



Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020

Summary report on European PE innovations, D.1.4

Authors

Niels Mejlgaard

Tine Ravn

Mikko Rask

Saulė Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė

Loreta Tauginienė

Contributors

Timo Aarrevaara

Luciano d'Andrea

Ian Dobson

Fabio Feudo

Sigurd Anders Gylstorff

Per Stig Lauridsen

Kaisa Matschoss

Maria Pietilä

Janne Wikström

June 2015

This report is available for download at www.PE2020.eu

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
 AARHUS UNIVERSITET	UA	University of Aarhus, Denmark
 IBS	VU IBS	Vilnius University International Business School, Lithuania
 LSC	LSC	Laboratorio di Scienze della Cittadinanza, Italy

Contact information: Niels Mejlgaard, AU, nm@ps.au.dk

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

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 author/s 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.

Contents

1	Exploring public engagement innovations in Europe and beyond.....	5
2	Synthesis of activities in WP1 – inventory, catalogue, and workshop.....	6
2.1	Main tasks and their interrelatedness.....	6
2.2	Presentation of main findings	7
2.2.1	Inventory of PE mechanisms and initiatives.....	7
2.2.2	Categorization of PE mechanisms/initiatives - towards a typology of PE.....	7
2.2.3	PE dedicated session on PE at the PCST 2014 conference.....	9
2.2.4	Catalogue of public engagement innovations.....	9
3	Implications for ensuing work in PE2020	12
4	References	14
5	Appendixes	16
5.1	Appendix a: Inventory of PE mechanisms and initiatives. D.1.1	16
5.2	Appendix b: Catalogue of public engagement innovations D.1.2	17
5.3	Appendix c: Presentations at an international workshop, D.1.3.....	18
5.4	Appendix d: Cover letter and questionnaire for exploring PE innovations.....	19

1 Exploring public engagement innovations in Europe and beyond

The report at hand distils the main results of the tasks and sub-tasks encompassed in the first work package within the scope of the PE2020 project. One main objective with this work package has been to explore the landscape of current and prospective public engagement innovations in Europe and beyond as a means towards reaching the broader PE2020 goal of identifying, analysing and refining innovative public engagement innovations for dynamic governance in the field of Science in Society. Two main work package outputs include an up-to-date inventory of 250 prospective European public engagement innovations that encompasses 76 mechanisms and 250 initiatives, and a catalogue of 38 innovative cases that sets out to explore some of these innovative and cutting edge practices in depth and across different engagement categories and objectives to explore the breath of PE formats and their different relations to the Horizon 2020 societal challenges.

During the last decades, the multifaceted field of public engagement (PE) with science and technology has witnessed and responded to a greater societal and academic attention. It is increasingly acknowledged that existing and emerging societal challenges as well as scientific and technological advances call for new initiatives, platforms and opportunities for engaging the public in non-traditional ways. Ever more, new formats take into consideration elements such as early citizen involvement in research and innovation processes, mechanisms fostering deliberation and co-governance as well as other participatory and democratic practises. Accordingly, attention has been focused on the different rationales for involvement (whether these are idealistic, democratic, instrumental and normative etc.) and the benefits and possible impacts of participation have been critically reviewed in an attempt to bridge the ‘gap between theory and practise’ (Bucchi and Neresini 2007; Burchell et al. 2009; Delgado et al. 2011:826; Marris & Rose 2010).

Such transformations within the field of PE is generally described as a turn from ‘understanding’ to ‘engagement’ which includes a move from a one-way and top-down model of communication towards an increased focus on ‘new’ dialogue-based approaches that entails deliberation processes, e.g. mechanisms such as citizens juries, consensus conferences, deliberative polls, among others, taken together under the term ‘mini-publics’ (Abelson et al. 2003; Burchell et al. 2009; Goodin and Dryzek 2006; Stilgoe et al. 2014). The greater focus on the benefits of including different societal actors in research and innovation processes in non-traditional and democratic ways has consequently brought forth new endeavors of engaging the public and helped reinvigorate the field at large. New democratic innovations and PE formats for including societal stakeholders have been developed, put into practice as well as formalized in different national and institutional contexts.

