in Dec. 2014 – Jan. 2015.

The framework for analyzing the pilots is taking place in the MAC meeting of April 2015.

Feasibility criteria is important. First pilot report ready by end of April to help planning of other pilots.

Luciano working in three directions: contact with ENEA (Italian Environmental agency) on the theme of energy; Italian network of the security of internet; Modio from Napoli science centre.

Bonus pilot can start in the beginning of February.

Decision: a draft plan of action of the Bonus pilot should be send to the partners by mid January, and then discussed in the next MAC meeting around ten days before Aarhus meeting.

WP3 will prepare for the Aarhus meeting the following issues:

- definition of pilots
- theoretical approach
- draft version of practical planning (especially for the first pilot)

2.5 Wp4

Proposal (Luciano): Update on WP4, comments and requests to other WPs.

Luciano exploring documents on PE in the context of responsible research and innovation in order to understand the frame of the toolkit. Secondly, reviewing other available toolkits and handbooks.

2.6 WP 5

Proposal (Kaisa): Review of the plans for peer reviewed research articles. Other dissemination issues.

Niels + Saule + Kaisa have sent suggestions. Saule sends the paper for the consortium members on Evidence Based Policy Making. Partners will continue to fill the table with the intention to have at least five papers nominated in one month.

2.7 WP6

Proposal (Mikko): Update about the NCRC merger with UH. Other management issues. Partners' comments and suggestions for better management services.

The EU/ REA has recognized the request of NCRC to start the amendment process. We expect that the amendment cannot be accepted before end of Dec 2014 but that is hardly a critical issue.

3 Issues for information

Kaisa and Mikko have new email addresses to which all new emails should be directed:

kaisa.matschoss@helsinki.fi and mikko.rask@helsinki.fi.

4 Other issues

5 Next skype meetings

Around 20 Jan. 2015

6 Closing of the meeting

3.1.7. MAC 30.1.2015

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – MINUTES

Time: January 30, 2015, 16:00-16:30

Place: The Danish Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy (CFA), University of Aarhus

Participants

- *Mikko Rask, CSRC x
- *Niels Mejlgaard, AU x
- *Luciano d’Andrea, LSC x
- *Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS x
- *Timo Aarrevaara, UH x
- Kaisa Matschoss, CSRC x

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

16.00

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

Issues to be informed

1.4 Amendment to the Grant Agreement

Topic: Due to the merger of NCRC with UH a process of negotiation with the European Commission is still under way. The merger took place 1 Jan. 2015 and now NCRC is part of the University of Helsinki, under a new name “Consumer Society Research Centre” (CSRC). It is expected that the merger does not cause obstacles to the successful continuation of the project, and the same resources and persons will continue to work in the PE2020 project. The coordinator will keep partners informed about the amendment process.

Mikko informed the consortium about the amendment process. The consortium considered it appropriate that the coordinator will meet PO in the near future to discuss this and other key topics discussed during the consortium meeting.

Issues to be decided

1.5 WP1

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

Decisions taken:

- D1.1 - the inventory will be kept open and updated with new cases. Partners will send completed case descriptions to Niels.
- New case descriptions to be considered (Edward and Martin).
- D1.2 targets to about 35 cases; links will be added to other innovative cases.
- Cases from Finnish Academy and Bonus programme will be reviewed by Niels and Tine with the help of Timo.
- Niels will ask respondents to complete information about the impacts of PE cases while sending reports for review.
- Niels, Tine, Luciano, with help of Edward and Kaisa will clarify the need and options to recruit a designer to make the pdf publication of D1.2 interactive (possibility to use 5000€ for this). The possibility of using the same layout and branding will be explored.
- Niels will send D1.3 for comments by 21 February, submission in time.
- Niels will send the outline of D1.4 to partners before the next skype meeting. Draft will be submitted by end of March, date of the final version to be agreed in a skype meeting.

1.6 WP2

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

Decision taken:

- The conceptual model will focus on dynamic governance. The model will distinguish main concepts and sub concepts.
- Case studies will be the main empirical material for preparing a “grounded model”. The objectives, outcomes and different ways of arriving at them will be analysed.
- Policy cycle will be used as a “boundary object” or “thinking tool” helping communicating and focusing on the different stages of PE in research policy.
- The consortium did an analysis of the success factors of PE. This will be used as a material in further analysis.

1.7 WP3

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

Decisions taken:

- The aim is to continue working with 6 pilots. If critical obstacles emerge, the plan will be changed.
- A “nudging approach” for pilots will be applied (a retrospective approach will not be applicable).
- Plans for carrying out pilots will be done very soon, including plans on how partners with working months take part in the initiatives.

1.8 WP4

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

Decisions taken:

- Luciano will continue to develop a concept of the toolkit by following a critical approach.

- A more concrete model of the toolkit will be discussed in the next consortium meeting in Vilnius.
- Possibilities to connect Luciano's analysis of RRI issues to WP2 reporting + articles will be explored.

1.9 WP5

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

Decisions taken:

- Saule and Mikko initiate a paper on dynamic governance.
- Kaisa will make a proposal on a collaborative paper with Engage2020 team.
- Conferences are an important channel for developing the draft papers.
- The promise of "accepted papers" could be an issue of negotiation with the EU.
- The first policy brief about WP1 and WP2 results in summer 2015.
- The consortium wishes that Kaisa will centrally email/ disseminate results.

1.10 WP6

Proposal: the main decisions done during the consortium meeting:

No decisions were taken in regard to WP6, but the coordinator informed the consortium about the GA Amendment process, which is currently waiting for the notification of the merger of NCRC with UH by REA.

In addition, the SAB provided feedback on the consortium, which is summarized through the following points:

- SAB considered that PE2020 project was going globally well, and it promises a lot. The working of the consortium seems dynamic and it solves problems effectively in the consortium meetings.
- Some points of development include the following issues:
 - Better definition of whom is the project for
 - Better liaison with the PO
 - More meetings among the consortium might be valuable, more time is needed for discussions
 - The draft of D1.2 catalogue seems globally fine but some of the cases need enrichment
 - WP2 seem a bit overambitious
 - A matrix justifying the choice of pilot cases in WP3 should be provided
 - WP4 analysis of the toolkit situation seems nice
 - Overall, synthetizing and use of graphics should be considered
 - Important to make the complementarities with Engage2020 clear and also show it to outsiders

1.11 Next Consortium meeting

Proposal: the next consortium meeting will be organized in Vilnius, in June 2015. The dates of this meeting shall be confirmed.

The dates will be decided in the next skype meeting.

Other issues

No other issues.

Next skype meetings

To be decided through email.

Closing of the meeting

Closing of the meeting 16:27.

3.1.8. MAC 26.3.2015

PE2020 Extraordinary MAC meeting – NOTES

Time: 26 March 11-12.30 EET

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

Mikko Rask, CSRC/UH

Niels Mejlgaard, AU

Luciano d'Andrea, LSC

Fabio Feudo, LSC

Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS

Timo Aarrevaara, UH

Kaisa Matschoss, CSRC/UH (secretary)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

11:05

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

The consortium decided to change the agenda as follows:

Other topics are postponed.

There is discussion about the formal status of the MAC to make decisions. Mikko raises the question that before Amendment 1 to GA is accepted (which acknowledges that the coordinator has been changed), the status of MAC seems unclear. This is for the reason that the Commission has not yet accepted the change of the coordinator to UH and NCRC does not exist any more.

2 Issues to be decided

2.1 Amendment 1 to GA

Proposal (Mikko): The merger of NCRC to UH shall have to be acknowledged through an amendment to GA. This is now possible, since the REA has accepted the claim of the merger. An amendment

(Amendment 1, ANNEX 1) concerning the merger has been prepared by a lawyer of UH, and it is proposed to be accepted by the partners.

