



CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS IN DESIGNING RESEARCH GOVERNANCE



Guidelines Handbook

CONSIDER Project
(GA number 288928)

Deliverable D4.1
31.01.2015

Authors

Bernd Carsten Stahl
De Montfort University

Kutoma Wakunuma
De Montfort University

Quality Assurance:

	Name
Review Chair	Karen Bultitude
Reviewer 1	Dimitris Micharikopoulos
Reviewer 2	Terry Martin



Executive Summary

The CONSIDER project developed a set of guidelines for a range of different stakeholders. The main guidelines are as follows:

For researchers

- R1. Clarify your reasons for CSO involvement
- R2. Be aware of your local institutional support and recognition
- R3. Clearly define the roles of consortium members
- R4. Agree on project management principles in advance

For CSO's

- C1. Dare to take the initiative
- C2. Act in line with your mission, priorities and reputation
- C3. Be clear about your resources and be ready to raise funds
- C4. Grow your research skills
- C5. Raise your visibility

For policymakers

- P1. Clarify objectives when encouraging CSO participation
- P2. Create an environment conducive to CSO participation in research
- P3. Rethink scientific excellence
- P4. Simplify processes
- P5. Recognise the diverse nature of CSOs
- P6. Foster collaboration over competition

For funders

- F1. Raise awareness of the issues to consider in CSO engagement
- F2. Allow CSOs to help shape the research agenda
- F3. Create funding structures that are sensitive to CSO needs
- F4. Facilitate building connections between CSOs and researchers
- F5. Emphasise the importance of dissemination and impact
- F6. Celebrate positive research outcomes involving CSOs
- F7. Ensure sensitivity to CSO-related issues during evaluation

For evaluators

- E1. Consider the public relevance of the project
- E2. Review the appropriateness of the proposed co-operation structures and funding allocation
- E3. Take into account the dissemination potential

This document outlines the steps taken in developing these guidelines. It details the rationale of the development, various steps undertaken in creating the guidelines and outlines some of the considerations that gave rise to the final version.

More detail on the guidelines, including a description of the stakeholders as well as additional context, brief illustrations and quotes are available on the project website under:

<http://www.consider-project.eu/guidelines-landing-page>



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
1 INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE OF THE DELIVERABLE	3
2 CONSIDER GUIDELINES	4
2.1 GUIDELINES FOR POLICYMAKERS.....	4
2.2 GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCHERS	13
2.3 GUIDELINES FOR CSOs	20
2.4 GUIDELINES FOR FUNDERS	25
2.5 GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATORS	35
2.6 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	40
3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE OF THE GUIDELINES	41
4 BACKGROUND INFORMATION: DEVELOPMENT OF THE GUIDELINES	42
4.1 REQUIREMENTS ACCORDING TO THE DoW	42
4.2 METHODOLOGY: CONSTRUCTING USEFUL GUIDELINES	43
4.3 STAGES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GUIDELINES.....	43
4.4 STRUCTURE OF GUIDELINES	44
4.4.1 Good Practice Examples According to the Project Officer	44
4.4.2 Stakeholders Targeted by Recommendations	45
4.4.3 Additional Content of Guidelines.....	46
4.4.4 Medium of Delivery	46
4.5 POSSIBLE GUIDELINES TO BE INCLUDED	47
4.6 PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE GUIDELINES	47
4.7 EXPERT WORKSHOP	52
4.8 PROCESS OF CONSTRUCTION OF THE FINAL VERSION OF THE GUIDELINES	53
5 REFERENCES	55
APPENDIX: GUIDELINES CANDIDATES	57

1 Introduction, Purpose of the Deliverable

The CONSIDER project has investigated the role of civil society organisations in research governance. One key outcome of this research is a set of guidelines and recommendations that will help stakeholders to better understand such participation processes and allow them to maximise their outcomes.

This deliverable, the 'Guidelines Handbook', contains a printed extraction of the final online version of the guidelines arising from the theoretical and empirical work undertaken by the project. The navigable online version of the Guidelines constitutes the heart and key output of the CONSIDER project.