Although public engagement activities have generated increased attention in general, not least with the fairly recent promotion of ‘responsible research and innovation’ (RRI) by the European Commission, which aims to “engage society more broadly in its research and innovation activities” (ec.europa.eu), there are enduring and forthcoming challenges of reinforcing inclusive and deliberative PE performances. ‘Deficit-like assumptions’ still mark dialogue (Stilgoe et al. 2014:5), in many cases, the assessments and evaluations of possible impacts remain unexplored and unaccounted for (Burchell et al. 2009; Rowe and Frewer 2005) and the prospects for developing alternative models of scientific governance in terms of ‘a culture of experimentation’ have not yet been exhausted (Irwin 2014:74). Furthermore, SIS practitioners and experts within the field point to public engagement activities as often being outdated, discouraging and performed as a ‘tick-box exercise’ rather than being an integrated part of public services (Andersson 2014:2).

The inventory, and in particular the catalogue, aim to further explore and understand innovative PE practices, and provide a platform for international inspiration and learning within a PE setting constantly in a state of flux. Taken together, the range of PE innovations explored in WP1 reflect the commitment to actively engage citizens and go beyond mere 'tokenistic' and 'downstream' exercises (Arnstein 1969; Wilsdon and Willis 2004), while they in various ways take on the challenge of reinforcing inclusive and deliberative PE performances.

2 Synthesis of activities in WP1 – inventory, catalogue, and workshop

The summary report at hand first provides a synthesis of the specific activities included in WP1 and describes their interrelatedness in terms of objectives and progression. Subsequently, the main results regarding the inventory (task 1.1), the catalogue (task 1.2) and the international workshop (task 1.3) are presented and followed by reflections on their implications for ensuing work. Finally, the main outputs from each of these tasks are referred to in the appendix and links to the reports are provided.

2.1 Main tasks and their interrelatedness

Work package 1 of the PE2020 project is divided into four main tasks. First, it designs and implements a collection of existing examples of public engagement activities in Europe and beyond, classifies these, and present the inventory as the first deliverable. Second, it selects 38 innovative cases from the inventory for further analyses, collects detailed data on these cases by means of survey methodology, and presents the case descriptions in a catalogue of innovative PE activities as the second deliverable. Third, it shares the results of the empirical investigations with a forum of international colleagues in order to discuss and enrich the work. And it finally distils the main results of WP1 in the summary report at hand.

More specifically, the main objective of the first task in WP1 is twofold; to 1) construct a systematically ordered inventory of public engagement innovations in Europe and beyond and 2) to crystallize an analytical approach that is able to capture variation in PE objectives and formats as well as their particular degrees of orientation towards the societal challenges identified in Horizon 2020, and that in turn will involve categorisation and classification of PE activities across Europe.

Furthermore, the inventory and the amount of empirical material it comprises, have informed the construction of a pre-categorisation model that serves as a heuristic for organising data while (partly) capturing the complexity of the field (See section 2.2.2). The inventory as well as subsequent work in WP1 have provided a platform for further conceptualisation as envisaged in WP2.

Whereas task 1.1 remains broad in scope, task 1.2 logically progress by identifying a number of initiatives for in-depth exploration in terms of innovative characteristics, orientation towards societal challenges, advantages and obstacles etc. Task 1.2 clearly interlink with the PE2020 project at large as the catalogue also serves as a foundation for further conceptual analysis in terms of PE performances as well as for the pilot selection and toolkit construction in subsequent work packages.

The inventory and the preliminary PE typology/classification were discussed at a dedicated session at the PCST 2014 conference. Fulfilling the aim of task 1.3 to invite feedback on the status and progression of the research process, the workshop provided a forum for discussing the progress of the project in general and the developments and research strategy of WP1 specifically.

2.2 Presentation of main findings

The following section delineates the main findings from deliverable D.1.1, D.1.2 and D.1.3, including key methodological specifications.

2.2.1 Inventory of PE mechanisms and initiatives

The inventory functions as an independent output that illustrates the scope and heterogeneity of both national and cross-national PE activities that have been and are taking place across Europe and further afield. It goes without saying that even though 250 PE initiatives should allow users of the inventory to get a good sense of the field, the inventory is, in other words, still only a sample of a (growing) universe of PE initiatives worldwide.

The construction of the inventory has relied on a multilevel approach that has been applied in the data collection process; a desk research including a literature review have been performed, survey results have been applied as well as innovative PE mechanisms and initiatives in Europe and further afield have been identified with the assistance of the international members of the advisory panel and PE2020 coordinators. In this regard, the 37 national country reports emerging from the 'Monitoring Policy and Research Activities on Science in Society in Europe' (MASIS) project (2010-12) have constituted the main empirical starting point for data collection (see Ravn, Mejlgaard and Rask 2014 for data collection specifications).

