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Executive Summary

Five high-profile academic dissemination activities carried out by ProGReSS partners across the world are presented and illustrated. Three took place in Europe, one in Japan, and one in the US.

As further highlights:

- a video of the RRI session at ESOF 2014 where the project was presented has been produced by ProGReSS and is currently available on our YouTube Channel.
- two academic publications are added.
Introduction

Among all the societal actors involved in the Research and Innovation process, those that belong to Academia can be said to occupy a privileged position where discussion and promotion of new ideas are a consolidated practice, even though adoption of novel approaches can prove challenging.

The efforts of the ProGReSS consortium to disseminate the project’s outcomes as well as to raise awareness of the RRI debate globally among all the relevant stakeholders (end-user communities, researchers, innovators, policy makers) has been documented throughout the course of the project, and will be the object of our final dissemination report, D6.5.

Here, we highlight seven cases of high-profile academic dissemination initiatives that show ProGReSS’ achievements in promoting the vision of an inclusive and societally desirable RRI among multidisciplinary and multicultural audiences of researchers and academics.

The original request to present only three high-profile academic cases has been changed to accommodate important examples of dissemination that demonstrate the global geographic coverage of ProGReSS’ activity.² The ProGReSS project proposal for an inclusive RRI has been discussed both in traditional knowledge and science arenas such as the PACITA Conference 2015 and the ESOF conference 2014, as well as in highly specialized academic events in Japan and the US. In addition, two scientific papers were published beyond those planned in the contract, in order to disseminate our work more widely.

² The activities undertaken at no additional cost to the project are marked with a * in the heading.
Global Ethics Panel – Cambridge University Press

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (Invite-only event)

Location:
Paris, France

Date:
June 2013

ProGReSS PARTNERS:
UCLAN, SASI

From Bench to Bedside - The Global Angle.
Global Ethics Panel discussing societal desirability as part of RRI

In June 2013, Roger Chennells (SASI) and Doris Schroeder (UCLan) gave a presentation entitled “From Bench to Bedside - The Global Angle” at this invite-only event organised by the Cambridge University Press and held at the Reid Hall in Paris. The paper introduced ProGReSS to an audience of 40+ bioethicists from around the world. In addition to providing information on the project, Roger introduced an inclusive innovation success story of bringing a pharmaceutical product to market based on indigenous knowledge. The product, Zembrin, is based on the anti-depressant and anti-anxiety properties of the Sceletium plant. Comments from the audience revolved around the case study and a professor from the USA stated that it is an excellent idea to examine different approaches to RRI globally.


The news also appeared in the 1st ProGReSS eNewsletter.
RRI Seminar

Location:
Hokkaido, Japan

Date:
May 2014

ProGReSS PARTNERS:
UCLAN

RRI – How to drive publicly funded research towards socially desirable goals
Societal Desirability, Inclusive Innovation and Participatory TA

In May 2014, Doris Schroeder (UCLan) visited the University of Hokkaido to work with the ProGReSS external advisor, Associate Professor Shunzo Majima. She gave one lecture on “Applied Ethics” and one seminar on “RRI – How to drive publicly funded research towards socially desirable goals”. Japan has been included in Deliverable 3.1., which analyses how governments around the world try to achieve strategic goals through research funding.

Hokkaido University is one of the top seven in Japan, a former imperial university. One of its four principles states that “applied research earnestly discusses how it can help human beings”. The concept of RRI is virtually unknown in Japan and the ProGReSS project has made a start on changing this.

Link to news:
The first five RRI projects funded by the European Commission came together for ESOF2014. “The premier science event of the year” gathered 4,500 delegates in Copenhagen from 21 – 26 June 2014. Queen Margrethe II and President of the EC Jose Manuel Barroso opened the proceedings.

Together with Karen Fabbri (the first RRI project officer from the EC) and Hilary Sutcliffe (the Director of Matter (http://www.matterforall.org/)), the 5 Co-ordinators took part in a panel on RRI moderated by BBC science journalist Quentin Cooper.

A short film of the panel has been produced and made available by the ProGReSS project on its YouTube Channel.