In order to complete the amendment process, Annex 1 (description of work, DoW), needs to be updated as well. For this purpose, the coordinator has proposed changes to DoW, as indicated in ANNEX2. The coordinator proposes that these changes will be accepted and fine-tuned by the consortium members.

After completion of the amendment, the coordinator will clarify the process of authorizing the changes through the commission system and partners.

There are no comments on Annex 1, and the coordinator can proceed with the current version.

Mikko presented all the revisions that need to be done to DoW (Annex 2).

It was accepted that the additional budget from changing overhead would be divided in same proportions than previously between management, dissemination and research. Additional RTD person months will be allocated to WP3.

Niels remarked that the lead beneficiaries numbers should be updated in the tables. Further he suggested that 2 PM change between WP1 and WP2 should be updated in the revised DoW. This does not have budget implications. This was accepted that Niels promised to send information on the decision that was previously done on this issue to the coordinator.

Coordinator will consider what is appropriate in terms of including the change of sub-contracting in updated budget table.

2.2 Change in the structure of the Management Committee

Proposal (Mikko). The structure of the Management Committee (MAC) has been specified in the Consortium Agreement (CA), which says that the MAC consists of one representative of each Party. In order to maintain the current balance of representation, it is suggested that UH shall have two representatives in the Management Committee, as proposed in the draft Amendment 2 to CA (ANNEX3), drafted by the lawyer of UH.

Postponed

2.3 PE2020 authorship policy

Proposal (Mikko): Authorship policy of PE2020 has raised concerns, for which reason the coordinator proposes that the consortium agrees on the principles of authorship. After consulting two members of the SAB (Markku Mattila and Martin Hynes), the coordinator was recommended to establish principles of authorship policy in PE2020.

In order to establish such principles, the coordinator has drafted the following guidelines:

- *The consortium supports collaboration by encouraging co-authoring and co-editing in all publications. Particularly in the case of deliverables, all partners shall have to be offered the possibility to participate as a co-author or co-editor, if there are no clear restrictions for doing so.*

- *Being in the role of an author or editor means writing text and taking part in the elaboration of the text.*
- *Partners are free to suggest names among “contributors” from their organization.*
- *It is the WP leaders’ responsibility to ask for partners’ contributions, ask their willingness to serve as authors or editors, and propose ways to do so. WP leaders should also ensure that enough time is left for commenting drafts or providing input.*
- *We acknowledge that extensive co-authoring among the partners has the following benefits:*
 - *it better meets the idea of an EU project that cannot be based on separate national exercises*
 - *it respects the collective working, thinking and ownership of collectively produced ideas among the consortium*
 - *it helps the MAC to become responsible on the quality of publications*
 - *becoming an authors is rewarding, empowering and motivation to the partners*
 - *it is more effective in mobilizing the expertise and dividing work among the partners.*

In addition to these guidelines, the SAB recommended the following documents

ESF principles of Research Integrity
http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/Code_Conduct_ResearchIntegrity.pdf

that contains substantial guidelines on authorship practice, and

Authorship guidelines of the British Sociological Association

<http://www.britisoc.co.uk/publications/quidelines-reports/authorship-quidelines.aspx>.

The latter, in particular, says following about authorship policy

“Everyone who is listed as an author should have made a substantial direct academic contribution (i.e. intellectual responsibility and substantive work) to at least two of the four main components of a typical scientific project or paper: a) Conception or design. b) Data collection and processing. c) Analysis and interpretation of the data. d) Writing substantial sections of the paper (e.g. synthesising findings in the literature review or the findings/results section).”

Based on these components, the coordinator suggests that a working group will be formed to propose the principles of authorship policy of PE2020.

Postponed

2.4 Authorship of Deliverables 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and other forthcoming deliverables

Proposal (Mikko): The authorship of the forthcoming deliverables will be decided after accepting the authorship policy of PE2020.

For the practical purpose, however, the consortium shall have to preliminarily nominate authors, editors and contributors for the forthcoming deliverables.

Postponed

2.5 The withdrawal of Aarhus University from the PE2020 consortium

Proposal (Niels, Mikko):

Niels proposes that “AU will withdraw from the consortium. The following conditions will apply: AU will complete the work leading to submission of final deliverables D1.2, D1.3 and D1.4 before leaving the consortium. AU has spent its funding relating to responsibilities in WP1, WP2 and WP5, but not funding related to WP3 and WP4, and is therefore prepared to return funding relating to WP3 and WP4. AU will allow any use of its contributions to the project for the purposes of the consortium and will make all data and information gathered throughout its involvement in the project available to the consortium.”

An alternative proposal is suggested by Mikko, based on the consultation of project partners and two SAB members. This proposal is to postpone the decision on withdrawal, and start clarifying the issue through the following means:

- *By consulting a neutral third party to review any doubts of violation of research ethics or research integrity, and to give external evaluation of the issue (a suggestion by the SAB).*
- *By clarifying the technical aspects of potential withdrawal. Such issues include e.g. IPR issues, financial issues and other technical aspects. The lawyers of UH and AU need to be engaged in the clarification of such issues.*

There was a long discussion about this issue. Saule raised the issue that this question is not only about the success of one particular EU project, but also about the success of social sciences under EU framework programmes.

Luciano emphasized that the termination of AU is a risk for the success of the project, since there would be only three partners. He emphasized the human aspect in treating the conflict, and importance to “reset” the project by creating a new informal agreement of working together. He underlined the need to avoid formal decisions on this issue.

Mikko presented the idea of commissioning a neutral external party to clarify the issue. Fabio was of the opinion that the consortium should try to solve the problem by itself.

Timo found the proposal by Martin Hynes interesting.

Luciano: the conflict started with authorship, and evolved to different issues. Important to find new forms of co-operating. Avoiding to find the reasons of conflict, but finding solutions and common points.

Niels: already difficulties in social sciences. Termination is not an ideal solution. It would have negative implication to all partners. A major issues is allocating authorship. Mikko's role is another issue: managerial behavioral is inappropriate.

Mikko's interest: to ensure that the PE2020 project can be completed successfully.

Niels's Interests: preserve the continuation of PE2020. Interest: to ensure high quality research and dissemination of results. Personal and academic integrity: this is currently in conflict with good academic research practice.

Saule's suggestion: two ask Loreta to prepare two separate memorandums, based on the perspectives of all wp leaders: 1) position paper on authorship in PE2020, and 2) another about how management and coordination should work. Make some recommendations. Then the consortium should have a discussion either electronically or other means.

Conclusion: we have to settle existing conflicts about authorship and find a way forward. This will be done by allowing Loreta to start such a clarification process.

2.6 Other issues

Postponed

3 Issues for information

Postponed

4 Other issues

No

5 Next skype meetings

Soon

6 Closing of the meeting

13:09

3.1.9. MAC 2.6.2015

PE2020 Extraordinary MAC meeting – Agenda

Time: 02 June 13.00 – 14.30 EET

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

*Mikko Rask, UH x

*Niels Mejlgaard, AU x

*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC x

*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS x

Loreta Tauginiene

Timo Arravaara, UH x

Kaisa Matschoss, UH (secretary) x

Ian R. Dobson, UH

Maria Pietilä, UH

Fabio Feudo, LSC x

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

Opened 13:13

1.2 Validity and quorum

VUIBS absent at the beginning, but the meeting is valid to make decision. VUIBS joined the discussion from the point 3.

1.3 Approval of the agenda

Approved

2 Issues for information

2.1 Amendment 1 to GA

Information (Mikko): The amendment process is still on-going. Mikko will give an update based on latest information. Based on the information by the PO, the next portion of pre-funding cannot be paid to PE2020 before the amendment process is complete.