The up-to-date inventory of current and prospective European public engagement innovations encompasses 76 mechanisms and 250 initiatives. The inventory is presented under the five headlines specified in the section below; public communication, public activism, public consultation, public deliberation and public participation. The inventory furthermore applies a simple, dual classification scheme. First, it distinguishes between PE mechanisms (which are generic ways of enacting public engagement) and PE initiatives (which are the concrete examples of specific engagement activities), (Ravn, Mejlgaard and Rask 2014 - see appendix a).

2.2.2 Categorization of PE mechanisms/initiatives - towards a typology of PE

The mechanisms and initiatives encompassed in the inventory are structured according to five main categories that serve as a heuristic to classify PE mechanisms and initiatives by 1) their aim / objective and 2) the direction of the flow of information. These five categories (see table 1) have been constructed and refined through a stepwise and iterative coding process informed by dominating conceptual models for categorizing PE activities, as well as they are empirically driven and funded by the inventorying of 250 specific engagement initiatives across Europe and beyond (see appendix a for a specified description of the pre-categorization model).

Table 1. Categorization of PE mechanisms/initiatives

Public communication – *the aim is to inform and/or educate citizens.* The flow of information constitutes one-way communication from sponsors to public representatives, and no specific mechanisms exist to handle public feedback (examples include public hearings, public meetings and awareness raising activities).

Public activism – *the aim is to inform decision-makers and create awareness in order to influence decision-making processes.* The information flow is conveyed in one-way communication from citizens to sponsors but not on the initiative of the sponsors as characterizes the ‘public consultation’ category (examples include demonstrations and protests).

Public consultation – *the aim is to inform decision-makers of public opinions on certain topics.* These opinions are sought from the sponsors of the PE initiative and no prescribed dialogue is implemented. Thus, in this case, the one-way communication is conveyed from citizens to sponsors (examples include citizens’ panels, planning for real and focus groups).

Public deliberation – *the aim is to facilitate group deliberation on policy issues of where the outcome may impact decision-making.* Information is exchanged between sponsors and public representatives and a certain degree of dialogue is facilitated. The flow of information constitutes two-way communication (examples include ‘mini publics’ such as consensus conferences, citizen juries, deliberative opinion polling).

Public participation – *the aim is to assign partly or full decision-making-power to citizens on policy issues.* Information is exchanged between sponsors and public representatives and a certain degree of dialogue is facilitated. The flow of information constitutes two-way communication (examples include co-governance and direct democracy mechanisms such as participatory budgeting, youth councils and binding referendums)

This basic classification scheme primarily functions as a means for arranging the empirical cases in an accessible and informative way, and it is meant to reduce complexity in a highly complex database. Clearly such classificatory schemes also involve a certain degree of violation of the subtler nuances of the individual cases. Attempts to validate the classification scheme by multiple coding procedures within the PE consortium have revealed considerable interpretative variation and have highlighted the difficulties in applying even simple categorisation of PE initiatives (see methodological specifications in report 2.1, Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė et al. 2014). Still, as the objective of these categories is to organize and survey a large amount of data, the categories need to be able to allow for a comparison of similarities and differences among PE mechanisms but at the same time also be inclusive enough to encompass hybrid forms of PE innovations. To serve these purposes, the classification scheme is considered to be a useful platform for (partly) capturing the variation and level of complexity characterising this multifaceted field of public engagement.

The discussion with participants at the PCST workshop (see appendix c) included a discussion on the development of the catalogue of innovative PE initiatives. It was brought forward that the major challenge with regard to developing a user-friendly catalogue of PE initiatives was to ensure an intuitively comprehensible and transparent way of organising the contents. The typology of PE was in general considered an adequate and useful classificatory scheme.

2.2.3 PE dedicated session on PE at the PCST 2014 conference

The discussion with participants at the workshop revolved around two overall issues, namely the development of the catalogue of innovative PE initiatives as touched upon in the previous section, and the notion of 'innovativeness' itself in the context of public engagement with science and technology. Regarding the latter discussion, two main issues were highlighted which can be summarized as following:

- Participants raised the point that innovativeness in PE might require flexibility as a precondition for transferability. In PE, **one size does not fit all**, and fixed formats often suffer from a lack of sensitivity towards the context in which they are installed. PE mechanisms should maintain a degree of flexibility, or even fragility, in order to remain dynamic and allow for adaptation to the particular context in which they are applied.
- Issues related to hybridization were discussed extensively by the participants at the workshop. One point related to PE mechanisms and stressed the importance of achieving continuous progression in the formats for PE by combining elements from different PE mechanisms. This discussion echoed previous collective reflections in the PE2020 consortium that have tended to emphasize **hybridization as a significant component of innovation in PE**. The deliberate mixing of various formats in order to tailor PE activities to the specific demands and expectations in a given contexts was considered an important point of attention for the development of a concept of innovativeness in PE.