The news also appeared in the 3rd ProGReSS eNewsletter

Link to the video: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCKrILNrxHNluXpmO_Rsc4pQ
ProGReSS @ PACITA Conference 2015 *

The Next Horizon of Technology Assessment.

PACITA CONFERENCE 2015

Location: 
Berlin, Germany

Date: 
26 February 2015

ProGReSS PARTNERS: 
UCLAN, EA

Miltos Ladikas (UCLan) presented the ProGReSS project during the 2015 PACITA Conference session dedicated to the RRI debate and chaired by Stephan Lingner (European Academy, ProGReSS partner) and Michael Decker (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology). Other presenters in this session were also Co-ordinators or members of RRI projects: Petra Ahrweiler (GREAT), Bernd Stahl (Responsible Industry and Human Brain) and Christopher Coenen (SYNERGENE).

The session was well-attended by RRI experts from Europe, the European Commission (e.g. Rene von Schomberg) and the policy maker community (e.g. the Head of the Innovation Department of the German Science Ministry). Following the presentation of ProGReSS a lively discussion about the definition and operationalisation of RRI took place, with von Schomberg supporting the approach of ProGReSS as process-driven analysis. One could conclude that ProGReSS is unique in its approach both in obtaining information on RRI at the global level and also in including “inclusive innovation” in its analysis; both aspects were well received.

Link to news: 

Link to the slides: 
and
## Two Examples of Successful Industry-Funded Research – The “Collaboration Conundrum” Conference 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The John J. Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values Conference on the “Collaboration Conundrum”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Location:  
*Notre Dame, IN, USA* |
| Date:  
*5-6 November 2015* |
| ProGReSS PARTNERS:  
*IIT* |

### Two Examples of Successful Industry-Funded Research

*Citizen groups in industry-funded research*

| Michael Davis, IIT. |

To answer a question posed in the Call for this conference: “Could the participation of citizen groups in industry-funded research also prove valuable to increase the relevance, reliability, and acceptability of industry research?” Michael Davis (IIT) presented a paper introducing two examples of successful industry-funded research.³ The Call asks *whether* it is possible for participation of citizen groups to improve industry-funded research, not *how likely* such participation is to improve such research. Since what is actual is also self-evidently possible, Michael’s answer to the question was ‘Yes, if there is at least one example of such improved research’. Michael believes there are many such examples, but he selected two for this occasion; “PressureTel” and “MY Brain Book”.


---

"Broader impacts" or "responsible research and innovation"? A comparison of two criteria for funding research in science and engineering *

Michael Davis and Kelly Laas

Abstract

Our subject is how the experience of Americans with a certain funding criterion, "Broader Impacts" (and some similar criteria) may help in efforts to turn the European concept of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) into a useful guide to funding Europe's scientific and technical research. We believe this comparison may be as enlightening for Americans concerned with revising research policy. We have organized our report around René Von Schomberg's definition of RRI, since it seems both to cover what the European research group to which we belong is interested in and to be the only widely accepted definition of RRI. According to Von Schomberg, RRI: "... is a transparent, interactive process by which societal actors and innovators become mutually responsive to each other with a view to the (ethical) acceptability, sustainability and societal desirability of the innovation process and its marketable products (in order to allow a proper embedding of scientific and technological advances in our society)." While RRI seeks fundamental changes in the way research is conducted, Broader Impacts is more concerned with peripheral aspects of research: widening participation of disadvantaged groups, recruiting the next generation of scientists, increasing the speed with which results are used, and so on. Nevertheless, an examination of the broadening of funding criteria over the last four decades suggests that the National Science Foundation has been moving in the direction of RRI.
Towards principled Responsible Research and Innovation: employing the Difference Principle in funding decisions *

Doris Schroeder and Miltos Ladikas
Journal of Responsible Innovation, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2015, pages 169-183,
DOI:10.1080/23299460.2015.1057798

Abstract

Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) has emerged as a science policy framework that attempts to import broad social values into technological innovation processes whilst supporting institutional decision-making under conditions of uncertainty and ambiguity. When looking at RRI from a ‘principled’ perspective, we consider responsibility and justice to be important cornerstones of the framework. The main aim of this article is to suggest a method of realising these principles through the application of a limited Rawlsian Difference Principle in the distribution of public funds for research and innovation.