Mikko informed that the financial team of UH has calculated the new budget and the amendment is ready to be submitted, after Mikko explains changes in the DoW. Mikko also told that the PO had informed no prefunding can be paid before the amendment has been closed.

Mikko also informed that due to overhead changes, UH can use 4 PM more than previously. It was agreed that Mikko will send the revised person month allocation tables to partners for checking.

2.2 The structure of the management committee

Information (Mikko): based on the statement by the lawyer of UH, the following conditions, as defined in the current consortium agreement, will hold:

The Management Committee consists of one representative of each party to the consortium agreement. MAC has a quorum when two-thirds of its members are present or represented, and each member has one vote. If a decision is not reached by consensus, majority voting, with the coordinator having the casting vote in case of a tie, will be used for decision-making. MAC's decisions are binding once the minutes of the meeting has been accepted by the members. The minutes are considered accepted if, within 15 calendar days from sending, no member has objected in writing to the coordinator to the accuracy of the draft of the minutes.

For information: UH layer about the validity of decision making: all partners have one voice. Partner = organisation => UH has one voice, which must be the coordinator.

Lessons learned: consider in the future better the role of decision and discussion points.

3 Issues for decision making

3.1 Actions to settle issues concerning authorship policy of PE2020

Proposal (Mikko): it was the decision of the MAC meeting 26 March 2015 to settle the existing conflict about authorship by commissioning Loreta to explore issues and propose a way forward based on a consultation of WP leaders. It is suggested that the PE2020 shall accept the proposed version of authorship policy for PE2020 (see Annex 1).

The consortium partners have made no additional comments to the draft version of authorship policy circulated by VIUBS before the MAC meeting, except for AU. The draft proposal was read during the MAC-meeting.

Comments:

AU: overall aim should be to preserve the overall quality of the results, this should take place through peer review process. The quality should go first, but the quality might not be best guaranteed if the products have been opened up to additions by the consortium after the final version of the deliverable has been drafted, as it might interrupt the consistency of the paper / report. The best quality is guaranteed if the content of the paper is agreed in an early stage and the allocation of roles, including author roles, have been decided. The review process by the consortium improves the quality.

Luciano: the planning at early stages offers a consistent production / output. AU: The early involvement is the key as well as the organisation the collaborative writing processes.

VIUBS: contribution possible at any stage. The concept of contribution should be defined. The contribution should be possible from the beginning to the end.

AU: previous comments in adding content at the later stage.

VIUBS will refine

the content of the draft to finalise the policy, and invites the help of AU and other partners. VIUBS asks again for the improvements in writing. Contributions are expected to be delivered within a week from all partners. Include the texts, not just commenting, via email including all partners.

Conclusion: By 17 June comments from those partners, who are interested in contributing to the future of the PE2020-project.

3.2 Authorship of D1.2 and D1.3

Proposal (Mikko): applying the accepted authorship policy of PE2020, the consortium will make decisions concerning the authorship of D1.2 and D1.3.

Janne Wikström is also a contributor

AU: The opinion on the AU is that we can make decisions related D1.2 and D1.3.

The coordinator suggests that the decision will be postponed until the principles of authorship in the PE2020-project are decided.

Regarding the D1.2, the only delaying issue is the distribution of authorship.

LSC: The question is whether we should wait until the principles of authorship are agreed upon, due to rational reasons, because the deliverables will be delayed.

LSC and AU are willing to discuss the authorship of D1.2 and D1.3 in order to overcome the obstacle now.

LSC has no opinion or is willing taking a position about the authorship. The authorship should be on those who have actually written something.

UH: Coordinator would not like to reopen the discussion about the authorship. concerned that partners do not dare express their opinions at the skype meeting

AU: It is uncomfortable that the coordinator pushes the consortium in front of him.

UH: There are people who are unwilling to enter into a conflict in the skype call.

AU: The AU feels that the coordinator claims that AU is intimidating the partners about expressing their opinions.

VUIBS: Calls for contributions into the principles so that we can decide based on them how to proceed in conflicting situations. We need to see whether we share the same principles.

UH: There were discussions with the PO about the delay due to the conflict of authorship. The PO accepted the submission of the D's in August.

Proposal: Delay until the principles are decided upon. Acceptance from WP3 / UH, VUIBS in order to get forward. LSC: disappointed about the difficulties related to authorship, but accept the postponement. AU: decision could/should be done now.

Conclusion: postpone the decision (by disagreement) 2 vs. 2 votes

3.3 Status of D1.4

Proposal (Mikko): based on an update by Niels, the consortium needs to decide about the status of D1.4. All partners are requested to comment on the issue of appendixes included or excluded in the report. Other substantial comments.

AU: Is waiting for comments to the D1.4.

UH: Coordinator is worried about the lack of comments to requested contributions.

AU: Interpretation: Lack of comments = sign of approval.

Decision: remove the appendix contents but add the links to the reports as an appendix. D1.4 considered substantially ready.

3.4 Actions to settle issues concerning the coordination of PE2020

Proposal (Mikko): it was a suggestion by the MAC meeting 26 March 2015 to internally clarify suggested coordination problems and find relevant remedies. Fabio and Luciano were willing to contribute to this work. Based on their reflections, the consortium shall agree on the actions needed to solve the issues related to coordination.

LSC was asked to clarify the management problems with partners.

Peculiar condition of partnership. Normally large number of partners. In this small project we are able to have more frequent contacts. We require a higher capacity to achieve convergence.

1. Administrative work: this is not so problematic.

2. Planning of work leading to products. Not too problematic because responsibilities are clear in the two first points.

3. Development and drafting of deliverables is the most problematic area. Responsibilities are not exactly given in the beginning. Who has the final word?

- who is responsible for the text? Could be defined in DoW. Could be the consortium.

- how to work together? Who is the person in charge to propose a setup?

Luciano: usually WP leader is responsible in proposing a plan of deliverables, and showing how partners can contribute (this should be approved by the partners); everybody is usually asked to provide peer review, everything is discussed, the consortium decides about the final plan and outcome.

Timo: we have probably been too much involved in all processes (everyone everywhere).

LSC: conflict between autonomy of partners and tendency to share everything. We have to decide how to balance from here on. In any case we need better definition of responsibilities.

AU: the issue of not only actual work of drafting deliverables but also planning. The coordinator should take care of the academic focus of the work.

Fabio: let's focus on point 3! This can be discussed in later skype meetings. The coordinator/partners should propose 2-3.

3.5 Withdrawal of Aarhus University from the PE2020 consortium

Proposal (Niels): Niels proposes that "AU will withdraw from the consortium. The following conditions will apply: AU will complete the work leading to submission of final deliverables D1.2, D1.3 and D1.4 before leaving the consortium. AU has spent its funding relating to responsibilities in WP1, WP2 and WP5, but not funding related to WP3 and WP4, and is therefore prepared to return funding relating to WP3 and WP4. AU will allow any use of its contributions to the project for the purposes of the consortium and will make all data and information gathered throughout its involvement in the project available to the consortium."

Remarks (Mikko): When deliberating this proposal, the consortium should reflect at least the following dimensions of the issue:

- Costs and benefits of this measure to all parties. Are benefits bigger than costs? Can the withdrawal cause fatal risk to the PE2020 project?
- Explanation to the EC. The consortium has committed to settle existing conflicts and find remedies to problems. What are remaining issues that may justify withdrawal anyhow?
- Timing. As the on-going amendment process indicate, the process can last half to one year. Prefunding cannot be paid when there is an open amendment process.
- Re-allocation of work and expenses, and returning of funding, based on shared understanding.
- Other contractual measures and the procedures between AU, UH and EC.
- Risks of non-withdrawal.
- Alternatives solutions to withdrawal.

