

Framework Programme 9: A first response to the European Parliament Resolution and to “LAB – FAB – APP”

By: HERA Humanities in the European Research Area 10/2017¹

The European Parliament response to the H2020 interim evaluation, and the “LAB – FAB – APP”-report of the High Level Group on maximizing the impact of EU Research and Innovation Programmes (HLG/Lamy) have started to pave the way for the next EU Research & Innovation Framework Programme (FP9).² HERA appreciates the effort taken. With a view of keeping the development on the right tracks as regards to inter- and multi-disciplinarity, transdisciplinarity, innovation and impact, HERA would like to respond to these two papers and advocate suggestions from the perspective of the humanities; a large and diversified research and innovation community practiced in inter- and transdisciplinary dialogue.

Overall, HERA suggests to use the terms knowledge, innovation, growth and impact in their broadest sense, and to widen the economic and technological specifications with social and cultural innovation. New ways of understanding societies, cultures and identities, challenging assumptions, generating new ideas and pushing the boundaries of creativity and knowledge should all be essential parts of FP9. A sense of reflectivity should also be included, reflection and awareness of how things are done, policy regimes, approach to issues is vitally important for effective Research and Innovation.

It is crucial that the future Framework Programme, and its subsequent activities, uses language that engages and is accessible to all stakeholders, including wider audiences. The following principles should be integrated across the relevant areas of FP9 and in all aspects including context, content, missions and possible topics and work programmes:

- FP9 is a research **and** Innovation programme.
- **Innovation** should always be broadly conceived and include social and cultural innovation as well as processes, dynamics, scenarios and design in addition to new products.
- There is frequent mention of growth and jobs in the existing discourse but this should be expanded to **include social aspects** e.g. a better society with higher quality of living for all its members.
- The generation of **new knowledge** has wider value than just enabling innovation.
- **Multi-disciplinary**, as well as **cross-sectoral**, approaches should be enabled throughout to support new solutions to address existing research problems as well as urgent societal challenges.

¹ HERA stands for “Humanities in the European Research Area.” It is a partnership of 25 research funders across 24 European countries and is co-funded by the European Commission. More info can be found here: www.heranet.info .

² P8_TA-PROV(2017)0253, European Parliament resolution of 13 June 2017 on the assessment of Horizon 2020 implementation in view of its interim evaluation and the Framework Programme 9 proposal (2016/2147(INI)), <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P8-TA-2017-0253+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN> and “LAB – FAB – APP: Investing in the European future we want”, https://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/archive/other_reports_studies_and_documents/hlg_2017_report.pdf

- **Complexity and reflections** should be integral to FP9 – many issues are interrelated and exist in policy, regulatory, legal and value frameworks.
- **Collaboration** needs to be a significant part of the FP9 research & innovation environment.

HERA recognises that many of these issues are mentioned in the Parliament and the HLG/LAMY reports explicitly, but generally the language defaults to products, markets and economics and embedding these principles up front is essential for a successful FP9.

Addressing the European Parliament response to the H2020 Interim Evaluation:

- The European Parliament resolution of 13 June 2017 (31) recognizes that the “**most pressing problems** faced by the EU require methodological research that is more conceptually focused on SSH” and “calls on the Commission to strengthen the possibilities for SSH research to participate in the interdisciplinary FP projects and to provide sufficient funding for SSH topics”, but these aspects are not included in the recommendations.

HERA suggests a specific recommendation for FP9: Solutions for societal challenges/missions need to integrate the relevant disciplines and stakeholders – including problems addressed by SSH research and avoiding technocratic language. In addition, the success of embedding of SSH into H2020 has been mixed, the interim evaluation highlighted this as an area of further consideration and this should be specifically addressed by FP9.

- The European Parliament (16) calls on the Commission “to provide a broader definition of ‘**impact**’, considering both economic and social effects”.

HERA supports this statement, and strongly recommends further consideration of how impact is measured, identified and evaluated. These impacts may be economic or social but also cultural, in the form of changes of opinions, attitudes, processes and environments. One project may have many impacts eg research, third sector, and business impact. Approaches to impact need to include both quantitative and qualitative approaches. (cp. EvalHum and ENRESSH (HERA/COST), Impact-EV, Cultural Value project (UK))³. It is also widely recognized that impact happens outside of the short term range of project funding, processes to capture this should be considered by the Commission. Narratives should complement evidence in political decision making.

- The European Parliament FP9 recommendation (39) wants to “promote **growth, jobs and innovation**” for Europe to become a “world-leading global centre for research and science”.

*HERA s recommends to add a fourth value to growth, jobs and innovation, which is a ‘**better society**’ and considers that a ‘**reflective society**’ is needed to achieve this aim. Societal values such as respect, tolerance, dialogue, justice underpin European lives as much as jobs and economic well-being.*

- The European Parliament (42, 43) and ‘**innovation**’.

