

ResIST Business Meeting



ResIST Stellenbosch Meeting
3-6 November 2008

Peter Healey
peter.healey@sbs.ox.ac.uk



ResIST end-game: decisions and actions in remaining main meetings

ResIST End-Game: Threads of Decision and Action in four remaining main meetings

	<i>Coimbra (04/08)</i>	<i>Rotterdam (08/08)</i>	<i>Stellenbosch (11/08)</i>	<i>Brussels (03/09)</i>
1. Second year reporting	<p>1.1 deliverables due by 15 May (1 May with Peter): #3 (WP1), #17-19 (WP3), #33 (WPO)</p> <p>1.2 other inputs to activity and management reports as last year</p> <p>1.3 Form C due <u>earlier</u> - by 15/04</p>			
2. Publication and dissemination plans	<p>2.1 converting working papers into journal articles</p> <p>2.2 other publications planned at WP level</p> <p>2.3 decision: overall synthesis volume: whether, what, who and when?</p> <p>2.4 plan other dissemination outlets: workshops, conferences, etc</p>	<p>2.5 test ideas in wider academic market and drawing conclusions</p> <p>2.6 feedback into content, scope and contributors of any synthesis volume</p>		<p>2.7 update on plans and progress at associated WP leaders' meeting</p>
3. Successor(s) to ResIST	<p>3.1 decision: overall shape - ideas, opportunities, people - of any successor(s) to ResIST and appointment of Stellenbosch working group</p>	<p>3.2 identifying potential competitors and collaborators</p>	<p>3.3 further detailed guidance in the light of emerging opportunities/ interests</p> <p>3.4 working group meets as follow-on to define proposal(s) further</p>	<p>3.5 update on plans and progress at associated WP leaders' meeting</p>
4. Role of Scenarios	<p>4.1 presentation of scenario approach</p> <p>4.2 decision: roles of scenarios in ResIST</p> <p>4.3 discussion: challenges in designing an effective engagement strategy - where are we now, where are we going?</p>		<p>4.4 a scenario exercise: more inclusive S&T policies for SA and Mozambique</p> <p>4.5 scenarios as part of a future proposal</p>	<p>4.6 synthesis of 4.4 & 4.5 as threads of presentation to decision-makers</p>
5. Final reporting	<p>5.1 decision: broad shape of final report and contributors and appointment of Stellenbosch working group</p>		<p>5.2 further detailed guidance in the light of emerging findings/narratives</p> <p>5.3 working group meets as follow-on to define report further</p>	<p>5.4 summary of emerging themes of final report forms third main thread of Brussels presentation</p>
6. Role of RAG	<p>6.1 Comments on draft deliverables (see 1.1 above) - drafts to RAG by 04/04/08 - please post on the RAG section of the Members' Area of the ResIST website by this date.</p> <p>6.2 inputs on 2, 3, 4 and 5 above</p>		<p>6.3 Comments on draft deliverables #9-16 (WP2), #20 (WP3), #22-26 & 28 (WP4) #34-36 (WPO) - to RAG by 20/10</p> <p>6.4 Inputs on 3, 4 & 5 above</p>	<p>6.5 independent presentation from RAG at Brussels meeting?</p>

ResIST end-game: remaining year 2 and year 3 deliverables

ResIST End-Game: What we promised - remaining Year 2 and Year 3 Deliverables and other expectations we raised

Deliverable	Title	Work Package	Month due
<i>Year 2 Deliverables (drafts to RAG by 04/04/08 - please post on RAG section of ResIST website; final versions to be with PH by 01/05/08)</i>			
#3	Journal Article summarising results	WP1	24 (03/08)
#17	Integrated framework for analysis of accountability systems from the point of view of their implications for redistribution and capacity building	WP3	24 (03/08) PH comment: cannot be written until after Coimbra?
#18	Case studies of innovative experiments of accountability	WP3	18 (10/07)
#19	Case studies of implications and impacts of mundane technologies	WP3	18 (10/07)
#33	First review report: interim review of agenda and results	WP0	20 (12/07)
<i>Year 3 Deliverables</i>			
#9-12	Four thematic papers drawing on national reports and empirical work in the four WP2 partner countries	WP2	28 (07/08)
#13-16	Three (four?) short policy-oriented reports	WP2	28 (07/08)
#20	Two reports for policy audiences	WP3	28 (07/08)
#22-23	Two workshops planning and integrating the case studies	WP4	28 (07/08)
#24-26	Journal article, policy paper and proposal for an edited book	WP4	34 (01/09)
#28	Paper for discussion with policy audiences through WP0	WP4	30 (09/08)
#34	Second review report: final review of results and recommendations	WP0	28 (07/08) PH comment: can be written only after other deliverables in - month 31 (10/08)?
#35-36	Two policy papers: one on main policy challenges and recommendations, one on the opportunity and challenges to develop policy tools for the assessment of the distributional of major research programmes	WP0	28 (07/08) PH comment: inputs to Brussels - month 34 (01/09)?
#37-39	Three world regional workshops (now Coimbra, Stellenbosch & Brussels plus possibly one or two further smaller meetings to be organised, with priority to the Caribbean)	WP0	Originally 30-34; now 25-36
#40	Final Report	All	Formally 36 - actually required by mid May 2009