AU: Refers to previously submitted written explanation. not shared understanding about authorship issues and approach to research. Difficulties in collaboration, in particular with the coordinator. No signs that we are approaching a shared understanding. There is a lock-in that is absorbing the good energy of this project.

Fabio: very sorry for the withdrawal of AU. Now it is useless to discuss or try to convince Niels to change his view. Need to consider best way to move forward. Normally EU is against this kind of solutions. EU do not want to manage extra problems. We need to avoid risks in terms of delays of payment etc.

Saule: would prefer AU to stay and keep the consortium as it is now.

Timo prefers to have AU included.

Luciano: AU has done a decision and we have to accept it. Need to find an agreement on how to manage the process. Mikko should find a list of substantive, economic and political questions that we need to
Find another partner?

Kaisa: could it be possible to find another partner from AU?

Niels: no. as has been communicated several times, Niels acts on behalf of AU

Timo: University of Lapland as a new partner is a possibility.

Mikko: accepts the withdrawal of AU to maintain a research focus of the project. Timing of the new amendment process: first finish the current one ensuring the payment for the partners, before opening a new process. Otherwise the payment will be postponed. Confusing to have two amendment processes simultaneously. PO suggested to have two issues in the same amendment: the University of Lapland as new partner and the withdrawal of AU.

Fabio: should we ask someone from the Commission to help us informally.

Niels suggest that the withdrawal should be made part of the current amendment process. The EC usually supports having all issues in the same amendment and from their point of view this would not be a big problem.

UH: there is a risk of delay in the amendment that is currently going on. Mikko fears for the continuation of the project and wishes to guarantee the next funding for the partners.

Mikko asks for the comments from partners.

Timo: what are the cons for the delay in the withdrawal of AU?

Niels: Top priority to get that done.

Mikko: What are the practical implications?

AU: Negative implications for the work together. Niels does not want to be a part of the management committee, and he would have to be.

Kaisa: suggestion that the MAC decides that the AU will withdraw. The MAC decides that AU will not work in any other work packages and AU stops being a part in MAC. There will be no further responsibilities of AU in the current work.

Mikko: The amendment process would only later formalise the decision earlier made by MAC.

Niels: suggestion to ask the PO. The coordinator reminds AU that the explicit rules of the agreement that only the coordinator is in contact with the PO. Niels asks to become part of this dialogue, so that he will not have to start the bilateral discussions with the EC. The coordinator reminds that the aim is to act on behalf of the project that will benefit all partners.

Mikko will inform AU and the other partners what the PO will say.

Saule: Supports the idea of withdrawal in a later stage with new amendment because she would not like to cause a delay in the funding that will influence partners situation.

Decision: The principal of withdrawal of AU will be accepted by all partners. Develop an exit strategy with contact with PO.

Mikko will inform the PO that a) AU will withdraw, b) what is the current condition of on-going amendment - and the POs advice on whether the withdrawal should be part of the ongoing amendment, c) what is the prospect of University of Lapland partnership of the consortium regarding WP3.

AU will not be a part in work any other WP's from now on. There has been no agreement in the way AU will withdraw, but financial issues related to funding has to be agreed upon. The missing contribution of AU to different work packages needs to be discussed separately.

Fabio: Details related to conditions of withdrawal are an issue for another meeting.

Saule: There has been an exchange of 2 PM's. WP2 has no unresolved issues. AU has no more obligations in WP2 or WP1

Kaisa: The contribution of AU in WP5 has been modest and not what expected.

Niels: Only remaining issue is WP5, Niels will report the work that has been done in WP5.

3.6 Next consortium meeting

Proposal (Mikko). The next consortium meeting will be organized in September in Vilnius. Based on Saule's proposal, the consortium needs to decide the dates of that meeting.

Saule will send a doodle asap.

4 Other issues

FYI: Mikko on holiday June 24th until the end of July.

Kaisa on holiday July 1st - August 12th

5 Next skype meetings

Mikko will send a doodle.

6 Closing of the meeting

17:09.

3.1.10. MAC 25.6.2015

PE2020 Extraordinary MAC meeting – NOTES

Time: 25 June 2015, 11-13 EET

Place: Skype meeting

Participants

*Mikko Rask, UH x
*Niels Mejlgaard, AU x
Tine Ravn, AU, not present
*Luciano d'Andrea, LSC x
Fabio Feudo x
*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS x
Loreta Tauginiene
Timo Aarravaara, UH x
Kaisa Matschoss, UH (secretary) x
Ian R. Dobson, UH
Maria Pietilä, UH

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

Opened 11.08

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

2 Issues for information

2.1 Amendment 1 to GA

Information (Mikko): The amendment has been submitted to the NEF portal. The financial officer opened a new session to refine DoW according to needed changes corresponding the draft sent by the PE2020 consortium.

3 Issues for decision making

3.1 Authorship policy of PE2020

Proposal (Mikko): The project will accept its authorship policy on the basis of the draft circulated in the previous MAC meeting.

Niels said he is not in a position to comment on the future policy, but sent around a note on authorship wrt already completed output.

Luciano: 1) dividing past and new situation regarding publications (current discussions should apply only to future deliverables), 2) principle of design 3) principle of responsibility. There are responsibilities as single institutes to the Commission

Luciano agree on the principles presented in the position paper. But he would like to specify the procedures. - Luciano proposes that these issues will be discussed in future MAC meetings.
Timo expresses agreement with Luciano

Position paper accepted.

3.2 Authorship of D1.2, D1.3 and D1.4

Proposal (Mikko): applying the accepted authorship policy of PE2020, the consortium will make decisions concerning the authorship of D1.2, D1.3 and D1.4.

Niels sent an email on 16 June proposing allocation of authorship for the reports. He also recycled his views of the division of work between partners in these reports. Partners are free to send additional comments on this issue before the meeting, but since these issues have already been discussed several times, it is just time for the consortium to make a decision based on their best views and the accepted policy of authorship.

Proposal for D1.4

Authors

Niels Mejlgaard

Tine Ravn

Mikko Rask

Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė

Loreta Tauginienė

Contributors

Timo Aarrevaara

Maria Pietilä

Janne Wikström

Ian Dobson

Kaisa Matschoss

Luciano d'Andrea

Fabio Feudo

AU support staff (sigurd, per)

ACCEPTED

Proposal for D1.3

Authors

Niels Mejlgaard

Tine Ravn

Contributors

Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė

Naoyuki Mikami

Mikko Rask

Ekou YAGI

Yasushi IKEBE

- Published in conference proceedings

ACCEPTED

D.1.2

Proposal

Editors: Tine Ravn and Niels Mejlgaard

Authors: Amodio, Luigi; Andersson, Edward; Bedsted, Bjørn; Browne, Bliss; De Marrée, Jozefien; Derenne, Benoît; De Ridder-Vignone, Kathryn; Ekstam, Niina; Farrell, David; Grenman, Katri; Hahn, Julia; Hansen, Hans Colind; Hoff, Anders; Horst, Maja; Hirno, Meelika; Iredale, Rachel; Jesse, Anke; Klüver, Lars; Lewanski, Rudolf; Longridge, Emma; Lukensmeyer, Carolyn; Machill, Katja; Macnaghten, Phil; Maaß, Katja; Mazzonetto, Marzia; Molinari, Francesco; Mulder, Henk; Pieper, Richard; Pollitzer, Elizabeth; Randall, Jane; Reuchamps, Min; Riise, Jan; Ritola, Maria; Seltz, Raymond; Sirola, Maija; Snik, Frans; Sumner, Seirian; Tomasson, Lotta; Vincent, Jaquet; Wernisch, Diana; Widegren, Erika

Contributors: Aarrevaara, Timo; d'Andrea, Luciano; Dikcius, Vytautas; Feudo, Fabio; Gylstorff, Sigurd Anders; Kaarakainen, Minna; Lauridsen, Per Stig; Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė, Saulė; Matschoss, Kaisa; Rask, Mikko; Pietilä, Maria; Tauginienė, Loreta, Janne Wikström, Ian Dobson,

Alternatives

- 1) as it is now, Niels & Luciano vote for this alternative
- 2) add WP leaders as editors (Tine and Niels first, other WP leaders after) After discussion, this option was rejected.
- 3) Tine and Niels as Senior editors, other WP leaders (who want to be included as co-editors) Mikko votes for this alternative, Saule votes for this, but would like to leave it up to each person to decide themselves how they see their own role.