³ <http://enressh.eu/work-groups/> | <http://heranet.info/heravalue/dr-paul-benneworth> | <http://www.evalhum.eu/> | <http://impact-ev.eu/about/> | <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/fundedthemesandprogrammes/culturalvalueproject/>

HERA suggests being aware of the assumptions and terms of innovation⁴. Innovation is more than product development – it needs to be seen as a process, dynamics, and scenarios. Examples of broader innovation: development from elite to social history, research on inclusion that integrates social linguistics, spread of Ebola and the practice of burial culture.⁵

- The European Parliament demands two different programmes with two separate budget for differentiating **defense research** from civil research (46).

HERA strongly recommends that the inclusion of defense research should not come at the expense of the FP9 programme (i.e. it should not take away budget from this area), it also advises that there are important interfaces to be taken into account. The approach to defense research and innovation in FP9 needs to consider security studies and reflection on ethical, legal, social and cultural contexts.

- The European Parliament prioritizes funding for **climate change** research and climate data collection infrastructure (48).

HERA stresses that the environmental challenges have very strong people aspects and need to take the full range of societal meaning, values, narratives and consequences into account as well as including questions of climate migration, consequences on social structures and resilience.

Addressing “LAB – FAB – APP”

HERA agrees with a lot of the goals of the HLG/Lamy report. The role of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in FP9 is still uncertain but the vision underlying the SDGs goes farther than economic growth. Apart from sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, they also aim at “a world of universal respect for human rights and human dignity, the rule of law, justice, equality and non-discrimination”, and at “a just, equitable, tolerant, open and socially inclusive world in which the needs of the most vulnerable are met”. HERA strongly recommends that this wider principle of a better Europe (and a better world) should also underpin Framework Programme 9. HERA suggests building capacities for a research and innovation environment that is better equipped to respond to large and global challenges and takes economic, social **and** cultural development into account. Growth may also be growth in reflectivity, understanding and enhancement of our ability of living together. All terms – growth, innovation, knowledge, impact – need a re-definition or re-calibration and include human, ethical, historical, legal aspects.

In response to the 11 areas (quoted below) outlined in the HLG/ LAMY report HERA makes the following suggestions:

⁴ See also the opinion paper Science Europe produced on ‘radical innovation’: http://www.scienceeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/151222_HUMAN_OP_Radical_Innovation_web.pdf. A Swedish analysis reports on a number of cases of how SSH have contributed to solving challenges, see http://www.scienceeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/SE_broch_HUM_fin_web_LR.pdf.

⁵ See also, for ex., HERA projects targeting single women, religious icons, HIV/Aids, camps: www.heranet.info

1. Prioritize research and innovation in EU and national budgets. *Action:* Double the budget of the post-2020 EU research and innovation programme.

HERA agrees with an increase in budget, not including defense research. Further detail on the approach to defense research is needed including ethical and social implications – not simply defense technologies.

2. Build a true EU innovation policy that creates future markets. *Action:* Foster ecosystems for researchers, innovators, industries and governments, promote and invest in innovative ideas with rapid scale-up potential through a European Innovation Council.

*HERA suggests adding **society** into the Action. Knowledge in this context is not just about human capital, there are wider benefits of a knowledge society. How do we construct a sustainable knowledge system and society to be better equipped for addressing challenges?*

3. Educate for the future and invest in people who will make the change. *Action:* modernise, reward and resource the educating and training of people for a creative and innovative Europe.

*HERA suggests to aim for a “creative and innovative and **reflective** Europe”. We need ‘innovators’ in a larger sense: in technology, culture and society, i.e. ‘entrepreneurs’ in a more than solely economic sense.*

4. Design the EU R&I programme for greater impact. *Action:* make pillars driven by purpose and impact, fine-tune the proposal evaluation system and increase flexibility.

HERA suggests to re-visualise the pillar system. If excellence is to be at the heart of everything, we need to think in concentric circles or pillars that are framed differently.

5. Adopt a mission-oriented impact-focused approach to address global challenges. *Action:* set research and innovation missions that address global challenges and mobilise researchers, innovators and other stakeholders to realise them.

HERA strongly supports that missions should encompass both research and Innovation. It welcomes the statements on the importance of SSH and that SSH researchers should be able to initiate and lead missions. HERA also strongly supports non-prescriptive calls. Missions need to include the societal conditions needed to obtain sustainable, just and democratic societies. The EU needs reflexivity and to renegotiate its shared values: with greater account taken of democratic governance, the rule of law, legal aspects to enable a research and innovation approach. (See additional section below).

6. Rationalise the EU funding landscape and achieve synergy with structural funds. *Action:* cut the number of R&I funding schemes and instruments, make those remaining reinforce each other and make synergy with other programmes work.

HERA agrees clearer synergies and aims of the different funds will be beneficial to the research and innovation landscape.

7. Simplify further. *Action*: be the most attractive R&I funder in the world, privileging impact over process.

HERA agrees that simplification will assist the research and innovation eco-system; but this needs to include a range from smaller size funding instruments to longer-term investments. Research and innovation actors should have flexibility in choosing the suitable instrument and its scale. Non-prescriptive calls also enable flexibility with simplification.