Overall project summary objectives from the *Description of Work*:

1. To analyse the ways in which regulatory regimes, policies and practices involving S&T contribute to the reproduction of social and economic inequalities within and between European members states, and between the EU and candidate and developing countries.
2. To propose more systematic ways to assess prospective research policies, the introduction of new technologies, and new research programme proposals, so as to offer the opportunity to:
 - reframe policy and practice by acknowledging and attempting to mitigate the most negative potential distributional effects of S&T;
 - enhance social inclusion in the processes of technology design, diffusion and innovation;
 - introduce new accountability channels in scientific governance which reflect these aims.
3. To conduct the research in an interactive manner with policy and practice communities in EU, candidate and developing countries so as to distil the broadest range of experience and needs, and to secure effective social learning by researchers and policymakers, and early change.

Letter on communication from SO

⌘ Dear Peter,

⌘ As agreed a few remarks on communication / dissemination.

⌘ A significant barrier to public debate on Europe is lack of knowledge. In this respect, there is today a greater need to communicate appropriately the actions undertaken, in particular when (common) objectives are achieved.

⌘ As a response to the need of improving access to existing instruments for information-provision to citizens (in order to empower them to voice their opinions on European affairs), the Commission Services were asked to put greater emphasis on communication/dissemination policies.

⌘ Often final/intermediate (publicly accessible) reports and publications (concerning research findings) need to be more digestible.

⌘ To better reach both policy makers and the general public, members of ReSIST should insist in producing a synthesis that highlights the policy (and industrial) relevance, on one hand, and the progress in research, on the other. There is also the need to simplify the verbal communication used to convey complex concepts, else stakeholders might not see or understand the usefulness of the work done. Partners are asked to put additional efforts adopting more active modes of dissemination and more innovative tools. They should better focus on how to share messages and information with different "publics". They should also further encourage both policy briefings papers and seminars (to improve the interaction between researchers and policy makers).

⌘ New ways to reach the goal above mentioned are currently explored. Attached you find - as agreed - a template (and an example of the OECD policy brief - with which I'm sure you are familiar). I would kindly ask you to have a look at it and fill it every six months.

⌘ It aims, on one hand, to monitor the evolution of on-going projects (such as ReSIST) and, on the other, to have a synthesis "ready to use" of projects that have finished. The latter could be a useful document that could be used in appropriate settings; this not only for the European Commission to provide clear and relevant information (adapted to a national, regional and local context) and to promote active European citizenship, but also to give visibility to COUNTER as a project.

⌘ In 2009 we aim at organizing a big Forum. The "ReSIST policy brief(s)" could be, for instance, used to communicate meaningful messages to different stakeholders.

⌘ Again, please note that with this email I just wish to try and make it easier for you to compile the necessary administrative information required.

⌘ Best regards,

⌘

⌘

⌘

Luca Rizzo

Scientific Officer

European Commission, DG Research

Unit L.2 - Research in Economic, Social and Human Sciences

8, Square de Meeus (SDME 7/47)

B-1049 Brussels

⌘ Luca.Rizzo@ec.europa.eu

Tel. +32 2 298 50 67

Fax. +32 2 296 21 37

Policy brief template from SO

POLICY BRIEF

Dissemination of the results of Framework Projects is highly important in terms of ensuring that the results of project feed into the policy development process. This policy brief template is designed to enable you to provide succinct information which will be useful for policy makers in framing and developing policies at European, national regional or institutional levels as appropriate. Please present your information succinctly and in a language understandable to the non-specialist reader (*not more than 5 pages*).