Decision: Number 3 selected.

Who will be mentioned as co-editors?

Mikko is not willing to be mentioned as co-editor.

Luciano, Kaisa, Timo, Saule wish to be contributors. Saule will check whether Loreta will be mentioned as a co-editor.

3.3 Withdrawal of Aarhus University from the PE2020 consortium

Proposal (Mikko): On 5 June 2015, the MAC of PE2020 did the decision to accept the withdrawal of Aarhus university from the consortium. MAC also advised the coordinator to ask for POs advice on whether the withdrawal should be part of the ongoing amendment or a topic of a new amendment.

PO's advice was to put this issue in the next amendment together with the entering of the University of Lapland as a new partner. Formally the withdrawal should take place since the beginning of the second period of the project.

The coordinator proposes that the MAC will decide about Aarhus work for WP5 and possible refunding of part of the funding based on agreement. AU should indicate contact persons and ways to start treating practical arrangements concerning the withdrawal process from the side of AU.

AU contact persons:

Niels Mejlgaard nm@ps.au.dk (all enquiries)

Grethe Baasch Thomsen gbt@au.dk (copy on grant agreement / EC stuff)

Eva Bang-Olsen ebo@au.dk (copy on consortium agreement)

Kirsten B. Jacobsen kirsten.b.jacobsen@au.dk (copy on financial stuff)

Coordinator will draft a second amendment.

Kaisa: if Niels presents or authors referring to PE2020 materials, he will refer to EU funding of the project. He will keep the consortium informed about any such activities.

AU Activities in WP5 approved, equivalent to .5 PM.

Reallocation of the months left from AU will be decided in next MAC meetings

3.4 Next consortium meeting

Proposal (Mikko): The date to be settled for the next consortium meeting in Vilnius. List of activities for the preparation of the meeting should be composed.

We will check if Oct 1. and 2 would be suitable for Timo. For other partners it fits.

4 Issues for discussion

4.1 Work in WP2

Proposal (Saule): overview of main on-going issues and requests for partners.

Saule: discussion policy cycle has been promised. Saule will take into account comments from Luciano, and send the next draft and work plan to the consortium within the next couple of weeks.

4.2 Work in WP3

Proposal (Timo): overview of main on-going issues and requests for partners.

All is going well!

Riga's workshop for young scientist went well, FES-Town hall -meeting in Helsinki in May and the next one will be in Tampere in September.

In Italy, 40 researcher and 15 students involved in Torino. (Luciano has many pictures from the event - in Finland we should remember to take photos as well!!)

Enea in Rome about energy project & their leaders. Summer school in ENEA, a very powerful institution, the first time that they are discussion PE!

Mikko: important to document some of the success in the mid-term report (e.g. that in ENEA they are for the first time now talking about PE in their organization)

Napoli, Italy, connect NGO's and research centres, mobility & PE in transportation. Esp. upstream engagement in October.

4.3 Work in WP4

Proposal (Luciano): overview of main on-going issues and requests for partners.

Discussions in Vilnius about the future development. Technical request specification should be on the way, the presentation in Aarhus can be used as a material for this.

4.4 Work in WP5

Proposal (Kaisa): overview of main on-going issues and requests for partners.

Kaisa was in contact in PUS journal about checking whether it is possible to submit.

Several blog articles have been submitted.

Videos from the context tailoring workshop will be published in a week

D1.2 almost final

5 Other issues

Proposal (Mikko): partners should indicate their availability during the summer.

Kaisa: Holiday! 29.6.-11.8.2015 :-) Mikko: 26 June – 31 July.

Form C should be sent by 10 September.

6 Next skype meetings

At the beginning of September.

7 Closing of the meeting

13:20

3.1.11. MAC 20.5.2016

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – NOTES

Time: May 20 2016, at 14:30 – 15:15

Place: Hotel Domus Australia, Via Cernaia, 14/b, Rome, Italy

Participants

x *Mikko Rask, CSRC

x *Luciano d'Andrea, LSC

x *Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS

*Timo Aarravaara, LAY (x Timo participated through Skype on issues related to WP3)

x Kaisa Matschoss, CSRC (secretary)

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

14.30

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

Issues to be informed

1.4 Periodic review and next pre-payment

Proposal (Mikko): The project has been successfully evaluated in the periodic review. Mikko will inform partners about the next payment

- The coordinator informed that he will proceed with the next pre-payment, taking into consideration the completion of requested tasks.

-

Issues to be decided

1.5 Decisions about substantial issues in the PE2020 consortium meeting in Rome

Proposal (Mikko): key decision will be confirmed.

WP2

- D2.2 accepted as a publication

- D2.3 It was agreed that the summary report will be developed as agreed in the discussion, according to the following time schedule: draft by June 3 by Saule, comments June 8, finalisation June 15, 2016.
- It was agreed that Saule will produce an extra report from WP2, literature review. Draft version by the end of July.

WP3

- Bonus report will be finished by reporting only the first phase of the pilot process. Timo will send the report for comments for partners on Monday, the 23 May.
- JPI MYBL- report will report only the first part of the piloting process.
- Academy of Finland case will be reported as a separate document.
- Deadline of D2.3 will be 30 June 2016. 20 draft version to Content is as follows: Introduction, 7 case reports, discussion focusing on the potential of PE2020 interventions in contributing to new capacities for public engagement.

WP4

- WP4: Following criteria for the webtool were agreed: a simple, stationary webtool; high quality visual features; easy navigation options; obile app. Luciano finished the full draft of webtool content 20 June. Mikko will help in the tendering process and organizing the testing of the webtool. Luciano, Mikko and Edward Andersson will make a practical proposal on how to develop the toolkit potentially in collaboration with Engage2020 consortium.

WP5

- *Following ideas about the policy conference were accepted.*
 - o *The aim (success) is to reach such audiences that are not yet in the PE discourse*
 - o *An important focus of the conference is how to put PE in action.*
 - o *Ideas about the conference format included suggestions that*
 - o *Day 1 focuses on European, Day 2 on national & regional issues*
 - o *Policy orientation instead of academic orientation. No call for papers, if possible (better arrange a panel in an existing academic conference; no competitive advance of having an academic conference in Brussels). Call for extended abstract, if the call for papers option cannot be deleted*
 - o *Topics related to everyday business of policy making: foresight, evidence based policy, PE in municipal/ city planning*
 - o *WP5 should check what Creative Commons means for the webtool and possibly publications*
 - o *Final project report draft ready by Nov 15 (except policy conference). Final draft by end of Nov. First draft ready by end of September. Coordinating provides the frame.*

1.6 Amendment 2

Proposal (Mikko): Decision on the completion of Amendment 2, including the share of one extra person month that was released from the University of Aarhus. Exit of Aarhus, entrance of the University of Lapland. Other possible items to be included, e.g. change in the publication plan.

- Mikko will initiate asap.

- The one month from Aarhus will be equally divided between UH and LSC.
- Amendment for publications of academic articles, so that 4 are either submitted or accepted, Mikko will ask the PO.
-

Other issues

No other issues.

Next consortium meeting

Will be 14-15 Nov. in Brussles, followed by the final policy conference on 16-17 Nov.