The discussions offered valuable lessons for WP1 and for the PE2020 project at large. The workshop provided new insights about the multiple dimensions of innovativeness in PE. In addition to general conceptual discussions on these dimensions, the workshop resulted in a new case study (Soap box science) that was later included in the catalogue of innovative PE cases in the PE2020 project.

2.2.4 Catalogue of public engagement innovations

The catalogue (D.1.2) sets out to explore some of the innovative and cutting edge practices identified in the inventory in depth and across different engagement categories and objectives to explore the breath of PE formats and their different relations to the Horizon 2020 societal challenges. The main purpose of the catalogue is to further explore and understand innovative PE practices, and provide a platform for international inspiration and learning within a PE setting constantly in a state of flux. The intention is that the catalogue of 38 case descriptions collectively will provide a rich picture of innovative mechanisms and initiatives in Europe and beyond (see appendix b).

The catalogue presents detailed case descriptions and reflections provided by individual case coordinators with particular expertise with the initiative in question. The approach of including expert descriptions allows for in-depth and first-hand reflections, experiences and information at a level of detail, which would have been difficult to access otherwise.

Each coordinator have completed an open-ended survey exploring key features of the initiative, including the innovative dimensions of the particular PE case; outcomes and impacts; case relations to policy decision-making processes; the advantages and challenges associated with the case and according to the Horizon 2020 societal challenges (the questionnaire and cover letter are included in appendix d). The common survey structure allows for horizontal comparisons of PE innovations while the open and

qualitative approach simultaneously enables a more inductive and nuanced examination of the concept and features of innovative practices.

2.2.4.1 Strategy for selecting innovative PE cases and administration of survey

As a basis for selecting the case studies included in the catalogue, a nomination procedure was implemented, that included the full consortium and the international advisory board (10 nominators in total). Each nominator was invited to select and rank 10 innovative initiatives each using a specific tailored template. Nominations were to take into account six sets of criteria of innovativeness delineated below, and nominators were requested to qualify each nominated initiative by providing a reflection on the initiative on the backdrop of the selection criteria. If supplementary criteria were used for nomination, each nominator was kindly asked to state these as well.

The following six pre-constructed criteria of innovativeness were applied for process and case qualification:

Hybrid combinations:

- Does the initiative combine mechanisms in new ways?
- Does the initiative include new hybrid ways and arenas for bringing policy makers into discussions between researchers (science) and the public (society)?

Methodological novelty:

- Have new dialogue-based approaches to engagement been applied? (Is deliberation possible among participants and/or between participants and decision-makers?)
- What is the extent of participant empowerment and governance contribution? – What are citizens' opportunities to set the agenda and articulate preferences, for being informed, taking part in conflict resolution or knowledge co-production and for influencing final decisions? (Smith 2005:7; Participedia.net)

Inclusive new ways of representation

- Is the initiative (and the mechanisms applied) inclusive in terms of selection methods? (Open to all or is the selection characterized by election, random selection, self-selection or appointment? (Smith 2005:7))
- Have new combinations of actors been introduced in the PE initiative?

Potential impact:

- To what extent can the initiative potentially bring about change? – According to the objectives stated and/or according to unintended impacts?
- Does the initiative seem potentially influential on political decision-making processes?
- Does the initiative seem potentially influential on political, media or learning outcomes?

- To what extent does the initiative seem to impact on public debate? (Beetham 2012:59)
- To what extent does the initiative seem to have an impact on the participants? (Beetham 2012:59).

Bearing on societal challenges:

- To what extent is the initiative oriented towards the societal challenges specified under Horizon 2020?

Societal challenges: 1) Health, demographic change and wellbeing 2) Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the Bioeconomy 3) Secure, clean and efficient energy 4) Smart, green and integrated transport 5) Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials 6) Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies 7) Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens (ec.europa.eu).

Feasibility:

- To what extent can the initiative be effectively transferred to other (national) contexts and pilot tested within limited amounts of resources (financial, administrative etc.)?