- ⌘ Title of the project
- ⌘ Coordinator's name
- ⌘ and Organisation
- ⌘ Project rationale/ Research context
- ⌘ Objectives: general and specific
- ⌘ Scientific approach / methodology
- ⌘ New knowledge, new concepts and
- ⌘ European added value
- ⌘ Key policy messages and recommendations for
- ⌘ different target groups, if appropriate:
 - ⌘ * Policy makers (local, regional, national, European),
 - ⌘ * Research community
 - ⌘ * Business world
 - ⌘ * Civil society organisations
 - ⌘ * Media

(At the end of the policy brief please give):

- ⌘ **The IDENTITY OF THE PROJECT**
- ⌘ Title
- ⌘ Consortium
- ⌘ Duration
- ⌘ Budget
- ⌘ For more info about the project
- ⌘ Further reading
- ⌘ Web site

RAG Members and Roles

⌘ Members

- ☒ Ahmet Ademoğlu, Boğaziçi University and TÜBİTAK, Turkey (chair)
- ☒ Jeffrey Dellimore, Independent Development Consultant, Barbados
- ☒ Marcelo Firpo Porto, National School of Public Health, Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Fiocruz, Brazil
- ☒ Ricardo Thompson, Department of Health, Mozambique
- ☒ David Walwyn, CEO, Arvir Technologies (pty) Ltd

⌘ Roles

- ☒ Intelligence about developing policies, cases, issues in their country/region relevant to ResIST
- ☒ Put project's work in context of own policy & research needs
- ☒ Facilitate specific access to sources
- ☒ Give early feedback and orientation on draft ResIST products
- ☒ suggest future research needs in relation to S&T, inequality and development

Costs for revised WP0 meetings schedule, final year of ResIST

Costs for revised WP0 meetings schedule, years 2 & 3 of ResIST - v.4 30 November 2007

	partner 1 Oxford	partner 2 Leeds/ Liverpool	partner 3 NIFU-STEP	partner 4 UvA	partner 5 CES	partner 6 UoM	partner 7 METUTECH	partner 8 UEM	partner 9 SU	partner 10 FhG/ISI	partner 11 GTRC	total excluding GTRC
Coimbra meeting (2 nights, 3 days) April 2008												
travel for ResiST team	900	300	600	300	0			1800	1800		1400	
accommodation for ResIST	198	66	132	66	0			66	66		66	
travel for RAG/guests				6125								
accommodation for RAG/guests (2 nights)				2100								
meals for all participants				2750								
<i>total</i>	1098	366	900	11341	0			2100	2100		1466	17905
Stellenbosch (5 nights, 4 days) Nov 2008												
travel for ResiST team	3600	3600	3600	1800	5400	3600	3600	400	0	3600	2200	
accommodation for ResIST	500	500	500	250	750	500	500	750	0	500	250	
travel/transfers for RAG/guests									9124			
accommodation for RAG /guests (3 nights)									1458			
meals for all participants/conference package									4847			
<i>total</i>	4100	4100	4100	2050	6150	4100	4100	1150	15429	4100	2450	49379
Brussels (1 night, two days) March 2009												
travel for ResiST team	600	300	600	300	600			1800	1800		1400	
accommodation for ResIST	200	100	200	100	200			200	200		200	
travel for RAG/guests				6125								
meals for all participants				1500								
<i>total</i>	800	400	800	8025	800			2000	2000		1600	14825
TOTAL	5998	4866	5800	21416	6950	4100	4100	5250	19529	4100	5516	82109

ResIST Budget Summary Sept 08

ResIST Budget Summary Sept 08 (claimed expenditure only) plus distribution of 3rd payment and proposed partner budgets