Closing of the meeting

15:15

3.1.12. MAC 15.11.2016

PE2020 Management Committee meeting – NOTES

Time: 15 November 2016, at 14:00 – 14:30.

Venue: Leopold Hotel Brussels EU - Brasserie Leopold, seminar room “Italy”

Address: Rue du Luxembourg 35 - B-1050 - Bruxelles

Participants

x*Mikko Rask, CSRC

x*Luciano d’Andrea, LSC

x*Saule Maciukaite-Zviniene, VUIBS -> replaced by Loreta Tauginiene

x*Timo Arrevaara, LAY

Kaisa Matschoss, CSRC (secretary)

(*Full members of the MAC)

1 Order of the meeting

1.1 Opening

13:44

1.2 Validity and quorum

OK

1.3 Approval of the agenda

OK

Issues to be informed

1.4 Amendment 2

Proposal (Mikko): Amendment 2 has been substantially accepted by the Commission. The coordinator will inform about the current status of the approval process.

Mikko informed about the amendment process. Only signatures to the University of Lapland and University of Helsinki need to be included in the NEF system.

Issues to be decided

1.5 Decisions about substantial issues in the PE2020 consortium meeting in Rome

Proposal (Mikko): key decision will be confirmed.

WP2: publication of the literature review (Saule)

The literature review will be published by **end of Nov. 2016** as an informal output of WP2. Only Lithuanian group will be included as authors.

WP3: publication of D3.3, i.e. WP3 summary report (Timo)

D3.3 will be published on 30 Nov. 2016. The next version will be prepared and sent to the partner for comments by 23 Nov. The deadline for partners to comment is Nov. 25.

In the discussion on WP3 it was reasoned that, overall, the pilots have been successful. To finalize reporting, Timo needs feedback in particular about the following aspects: arguments about cutting edge, remarks of missing information, evidence of impacts. If possible, the analysis should take into account contextual impact on the success of the pilots.

WP4: plan for completing the webtool and final tasks of WP4.

Luciano presented the current status of the webtool and the consortium discussed the remaining tasks. The quality of the webtool content was considered positive, even impressive. The consortium decided on the following action points to help complete this WP:

Luciano will propose ways to refer to the creators of the webtool. The current hypothesis reads as: "To refer to this toolkit, use the following reference: Luciano and Caiati (2016)....". Kaisa will help with inventing the name for the toolkit. Include also mentioning the deliverable number (4.2).

More attractive title should be considered.

Reference to the EU/ logo shall have to be included in the webtool.

Mikko will check with UH lawyers about any copy right issues and about possibility to use 'creative commons' or similar clause in the webtool. Luciano will produce one page of issues to be discussed.

Luciano should send a link to OneDrive where all can comment on the same document. All partners should send **feedback on the beta version by 12 Dec**. Same instructions should be sent to the partners as to other reviewers.

Summary report 4.3. Technical account of the work process and its outcomes.

WP5: publication of the policy briefs, newspaper articles, the book and peer reviewed articles. Final workshop and summary report.

All partners are responsible to submit information on their dissemination activities in the latter project period to the participant portal. Kaisa sent us information on how to do this.

The 3rd Policy brief will be written after the policy conference. Webtool and policy conference recommendations are the two main contents. Authors preliminarily include: Kaisa, Kirsi, Luciano, Mikko. The brief will be coordinated with CASI (Kaisa).

Each partner should aim at publishing at least one newspaper articles in their own country. Horizon portal article can be included among the deliverables in this category.

D5.2 including academic articles will be completed by the end of the project. List here the academic articles (Kaisa will add the list included in her slides).

Summary report will be further elaborated by Kaisa. **Wp leaders should send new versions to Kaisa by Dec 5.** New input should consist of WP summaries + key recommendations. **Kaisa will deliver the next version 23 Dec.**

Kaisa will make a plan for boosted dissemination for the two last weeks of the project activating all partners.

WP6: Final report to the EC. Deployment of the external evaluation. Final plan of using the knowledge.

We agreed about the content final dissemination plan.

January 15 Mikko will produce the draft report of the final dissemination plan.

Mikko will check out and inform partners about the final technical reporting, including form C:s. The deadline of reporting is end of March.

Other issues

No other issues.

Next skype meeting

Not defined.

Closing of the meeting

14:15

4. Advisory panel

It was the objective of the PE2020 project to deliver science-based policy relevant deeper understanding to be used by science policy practitioners and other actors who need to promote public engagement in science, technology and innovation. For this end, it was considered important that the Voice of the Customer (VoC) is heard and that there will respectively be a system for controlling the output. In addition, it was deemed important that the project reaches its key audiences. One way in which the two-way communication was incorporation in the project, was the establishment of Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) that consisted of scientific and science policy experts. The advisory board had its members representing internationally experienced and renowned senior experts in research as well as in science policy matters. The advisory board was particularly involved at the milestones. Its tasks consisted in the following functions:

- Assessing the scientific quality and especially practical relevance of the work
- Advising the Steering Committee and the Coordinator on issues relating to the progression of the research activities
- Advicing and supporting in terms of external communications and dissemination
- If needed, in discussing strategies and contingency plans in case of obstacles or delays to the envisioned implementation of the project.

The Advisory board included the following experts:

- **Martin Hynes**, BE, MBA, C.Eng., F.I.E.I., Chief Executive of the European Science Foundation
- **Markku Mattila**, DScTech, Professor, is Research Director at University of Helsinki, Network for Higher Education and Innovation Research-HEGOM
- **Eleonore Pauwels**, Public Policy Scholar at the (U.S.) Woodrow Wilson International Center. Eleonore, unfortunately, took part only in the first consortium meeting and was practically unavailable for the rest of the project due to her new commitments.
- **Simon Burall**, Director of Involve. As Simo was busy with some of his domestic projects, he was practically substituted by **Edward Andersson** from Involve UK. Both Simon and Edward, however, followed the project and contributed to it. Edward, in particular, adopted a highly active role in contributing e.g. in the Final policy conference as a subcontracted moderator.
- **Suzanne de Cheveigné**, senior researcher (directrice de recherche) with the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and director of Centre Norbert Elias in Marseilles, France

List of documents concerning SAB work:

- Notes of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board 7.3.2014
- Advisory group meeting – PE2020 – March 7, 2014, notes from Suzanne de Cheveigné
- Some general points of view and some successions for the Project leaders By the Scientific Advisory Board 17.3.2014
- Useful information to PE2020 from SAB 17.2.2015
- Letter to SAB members from coordinator 21.8.2015

- SAB meeting memo 2. – 3.11.2015

4.1. Memoranda

4.1.1. Notes of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board 7.3.2014

Notes of the Meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board 7.3.2014

Present Markku Mattila
 Suzanne de Cheveigne
 Martin Hynes
 Simon Burall (via Skype)

Important how the institution work, what kind of things do they recognize => PE differs depending on the institution

Purpose should be kept in mind and not only go to methods

Project definitions necessary, currently broad, need to formulate more focused aims, objectives and target groups

Who are the results directed at? policy makers? Practitioners? => essential to outcome

Collaboration with Engage2020, support important, work as close as possible to benefit from their efforts

Pilots are a key question, contact commission, organized together with existing European programs, which already have some experience, in order to give them benefit by offering new insights or methods, the work would be done by them

Important and essential, what are the conditions for working pilots, what are the obstacles, and reasons why something does not work

Define, what will be considered as success in the PE? Something functioning? Improvement of the quality? Improvement of the impact? What?

Criteria should be defined before the selection of the pilots

Even financial markets available, audiences? Euroscience a grass root approach, disruptive technologies, elife, not the focus of the project => is there a way to bring policy makers closer to those places where people go, commercial actors?