The PE2020 project is specifically tailored to explore PE in the context of Horizon 2020, and it is furthermore an objective to pilot a number of PE initiatives. The last two sets of criteria reflect these internal considerations. The criteria put forth are based on prior theoretical and empirical knowledge of the field, and in agreement with the explorative approach, they remain fairly open, inclusive and broad in order to reach a more comprehensive assessment of innovativeness and to deepen and complement our evolving understanding of the notion of innovativeness in public engagement.

On the basis of the nomination process, a total of 62 nominations were obtained. Subsequently, case coordinators were identified as informants for the survey. Based on a common contact-protocol, each consortium partner personally contacted a number of case coordinators with information on the project and the objectives of the survey. Upon these personal contacts between the consortium partners and the informants, 56 questionnaires were dispatched in three instances. Following a procedure of reminders and follow-up contacts with targeted informants, a total of 38 case descriptions have been collected.

2.2.4.2 Catalogue design

The catalogue is designed as an interactive pdf file, for which the main PE features function as search categories allowing for easy navigation among similar initiatives, mechanisms, geographical scales, target groups, among others. Moreover, each case provides additional references to similar initiatives, many of which can to be found in the main inventory (D.1.1) for further inspiration. In addition to specific background information, each case is classified according to the following main categories:

PE category: Public communication, Public activism, Public consultation, Public deliberation, public participation

Mechanism: Generic ways of enacting public engagement, e.g. consensus conference, participatory budgeting etc.

Main purpose of initiative: Awareness raising, education and capacity building, protest, community building, consultation, dialogue/deliberation, knowledge co-production; co-governance

Geographical scale: Global, European, National, Regional, Local/urban, and institutional

Organizing entity: National governmental body, local governmental body, academic institution, NGO, community based organisation, non-profit organisation, science museum/centre, industry and business

Target groups: Lay publics, researchers, stakeholder organisations/groups, experts, public officials

H2020 Societal Grand Challenge(s): Health, demographic change and wellbeing; Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the Bioeconomy; Secure, clean and efficient energy; Smart, green and integrated transport; Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials; Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies; Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens

It has been stressed that ‘innovations are more than ideas and theories; they are ideas in action’ and that ‘good innovations depend on ideas that can be implemented successfully’ (Newton 2012:5). The initiatives included in the catalogue cover a wide field; from small scale experiments to large scale innovations, from local settings to transnational co-operations, from grass-root activities to national institutionalized mechanisms and from awareness raising activities to direct power sharing exercises, among others. Common to all of them is their successful implementation and achievements of objectives and actions stated.

3 Implications for ensuing work in PE2020

The PE2020 project has two primary objectives. Firstly, to create new knowledge of the status quo and trends in the field of public engagement in science, and secondly, to refine innovative PE tools and instruments and propose new ones to be used in Horizon 2020 and other research policy activities. It is also the purpose of this project to communicate the results and insights from the PE2020 project to academic and broader communities, and to interact with science policy actors and societal stakeholders involved with research and innovation processes. The results of WP1 provide an extensive collection of cases of innovative PE practices that will be further analysed and utilized in the next stages of the PE2020 project.

A content analysis of the innovative PE practices (or “mechanisms” and “initiatives”) will be carried out in WP2. This will take place in two parallel streams: one will focus on qualitative content analysis whereas the other one will analyse the cases quantitatively. The focus of analysis is to understand the commonalities and particularities of innovative PE practice. There are at least five questions of particular interest in such

analysis: 1) What makes public engagement successful and what are the benefits resulting from such activities? 2) How should public engagement processes be organized to make them successful? 3) What are the dimensions of innovativeness among the selected PE practices? 4) Are there some common obstacles for effective implementation of PE in the studied contexts of RDI policy? 5) How have these different contexts influenced the organization and outcomes of the selected PE practices?

The case studies gathered in WP1 will be informative material for exploring these questions. We appreciate the opportunity to get access to such 'first hand' experiences, generously provided to us by 38 PE project coordinators. Having access to these reports is a unique opportunity to understand cutting edge and innovative PE practices in Europe and beyond. At the same time, however, we acknowledge that there are some limitations in this type of data. In particular since the case studies are not based on external research but on internal evaluations, to acquire a more balanced view of the pros and cons of different types of PE practices, additional analysis and information are required (such methodological considerations will be discussed in D2.2 and D2.3). A particular outcome of the analysis of the PE cases under WP2 is to develop a conceptual model that assist with drawing generalizable lessons of successful PE practices, while estimating different contextual factors that either support, resists, or perhaps just complicate the good intentions to develop more inclusive cultures of RDI governance. It is presumed that a systematic analysis of cases will enable possible redefinitions on innovativeness of PE and strengthen the groundwork for the development of such a critical and high-quality conceptual model of dynamic governance.