8. Mobilise and involve citizens. *Action*: stimulate co-design and co-creation through citizen involvement.

HERA considers there is a conflation of ideas in this section. HERA supports the involvement of research and innovation actors with stakeholders via co-design and co-creation but citizens are just one potential stakeholder in this scenario. Co-creation across business and research; research and third sector etc. should also be encouraged. Whilst the views of citizens have a place in scoping future research and innovation agendas they should not decide it. The term Citizen Science describes a method, not a political aim, and in keeping with the openness of non-prescriptive calls, methodologies should also not be prescribed. Involvement of citizens also raises significant representation, data, legal and ethical aspects that need consideration.

Related to this recommendation and across FP9 it is important that the freedom and independence of researchers isn't compromised (art. 13 of the EU Charta of Fundamental Rights on freedom of the arts and sciences states: "The arts and scientific research shall be free of constraint. Academic freedom shall be respected.").

9. Better align EU and national R&I investment. *Action*: ensure EU and national alignment where it adds value to the EU's R&I ambitions and missions.

Co-fund mechanisms need to be continued as an important mechanism of fostering alignment between EU and national investments.

As regards the suggestion for the EU to "limit co-investment in partnerships with Member States to those which help achieve the EU's mission", HERA wants to call to mind that science diplomacy may be a means to strengthen ties with members states with less identification with EU missions.

10. Make international R&I cooperation a trademark of EU research and innovation. *Action*: open up the R&I programme to association by the best and participation by all, based on reciprocal co-funding or access to funding in the partner country.

HERA strongly supports a strengthening of internationalization and wants to stress internationalization starts with the EU neighboring countries and regions – which are able to provide valuable perspectives on fundamental questions for Europe which require understanding of joint histories, and changing borders. Another aspect to consider is that the policy aspects of H2020 resulted in a strongly European focus in certain challenges e.g. SC6. HERA stresses that internationalization is not merely inclusion of researchers from non-EU countries but concerns the scope of topics, challenges and missions (e.g. migration is global).

11. Better capture and communicate impacts. *Action:* brand EU research and innovation and ensure wide communication of its results and impacts.

HERA recommends a wider definition of impact when designing the future monitoring and evaluation system. A portfolio analysis will need to be flexible, to take into account different types of missions that will need different frameworks of analysis. Impact will occur outside of the time range of project funding – this will need resources and measures to capture impact during and beyond a project. As regards ‘big data’, the future R&I programme should be big on the legal and ethical checks of (personal) data, data use and re-use. The life sciences and history may provide good practice cases of cross-disciplinary data use.

It is important to note that ‘communication’ is not the same as impact – impact plans may be a more useful tool at proposal stage.⁶ Communication of results and impact should occur at both project and mission level.

HERA missions for the future

Missions in theory sound like an interesting concept – it is important that these are distinctive from the current global challenges and that the relation mission/challenge is to be further defined. Among the questions to be discussed: What is the difference between ‘missions’ and ‘challenges’? Are ‘missions’ to be anchored in ‘challenges’? When are they to be generated – before or along the Framework timespan? How long would they last? How and when would their success or failure be measured? (And what about smaller side-effect impacts along the way?) Should a ‘mission’ have all Framework instruments to choose from – including ERC or MSC actions...? How many ‘missions’ of which size are wanted or feasible? And are ‘missions’ to be EU focused or truly global?

Missions from a HERA perspective would have these features:

- be a ‘corridor’ to restrain and focus activity
- be accessible / understandable by everyone
- be explicitly about both research and innovation
- be multidisciplinary and cross sectoral, and deliver new fields of inquiry

As above, HERA strongly supports non-prescriptive calls. If missions are to be able to be clearly measured, the tension of non-prescriptive calls with potentially prescribed impacts needs further consideration. Missions should offer more flexibility.

HERA suggestions for missions would come from a range of areas, all looking for societal impact and using a broader innovation concept, the scope and scale of a mission will obviously impact the ‘level’

⁶ See UK pathways to impact: <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/>

of framing. The areas below are initial ideas; prioritization and further clarification will be developed in the next few months.

As an initial step, HERA suggests the following **umbrella** mission which will need to be broken down in smaller missions:

Living together. Better societies. Shape societies. Transform societies. Build societies for the future. Understand the present (and the past) and shape the future.

- Diversity and integration/inclusion. Superdiversity and languages.
- Societal diversity and constitutional culture.
- Rights and justice / democracy. Environment. Ethics.
- Fundamental rights. Constitution. Rule of law. Constitutional cultures. European cultures not all monopoly of the state.
- Inequality and participation.
- Care & a good death – ageing well. What is a good end of life for all?
- Environmental futures: Healthy environment for all and environmental justice.
- Ethics and responsibility.
- Responsible innovation.
- Digital ethics / ethics and digital innovation. Technology transforming futures.
- Internet of past things: How to create the internet of past things.
- From data to meaning.
- Migration. Mobility. Environmental justice.
- Fragile histories and reconciliation.
- Intelligence reconsidered.