How to use new and old media? What is their role? In creating an atmosphere of putting different questions in the air. Instrument within public debate.

What is the scientists role? They are a part of the PE arena and approach, PE should not be defined in a negative way.

Symmetry needs to be built in the project, based on and starting from the citizen side

With science museums the PE could be only one way, one interesting and new would be to bring the Policy makers into existing communications! (Not the bring public to policy makers but to treat policy makers the “hard to reach” audience)

Policy makers real influence would make this project really new and valuable

Cutting edge requirement, what is?

- media, social media will have a role in the PE processes more and more, when the project finishes, the world might be completely new

To whom do we want to disseminate results? Who are they? Which is the essential audience?

The toolkit, who is it meant to?

The critical model of the toolkit?

Interested to be involved, send questions to be covered instead of long reports of results of the WP

Mikko should circulate the summary reports of the external evaluators of the PE2020 from the commission

cutting edge: something hybrid

PE2020: policy oriented project, the toolkit addresses the policy makers

Go where the policy makers are, organize an event from 17 until 20 before they go home, after their some other meeting

End meeting in Strassbourg instead?

4.1.2. Advisory group meeting – PE2020 – March 7, 2014, notes from Suzanne de Cheveigné

Advisory group meeting – PE2020 – March 7, 2014

Suzanne de Cheveigné

These are particular points I retained from the meeting – not full minutes.

- What are the respective scopes of Engage2020 and PE2020? (I wasn't at the Engage2020 presentation)?
- Need to think who the targets of the project are: for the Commission? For academia? For project coordinators?
- "Pilot" has to be defined – but it is clear that there is no way to build them from scratch on the budget that is allocated.
- It seems to me to be very important to treat "symmetrically" the science and the citizen sides. This means having a view of public engagement initiated from producers or brokers of science information – typically Science museums or projects – but also from the side of the public – typically CSO's. So among the pilot studies, some should be cases initiated on that side.
- Link to policy world is essential. It is one thing to have them participate – and quite another to be ready to have their policy-making affected by the outcome of the public engagement exercise.
- The place of the media (old and new) needs to be thought about. Social media should be present in some – not necessarily all – pilots.
- Toolkit has to get into what really works or doesn't work (the so-called "critical approach"). Simon would have very good input on this point.

4.1.3. Some general points of view and some suggestions for the Project leaders By the Scientific Advisory Board 17.3.2014

In the discussion at the Scientific Advisory Board some ideas came up to be used as suggestions for some indicators that would suggest that the choices made were successful:

- that policy makers are able to listen to what the public is saying and (in theory at least) impact on policy
- that we are genuinely getting to the public (or at least some publics)
- we are dealing with an innovation where there is considerable uncertainty about the right direction to take, where there are significant moral, ethical, economic and social questions arising
- that we are attempting more than a one off engagement (often actually just information extraction) and aiming for something more persistent that is really about wider governance than it is about a specific policy decision at a particular policy moment.
- that we are testing not just the method, but the factors that make the method successful.

In terms of scientific/ technological issue some board members expressed to be relatively ambivalent as long as the bullet 3 is taken into account.

The SAB members were particularly taken by the idea of the science museums and centres and flipping the idea of the hard to reach on its head to see if its possible to pilot different ways to get policy makers into spaces where the public (or at least some publics) already go. This is in contrast to the usual way of doing things which is to try to get the public to go to places where policy makers want to be.

4.1.4. Useful information to PE2020 from SAB 17.2.2015

17.2.2015

2050 Pathways Calculator

One of the most influential books for policy makers addressing energy questions has been Professor David Mac Kay's book and associated web-site "Sustainable Energy Without the Hot Air" <http://www.withouthotair.com/endorsements.html>

As a result of his publication and other communications efforts, David was requested to join the Department of Energy and Climate Change as Chief Scientific Advisor. Whilst there he developed a communications tool referred to as the **Pathways Calculator**: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2011/dec/28/uk-switch-low-carbon-energy>

From <https://www.gov.uk/2050-pathways-analysis#the-2050-challenge>

This is particularly interesting for inclusion because:

1. It is further West than some of the other examples!
2. It is relatively mature and probably amenable to impact measurement.
3. There is a conscious effort to promote its use in different regions and cultures.

Regarding this last:

"It has also been translated by volunteers into Japanese, German, Spanish, Hungarian, Polish and French. An Australian "translation" also exists, which sets the energy questions in a specifically Australian context." :-)

Synopsis from site: <https://www.gov.uk/2050-pathways-analysis>

The Pathways Calculator is available in three versions to allow a range of audiences to explore the fundamental question of how the UK can best meet energy needs while reducing emissions:

- the user-friendly [web-tool version](#) of the Calculator for a detailed look at the issue
- the [simplified My2050 simulation](#) for those who want an overview (please see [the My2050 Schools Toolkit](#) for ideas of how to use this in the classroom)
- the [full Excel version](#) of the Calculator for experts who want to look at the underpinning model.

DECC is [now working with teams around the world](#) to help them develop their own calculators, and is [also building a Global Calculator](#) to look at ways to reduce emissions worldwide.

If you have any questions, [please contact DECC's 2050 Team](#).

Direct web tool link:

http://2050-calculator-tool.decc.gov.uk/pathways/primary_energy_chart

Challenge and further debates: <https://www.gov.uk/2050-pathways-analysis#the-2050-challenge>

The Science Gallery, Trinity College Dublin

The Science Gallery at TCD was conceived during a phase of rapid development of a new nano-sciences research facility as a focal point during renewal of the research capacity in Dublin city centre.

There were many concerns that there was insufficient engagement with the public in the region, and a critical lack of a national centre for the public appreciation of science such as might have been filled by a national science museum. Several efforts were made to fund such a national museum, all ending in failure to demonstrate a sustainable funding model.

The traditional and historical aspects of research in Ireland were addressed to some extent by smaller facilities such as the Birr Castle Science Centre http://www.birrcastle.com/things-to-do-in-offaly/Science-Centre/info_11.html and other centres with a regional focus or focus on historical figures or resources.

The Science Gallery built upon experience gained with the failed Media Lab Europe venture and set out to interactively engage a younger participant demographic right in the city centre: <https://dublin.sciencegallery.com/this-is-science-gallery>

This example is interesting because:

1. It is perceived locally as being engaging and successful.
2. Exhibits characteristics of what we identified as “Dynamic Governance”
3. Being established 7 years ago, there is a track record and data on engagement.
4. There is an implementation under way with the support of Google¹ to internationalize the concept and it is already implemented at Kings College, London. <http://www.international.sciencegallery.com/thenetwork>

REISEARCH: Research Excellence Innovation Network

The network of newspapers, strong universities and international policy makers that is Atomium Culture has been working for some time to devise a new social platform involving key stakeholders.

Their REISEARCH initiative was presented at the 2012 EISRI Summit in Dublin during the Irish Presidency of the Council of the EU.

A new line under budget Title 09: Communications Networks, Content and Technology was established to fund a Pilot project:

“The proposed pilot suggests a valuable and important objective, to support clustering between researchers and communication between researchers, citizens, industry and policy makers, on the topics of Societal Challenges.[...] The pilot should highlight the proposed new dimensions: active interaction between science, citizens and policymakers through involvement of European media and social media, in order to support participation of citizens in research agenda setting, on-going research processes, as well as in discussions on the results and impacts of research for society, policy and further research.”

¹ **The Global Science Gallery Network**

In 2012, Science Gallery International received a gift of €1m from Google.org to launch the Global Science Gallery Network - a network of eight Science Gallery locations to be developed in partnership with leading universities in urban centres worldwide by 2020. To realise this ambition, [Science Gallery International](#) (SGI), a charitable organisation, is driving the development with limited seed funding.