The very preliminary reflections from the analysis of cases suggest the domination of an open innovation approach that stresses the importance of openness and dynamics. It is commonly acknowledged that innovativeness is a prerequisite for enhancing competitiveness, and the demand for innovativeness is likewise crucial for R&D projects and programmes. In this regard, preliminary findings indicate that the innovation environment for PE plays a major role in enhancing and understanding innovativeness in the context of PE.

The catalogue of innovative PE cases (D1.2) has also provided the basis for selecting six PE pilot initiatives that will be organized and evaluated under WP3. Interaction with the target research programmes where the pilots will be carried out (e.g. the Baltic Sea Research Programme BONUS) has indicated that there are no straightforward ways of transferring PE practices from one context to another. This was partly anticipated in the design of the PE2020 project, by including 'context tailoring workshops' in WP3. For instance, large scale research programmes that we have contacted have their own long-term plans and visions of appropriate ways to exercise 'science in society interaction'. While most programmes have been progressive in actively developing new engagement practices, we have learned that the first step in building collaborations is to try to carefully understand what is already taking place, and then discuss alternative ways of organizing public engagement. Feasibility and flexibility have proven to be important criteria that help transferring and adopting PE processes to new contexts.

The catalogue of innovative PE practices (D1.2), in addition to providing the basis of selecting the pilot PE cases, has proven especially valuable in three ways. First, the cases provide illustration, examples, and inspiration for programme coordinators who either hesitate in starting to invest in more inclusive governance practices or who are convinced that it should be done, but lack examples of how to do it practically. Secondly, knowledge of the experience (of success and failure) from these cases has helped refine or 'context tailoring' the pilot PE initiatives – hopefully towards more successful activities than would have otherwise been possible. Finally, collaborating with pilot PE processes has helped to recognize that

the study of contextual factors is challenging. Research programmes are in many ways rooted in their local and international contexts, in ways far more complex than what can be accounted in the relatively short (c. 5-10 pages) case descriptions in D1.2. The point is that the study of the six pilots will be highly complementary and contributing to an analysis of context bound factors explaining the success of PE practices.

Finally, WP1 will be an important element in the building of a toolkit that helps RDI policy designers to identify and develop PE practices for their own purposes (a task for WP4). While D1.2 contains interactive links that help excavating information relevant to specific PE mechanisms and initiatives, the web tool will further develop this search function by including additional categories of searching (e.g. obstacles of PE as found in both theoretical literature and the WP1 cases).

All in all, we expect that the deliverables of WP1 are interesting reading for the community of actors who are either studying or practically developing such practices, including RDI policy makers. In particular, D1.2 is unique in its topicality and authenticity (being based on project coordinators' own accounts), while D1.1 will remain an 'up-to-date' document to be updated with new innovative cases encountered by the PE2020 consortium during the lifetime of this project. These cases are not purported merely as data for researchers. Therefore the deliverables of WP1 will be included among the main themes of the first PE2020 policy brief, soon published, to inform people who are interested in further developing PE processes in future Horizon 2020 and national RDI policy activities.

4 References

Abelson et al. (2003): Deliberations about deliberative methods: issues in the design and evaluation of public participation processes. *Social Science & Medicine* 57, 239–251.

Andersson et al. (2014): From Fairy Tale to Reality - Dispelling the Myths around Citizen Engagement. RSA and Involve.

Arnstein, Sherry R. A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *AIP*, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.

Beetham, David (2012). Evaluating new vs. old forms of citizen engagement and participation. In: Newton, Kenneth and Brigitte Geissel (2012): *Evaluating Democratic Innovations: Curing the Democratic Malaise?* New York: Routledge

Bucchi, Massimiano & Neresini, Frederico (2007): Science and Public Participation. In: Hackett et al. *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies* (3rd edition). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Burchell, Kevin, Sarah Franklin and Kerry Holden (2009): *Public culture as professional science: final report of the SCOPE project – Scientists on public engagement: from communication to deliberation?* September, BIOS, London School of Economics and Political Science. Available at: (<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/BIOS/scope/scope.htm>).

Delgado, Ana, Kamilla Lein Kjølberg and Fern Wickson (2011): Public engagement coming of age: From theory to practice in STS encounters with nanotechnology. *Public Understanding of Science*. 20: 826.