Now proposed at 09/08

Partner	Original EU Budget	Year 1 claim	Year 2 claim	Total claimed yrs 1&2	Received in pre-payment and 2007	Proposed budget in revised DoW	Leaves for year 3	As percentage of highest year spend to date	Revised total budget allocation	Leaves for year 3	Proportional allocation of 3rd Commission payment
1. Oxford	389,400	126,939.90	114,002.24	240,942.14	267,488.49	367,545.97	126,603.83	99.73	367,545.97	126,603.83	31,699.38
2. Leeds/12. Liverpool	130,800	0	34,347.03	34,347.03	89,849.75	122,160.00	87,812.97	255.66	120,160.00	85,812.97	21,486.04
3. NIFU-STEP	126,500	38,016.00	12,721.50	50,737.50	86,895.98	123,811.50	73,074.00	192.22	118,811.50	68,074.00	17,044.52
4. UvA	69,900	12,797.80	12,177.19	24,974.99	48,016.04	74,655.22	49,680.23	388.19	74,655.22	49,680.23	12,439.05
5. CES	144,600	62,783.53	29,023.30	91,806.83	99,329.31	147,580.33	55,773.50	88.83	147,580.33	55,773.50	13,964.70
6. U. Malta	57,000	14,061.42	12,157.62	26,219.04	39,154.21	54,190.62	27,971.58	198.92	50,190.62	23,971.58	6,002.06
7. METUTECH	89,400	32,731.04	14,789.26	47,520.30	61,411.07	91,345.62	43,825.32	133.90	71,345.82	23,825.32	5,972.20
8. UEM	96,600	24,775.70	28,259.47	53,035.17	66,356.93	99,055.70	46,020.53	162.85	99,055.70	46,020.53	11,522.72
9. Stellenbosch	120,700	44,856.41	32,512.99	77,369.40	82,911.81	146,052.62	68,683.22	153.12	160,052.62	82,683.22	18,949.73
10. ISI	75,100	27,485.35	14,495.55	41,980.90	51,588.05	73,602.42	31,621.52	115.05	73,602.42	31,621.52	7,917.46
11. TPAC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
total/average	1,300,000	384,447.15	304,486.15	688,933.30	893,001.64	1,300,000.00	611,066.70	178.85	1,283,000.20	594,066.70	146,997.86

NOTE: A. Project still has up to €16,999.80 to allocate
 NOTE: B. Commission still has up to €260,000.50 to allocate to ResIST partners at final claim:
 $893,001.64 + 146,997.86 + 260,000.50 =$
 original grant allocation of 1,300,000

NOTES

1. Claimable costs (that is, 50% of full costs) only shown for the three FC institutions: NIFU-STEP, METUTECH and ISI
2. The WP0 costs in this budget are for Coimbra, the Stellenbosch meeting including RAG (November 2008) and the final Brussels policy seminar
3. The central costs of supporting the Stellenbosch meeting have been transferred from the UEM to the Stellenbosch University budget
4. The central costs of the Brussels workshop continue to be allocated to the Amsterdam budget
5. The core costs (hotel and guests T&S) of the Barbados workshop will be carried on the Oxford budget, with ResIST participants covering their travel
6. CES carried the central costs of the Coimbra meeting
7. Figures not shown for TPAC, partner 11, which will spend against the Resultar project in years 2 & 3
8. Following a contract amendment, Liverpool became partner 12, taking over its unspent budget on 01 September 2007
9. The coordinator agreed an additional €7k allocation to the Stellenbosch meeting budget to cover the costs of increased numbers attending

WPO: What messages, to reach what people, by what means (and with links with which WPs)?


1. An analytic framework/policy tool to allow research funders to be more reflexive about the distributional consequences of their research projects/portfolios:
 - ☒ for intellectual property (WP1)
 - ☒ for the training of personnel/enhancement/maintenance of capacity (WP2)
 - ☒ for the nature of products and processes produced, for the accountability issues which may arise in the course of their production, distribution and use (WP3), and in terms of their likely economic impact (WP4)
 - ☒ *Senior staff from DG research international section and from SIDA, through participation at Stellenbosch and Brussels*

WPO: What messages, to reach what people, by what means (and with links with which WPs)?

2. In a broadened view of knowledge, the prime role of STS as a key transactional expertise opening up new approaches to science, technology and development policy, including:
 - ⌘ alternative ontologies
 - ⌘ a broader take on local/indigenous knowledge systems (and what constitutes them)
 - ⌘ a focus on enactment in policy making as the point where resources are mobilised and committed - relationship of this to training policies/incentivising retention and return (WP2)
 - ⌘ a critical perspective on the assumptions and path dependencies involved in the technologies of technology assessment and foresight

Mozambique and South African Ministers of S&T/universities at Stellenbosch meeting

WPO: What messages, to reach what people, by what means (and with links with which WPs)?



3. The value of trading zones as ways of thinking about/restructuring accountabilities and power relations in science, technology and development, eg:
 - ☒ could there be compensation mechanisms/transfer fees paid to countries of origin when people move to developed countries (sunk costs and opportunity costs)? (WP2)
 - ☒ Introducing bottom up processes/accountabilities in S&T/medical aid

Key actors in the Mozambique malaria case at Stellenbosch