Probably not a Pilot because:

Whilst this initiative has intriguing characteristics and the strong support of key players, the pace of implementation has been so slow as to be of serious concern. Pilots have been already trialed in the academic community with the support of Orange Laboratories (Poland): it is believed that there is little data to enable evaluation and views to be taken on efficacy at that early stage of implementation.

1. Extract from documentation: Citizen-centred Approaches

Digital sharing cultures are blossoming. More and more governments and administration departments are following the call by the open government data (OGD) movement, including the Obama administration. «We will work together to establish a system of transparency, public participation and collaboration». This movement invites civil society to participate actively in governance by analyzing and sharing data and opinions.

Although initial results and experiences have proven very positive in some areas (like the Obama administration's Innovation for Disaster Response and Recovery Initiative) there are some important underlying issues to respond to if crowd sourcing governance is to develop into a common practice:

What information/evidence base does the citizen have access to? - How can one define the value of different inputs based on expertise of contributor? - What is the role of the media? - How to relate to the participatory divide that may arise?

REsearch will build a reliable and authoritative space for the development citizen engagement in research and innovation in a responsible and realistic manner.

<http://atomiumculture.eu/content/research-research-excellence-innovation-network>

Observations on the Aarhus Workshop generally:

I found the overall discussion to be extremely interesting and found that it greatly assisted gaining focus on the objectives of the project.

The methodology in use was not unlike that deployed for the ESF Exploratory Workshops: <http://www.esf.org/coordinating-research/exploratory-workshops.html>

In my view it would have been of great benefit to engage with a more diverse group of scientific collaborators familiar with trends in new media and social engagement. If a plenary workshop is not practicable, perhaps one could arrange one-to-one interviews?

Examples of scientists that I can recommend would include:

Professor Dirk Helbing from ETH Zurich.

<http://www.scoop.it/t/futurict-journal-publications/?tag=Dirk+Helbing>

Dr. John Breslin: <http://www.nuigalway.ie/our-research/people/engineering-and-informatics/johnbreslin/>

John also is a founder of Boards.ie: <http://www.siliconrepublic.com/innovation/item/9856-now-hes-talkin-john/>

At the more experimental level, the Directors of Mendeley prior to acquisition by Elsevier have very recent and direct experience: e.g **Dr. Victor Henning**
<http://www.mendeley.com/profiles/victor-henning>

or one of their former technical colleagues who is now very much engaged with the Open Science initiative e-LIFE **Dr Ian Mulvany**: <http://submit.elifesciences.org/>

4.1.5. Letter to SAB members from coordinator 21.8.2015

21 August, 2015

Dear member of the PE2020 Scientific Advisory Board,

I hope you are all well and enjoying the summer season! In Finland we normally spend our summer vacancies in July, and so we did it also this year when the weather was cool; not after returning to office, August has started a warmer season, and we also have some hot news from the PE2020 project.

Overall, the project is running well, and in the link below you will find the published version of the **D 1.2, Catalogue of Innovative PE processes** (<http://pe2020.eu/results/>). I hope that it will be interesting reading to you, and useful to your organizations. We have continued to analyze these cases in WP 2. At the same time we have started to run six public engagement pilots under WP 3 activities, three in Italy, and three in Finland, most of them with an international dimension. In our blog you can read about our collaborations, for example the pilot with JPI More Years Better Lives resulted in a seminar on public engagement dimensions of the JPIs in June 2015 at the premises of EC DG for Research and Innovation in Brussels, and a public engagement workshop with an international group of BONUS early career scientists was organized in Riga, also in June 2015.

You will be hear more about our activities in the **next consortium meeting in Vilnius, in November 2-3, 2015**, where we warmly welcome you all! Please save those days at your calendar.

The next consortium meeting will be organized with a slightly changed group or partners. After negotiations between the University of Aarhus and other partners, the Consortium decided to accept the withdrawal of Aarhus from the consortium. We had an issue about authorship policy, where we couldn't find a common understanding, and we decided to make this radical solution to ensure that we can turn our attention to more substantial matters and return to the positive working mode that we enjoyed before these issues emerged in our radar. While this is a most unfortunate news, we are convinced that the remaining group of partners will be capable of conducting the project successfully to its end. – And most positively, a new partner organization will join us later this year, since University of Lapland will become a new partner in our consortium, as Professor Timo Aarrevaara has moved there from University of Helsinki.

Before making our decision about the University of Aarhus, I was in contact with the chair of SAB, Markku Mattila, who recommended to consult Martin Hynes about this issue, since ESF had been doing some work related to authorship issues. Martin's insights were very useful, but there was not finally much to do about this case, since Niels's position was carved in stone.

Despite these dramatic news, I am happy about the consortium that now can re-enter a more positive mode of collaboration.

– Please do not hesitate to contact me in any questions or issues about the PE2020.

looking forward to seeing you in Vilnius, and happy summer to you all!
best wishes,

Mikko

4.1.6. SAB meeting memo 2. – 3.11.2015

PE2020 Consortium meeting; Vilnius, Lithuania 2nd & 3rd November 2015.

The meeting was Chaired by Dr. Mikko Rask and attended by all of the partner organisations listed at: <http://pe2020.eu/contact/>

In addition, Dr. Loreta Tauginiene supported the engagement by the International Business School at Vilnius University, Lithuania and facilitated the hosting of the meeting. The agenda for the meeting is attached.

Regrettably, only one member of the SAB had the possibility to attend in person. It was therefore agreed that he would record his personal impressions of the meeting and pass to the Chair and **other Members** for consideration and additional observations.

- Following engagement over the two days, it is clear that the project has taken on additional maturity and focus at this half-way point. The individual elements of delivery, the associated responsibility and the scope of work to be completed are now clearly elaborated.
- The report on the policy conference was clearly presented and discussed. It was agreed that it would be useful to give details (characteristics?) of those participating, whilst recognising the need to respect personal data.
- The first periodic report is taking good shape. It needs only moderate work to include considerations discussed at the meeting to be ready for submission.
- The Analysis of 38 innovative PE Cases (D2.2) and the Conceptual Models of Public Engagement (D2.3) gave rise to real hope of identifying design parameters of what might constitute success in analogous cases. It leads to the possibility of classification and focus on critical success factors in an effort to determine causality.
- Regarding the proposed Web Tool, the example of the tool utilised by ENGAGE 2020 appeared (to the author) to be of only limited utility as a means of supporting decision-making in relation to engagement instruments or approaches. The presentation by Dr. Luciano d'Andrea gave rise to a fruitful discussion on possible models and held out possibilities of new approaches.
- The SAB applauds the improved engagement with the Commission Project Officer, but notes that, since the responsible person has changed, it will now be essential to discuss with the new contact (Mr. Giuseppe Borsalino) at the earliest possible time. It is noted that the project contract (incorporating modifications to the consortium) has not yet been formally signed and accepted; the issue appears to be access to authorisation by the institutional LEAR at the University of Helsinki. Clearly, it is of concern that the contractual formalities have not been completed at this mid-point of the project. <Noted that this has since been successfully concluded>.
- Whilst individual work packages and the project milestones have been elaborated, it would be very useful to encapsulate all of the main deliverables and milestones into a single, dynamic, project plan. This would facilitate the forward planning of the project, especially as viewed by parties not engaged on a day-to-day basis.

- WP4 presented milestones and deliverables, but a similar plan is needed for WP3 and for every pilot project in it. A project plan with timetable should be done for all Work Packages and projects within each one.
- It was noted that a major event was planned in collaboration with the CASI2020 project (<http://www.casi2020.eu>) and that this would be a significant deliverable. It is planned to establish a formal organising committee so that “share of voice” can be established during the conceptual development and implementation; the organisers are encouraged to proceed with this formalisation as soon as can be agreed.