Goodin, Robert E. & Dryzek, John S. (2006): Deliberative Impacts: The Macro-Political Uptake of Mini-

Publics. *Politics Society* 2006, 34:219.

Irwin, Alan (2014): From deficit to democracy (re-visited). *Public Understanding of Science*, Vol. 23(1) 71–76.

Mačiukaitė-Žvinienė, Saulė et al. (2014): *A Refined Typology of PE Tools and Instruments*. D2.1. PE2020. The report can be found at: http://pe2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2014/02/D2-1-PE2020_submission-1.pdf

Marris Claire & Rose, Nikolas (2010) Open Engagement: Exploring Public Participation in the Biosciences. *PLoS Biol* 8(11).

Rowe, Gene and Frewer, Lynn J. (2005): A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms. *Science Technology Human Values* 2005 30: 251.

Smith, Graham (2005): Beyond the ballot. 57 Democratic Innovations from Around the World. The POWER Inquiry.

Stilgoe, Jack et al. (2014): Why should we promote public engagement with science? *Public Understanding of Science* 2014 23:4.

Wilsdon, James and Rebecca Willis (2004): *See-through Science Why public engagement needs to move upstream*. London: Demos.

5 Appendixes

5.1. Appendix a: Inventory of PE mechanisms and initiatives. D.1.1

Ravn, Mejlgaard & Rask 2014: *Inventory of PE mechanisms and initiatives. D.1.1*. The report can be found here: <http://pe2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2014/02/PE2020-FINAL-D.1.1-report.pdf>



5.2 Appendix b: Catalogue of public engagement innovations D.1.2

The report can be found here: <http://pe2020.eu/results/>



5.3 Appendix c: Presentations at an international workshop, D.1.3.

The report can be found here: <http://pe2020.eu/results/>



5.4 Appendix d: Cover letter and questionnaire for exploring PE innovations

Mail topic headline: Description of “[name of initiative]” for catalogue of innovative public engagement initiative

Dear X,

The consortium of the FP7 funded research project PE2020 (Public Engagement Innovations for Horizon 2020, 2014-2017) wishes to explore the “[name of initiative]” initiative as part of our research into innovativeness in public engagement activities. We have contacted you in your capacity as coordinator of/expert on this initiative to request your assistance in answering a number of questions related to this initiative (questionnaire attached).

One of the objectives of the PE2020 project is to deliver a catalogue of 50 particularly innovative and cutting edge public engagement initiatives, and it is our intention to include the “[name of initiative]” initiative in the catalogue. The completed questionnaire will provide us with a rich and detailed case description of each of the initiatives to be presented in the catalogue. The final catalogue of 50 case descriptions will offer a picture of innovative public engagement initiatives in Europe and beyond, which will form the basis for international learning. The catalogue will be publicly accessible and will be widely distributed among practitioners and researchers in the field of public engagement. Your answers to the questions will also be instrumental in advancing the work in the PE2020 project aimed at identifying, analysing and refining innovative public engagement mechanisms for dynamic governance of research and innovation.

The PE2020 consortium members are the National Consumer Research Centre, Finland (project coordinator); Aarhus University, Denmark; International Business School at Vilnius University, Lithuania; Laboratorio Di Scienze Della Cittadinanza, Italy; University of Helsinki, Finland. More information on our consortium and the PE2020 project in general can be found at: <http://pe2020.eu/>

If you have any questions or comments to the questionnaire, please contact: Niels Mejlgaard, Aarhus University, Denmark. Mail: nm@ps.au.dk

We hope that you will be able to support us by filling in the questionnaire. We realize that this will be a time demanding task, but your description of the “[name of initiative]” initiative and contribution to the final catalogue of innovative public engagement will be much appreciated. The catalogue, including your contribution, will increase the visibility of innovative public engagement activities, and will be communicated to policy planners at EU and national levels. We will also send you a print version of the catalogue immediately upon publication.

Kind regards from the PE2020 Consortium



The PE2020 Project

Year of implementation: February 2014 – January 2017

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

Project consortium:



NCRC **National Consumer Research Centre, Finland**



UH **University of Helsinki, Finland**



UA **University of Aarhus, Denmark**



VU IBS **Vilnius University International Business School,
Lithuania**



LSC **Laboratorio di Scienze della Cittadinanza, Italy**

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, National Consumer Research Centre

E-mail: mikko.rask@ncrc.fi

Project website: www.PE2020.eu



Building a catalogue of Public Engagement initiatives

This questionnaire comprises 8 questions related to the “[name of initiative]”. This initiative was nominated as a particularly interesting and innovative example of Public Engagement. Your answers to the questions will be used to develop a rich and detailed description of this particular initiative, and will also inform our research efforts related to understanding what innovativeness means in the context of public engagement activities.

