

Meritxell Martell  
Merience

Anne Bergmans  
University of Antwerp

# SCENARIOS FOR IMPROVING STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT WITHIN THE IGD-TP



IGD-TP Exchange Forum 4. 29 November 2013



## IGD-TP as an ETP: challenges



- ETPs need to address societal engagement: inclusiveness, access to finance and expertise, acknowledge limited involvement of societal actors in detailed aspects of R+I strategies, rights and obligations;
- In some cases, ETPs become “clubs” or “closed shops”;
- NGOs often under-represented, their participation is just cosmetic, seen as a factor of legitimacy.

- Based on Callon's basic model of co-production of knowledge:
  - ▣ *Deficit or public education model;*
  - ▣ *Public debate model;*
  - ▣ *Co-production of knowledge model;*
- Simple and comprehensive framework along a spectrum of involvement;
- No best model, depends on context, nature of the problem or question at hand.

## Criteria to conceptualise scenarios



- Nature and level of interaction between experts and stakeholders;
- Types of stakeholders involved;
- Degree of joint co-production of knowledge;
- Use of instruments and tools to generate information and knowledge;
- Legitimacy of decisions;
  
- *Advantages & disadvantages.*

## Interpretation of theoretical model for IGD-TP



	<i>Deficit or public education model</i>	<i>Public debate model</i>	<i>Co-production of knowledge model</i>
<i>Interaction experts-stakeholders</i>	Information provision. One way communication.	Consultation processes oriented to convince of own assumptions and values. Few opportunities for harmonising and combining knowledge.	Continual and organised stakeholder involvement contributes to building trust.
<i>Type of stakeholders involved</i>	RWM agencies, academics, science providers. Indirect and passive communication towards other stakeholders	“Selected” stakeholders more actively involved. Differentiates between them with different viewpoints and competences. Need for clarity in the membership policy.	IGD-TP proactively seeking stakeholder involvement (resources available). ICT important. Local communities involved. Scientists from different disciplines.

	<i>Deficit or public education model</i>	<i>Public debate model</i>	<i>Co-production of knowledge model</i>
<i>Degree of joint co-production of knowledge</i>	Knowledge dominated by IGD-TP. Stakeholders as recipients of information.	Interaction IGD-TP with those sharing their values and assumptions. No real intention to create a common knowledge base.	Joint activities to develop a common knowledge base through negotiation and mutual adjustment.
<i>Instruments &amp; methods for co-production</i>	IGD-TP in control, accountable and responsible. One-way communication of SRA and DP (web).	Limited consultation processes (EF and web). IGD-TP often presents ready-made solutions to pre-defined problems. Some degree of learning and debate possible.	Engagement tools that allow open up for a process of new issue formation. WG good start point but advice for strategic choices.

# Remarks (1/4)



- Interpretation of models:
  - ▣ Indicative and illustrative of different ways to organise outreach and integrate views.
  - ▣ Reflection tool for future paths.
- Current approach: intermediate between public education and public debate models.
  - ▣ Experts of similar backgrounds → stakeholder knowledge can improve problem identification and search for feasible solutions;
  - ▣ Limited involvement of some groups → lack of clear strategy on stakeholder involvement and resistance to change
  - ▣ Role and nature of EF is not clear, uncertainty of participation; (cont.)

## Remarks (2/4)



- Current approach: intermediate between public education and public debate models.
  - ▣ Lack of clarity concerning membership.
  - ▣ Consultation processes do not result in constructive relationships, does not build ownership.
  - ▣ Very concrete vision: clarity but limits involvement.
  - ▣ Concept of Technology Platform might be misleading and hamper initiatives of stakeholder involvement:
    - Focus more on mission and problem solving aspects rather than technological issues (European Research Advisory Board, 2004).



## Remarks (3/4)



- Exchange Forum:
  - ▣ Working groups: may facilitate identification of common goals and a more horizontal structure.
  - ▣ Need to target communication and participatory actions.
- An option: involve European representative organisations, such as:
  - ▣ Committee of Regions;
  - ▣ European Economic and Social Committee;
  - ▣ Group of European Municipalities with Nuclear Facilities;
  - ▣ Association of European Journalists;
  - ▣ European Environmental Bureau;
  - ▣ Etc;

## Remarks (4/4)



- Consider methods of interaction for realising co-production of knowledge (PTA, multi-criteria analysis..) or interactive exercise for developing stakeholder involvement scenarios.
  - ▣ Learn directly from stakeholders' concerns and expectations regarding IGD-TP.
  - ▣ Framing a common understanding regarding opportunities for involvement.

Website: [www.insotec.eu](http://www.insotec.eu)

Meritxell Martell  
Merience,  
Anne Bergmans  
University of Antwerp

Open seminar to communicate project progress  
and intermediary results: **12-13 November  
2013** (Berlin)

THANK YOU