Fifty specific initiatives, including the “[name of initiative]”, have been nominated for further exploration, and it is the intention that these fifty cases will be presented to the community of practitioners and scholars within public engagement in a user-friendly and easily accessible catalogue. The catalogue will provide a platform for international inspiration and learning and it will be widely circulated.

We invite you to answer the questions below as precisely and comprehensively as possible. We realize that this is a time demanding task, but it is our contention that detailed information about your experiences in the “[name of initiative]” will be of great value to colleagues in the field of public engagement.

Each question is followed by a suggestion of possible topics to be included in your answer, as well as the approximate number of words suggested for your answer. Please consider the suggestion of topics as a guideline only and respond as you see appropriate. Other topics may be more important.

Please answer the questions using the boxes below. Save the completed version of the questionnaire and send it by email to Niels Mejlgaard at nm@ps.au.dk by December 17, 2014.

General information

Please insert information regarding the initiative subsequent to each ‘topic headline’

Name of initiative:

Name of organizer:

Duration of initiative (from MM/YY to MM/YY):

Location of initiative:

Your personal contact information:

Name:

Organization:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

1. Background, organizers, and participants

What was the background for implementing the initiative and who organized and funded it? Who were the citizens and stakeholders participating in the actual engagement activities (E.g. rationale for implementing



the initiative, challenges to be addressed, opportunities and needs, who were the organisers, and who were the citizens and stakeholders taking part) – approximately 150 words

2. Objectives

What were the aims of the initiative? (E.g. awareness raising, education, consultation, dialogue/deliberation, knowledge co-production; co-governance, better policies, democratization, dealing with particular problems etc.) – approximately 150 words

3. Mechanism(s) applied

Which mechanism(s) were used for engaging the public? (E.g. concerning identification/recruitment of participants, engagement activities carried out, roles and responsibilities of organizers, facilitators, citizens, stakeholders, and other actors, the practical arrangements, resources available, challenges encountered etc.) – approximately 400 words

4. Outcomes and impact

What were the outcomes and impacts of the initiative? Was there any formal evaluation? (E.g. attainment of the objectives stated, unintended impacts, influence on political decision-making processes, influence on political, media and learning outcomes, impacts on public debate, impacts on participants, potential impacts to come etc.) – approximately 350 words

5. Advantages of the particular initiative

What were the main advantages of the initiative? (E.g. with regard to feasibility of implementing the initiative and effectively transferring it to other (national) contexts, level of inclusiveness and power-sharing, media interest in the initiative, flexibility etc.) – approximately 300 words

6. Obstacles

Did the initiative face specific obstacles? (E.g. limited mobilization of the public and stakeholders, difficulties of economic, administrative, organizational, or political kind, resistances from leaders, researchers, external actors, administrators, or any other problems? How did you manage them and the negative consequences they had?) – approximately 300 words



7. Innovative dimensions

In what ways can the initiative be described as innovative? (E.g. with regard to methodological novelty, new combinations of mechanisms, new combinations of actors, in terms of inclusiveness, impact, continuity and wide appliance, use of (social) media etc. - Please also elaborate on other innovative elements which possibly characterize the initiative) – approximately 400 words

8. Orientation towards societal challenges

Is the initiative relevant towards one or more of the societal challenges, which are currently specified under Horizon 2020, or other societal challenges? (Please provide a short description of the topics, to which the initiative relates and state which – if any – societal challenges, the initiative is relevant towards. The seven challenges in Horizon 2020 are: 1) Health, demographic change and wellbeing 2) Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the Bioeconomy 3) Secure, clean and efficient energy 4) Smart, green and integrated transport 5) Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials 6) Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies 7) Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens (ec.europa.eu).) - approximately 200 words

Additional information

Is there anything you would like to add to the description and analysis of the initiative? (If possible, please also list references, web links etc. which include additional information regarding the initiative)

Thank you very much for your significant contribution to our research and to the development of a catalogue of cutting-edge public engagement activities in Europe and beyond!

If you have any questions or comments to the questions, please contact:
Niels Mejlgaard, Aarhus University, Denmark
Mail: nm@ps.au.dk

Please submit the filled questionnaire to nm@ps.au.dk by Dec. 17, 2014.