It is important to note that the CONSIDER project consortium eventually decided to publish the latest version of the guidelines on its website to ensure that they are open to further discussion and development. The guidelines collected in this document therefore represent a snapshot at a particular point in time which may well be superseded after the end of the project.

In addition to the actual guidelines the deliverable contains a section that gives a brief overview of the requirements of the deliverable according to the Description of Work (DoW) and how this informed the structure of the work undertaken and the content of the deliverable. This final section briefly outlines the methodology used in constructing the principles of the guidelines and the steps undertaken in compiling guidelines and gathering feedback from potential users and stakeholders.

The guidelines were informed by numerous sources. The consortium devised a rigorous iterative process in developing them, thus ensuring that the conceptual, empirical and analytical insights from all aspects of the project were represented in creating them.



2 CONSIDER Guidelines

This section contains a copy of the guidelines as they were presented on the website in January 2015. It is important to note that the final versions of the guidelines are those on the website. If there is a discrepancy between the online version and the present version, then the guidelines available online take precedence.

2.1 Guidelines for Policymakers

Who is a policymaker?

Policymakers are individuals involved in decision making or policy formulation. There are policymakers within different sectors encompassing nation-states/governments, political economic unions such as the EU, institutional/organisational levels as well as other sectors including business and industry. Policymakers make decisions/formulate policies on different aspects, be it health, business, ICTs. Anderson¹ defines a policy as ‘a guiding principle used to set direction... It can be a course of action to guide and influence decisions. It should be used as a guide to decision making under a given set of circumstances within the framework of objectives, goals and management philosophies as determined by senior management’. For purposes of this document, we concentrate on EU policymakers. These are in a position to ‘set direction’ on CSO participation in research by either setting policy regulations and formulating appropriate policies with clear guidance on CSO participation for CSO involvement in research. However, the recommendations are generally valid for research policymakers on national and other levels as well.

Why would policymakers be interested in including CSOs?

There is currently a strong call for and promotion of public participation in research. One good example of such a promotion is through EU research funding programmes such as the [EU's Horizon 2020](#). The political driver behind European research funding is the [European Research Area](#).

Inclusion of CSOs aims to promote broader societal debate on aspects of research that affect the public. This call for civil society inclusion is most obviously plausible in the case of research into social challenges but applies as well to research for industrial leadership and excellent science. These programmes are intended to ensure that the desired broader societal participation is realised through for example and most notably through the funding scheme for the active participation of Civil Society Organisations in Research called ‘Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups Civil Society Organisations BSG-CSO’.

Reason for promoting CSO involvement include:

- the status of CSOs representatives of societal groups with the capacity to ensure that public interests are taken into consideration during the process of research,
- increased accountability for the use of public funds in research,



- transparency in research in the sense of communicating purpose and outcomes to the public,
- increased legitimacy of research methods and outcomes,
- higher acceptance of resulting technologies, products and services,
- improved knowledge base of research leading to higher quality research.

From a policy perspective each of these may constitute a reason for including CSOs in research. It is important to see, however, that these aims are not identical and may call for different ways of implementing and evaluating CSO inclusion. It is therefore important for policymakers to be clear on what they want to achieve by including CSOs in research (see recommendation [P1: Clarify objectives when encouraging CSO participation](#)).

Key Recommendations

Recommendations to policymakers:

[P1. Clarify objectives when encouraging CSO participation](#)

Much of the involvement of CSOs in research is driven by research policy. Policymakers are the people who provide the resources and instruct funders to devise mechanisms that encourage CSOs to participate in research. There are numerous possible reasons why CSO involvement might be desired (see section (why would a policymaker be interested in CSOs in research) but these are not always consistent and require different mechanisms of promotion, implementation and evaluation. Policymakers should therefore specify what they hope to achieve, in order for funders and participants in research to shape research agenda and implementation accordingly.

Unless the policy aims behind CSO involvement are clearly spelled out it will be difficult to devise research in a way that it meets the aims and to develop evaluation mechanisms to promote them.

Guiding Questions

Policymakers devising research policy of relevance to CSO involvement should ask themselves:

- What is the [purpose that CSO involvement](#) is supposed to achieve?
- Is the policy sensitive to the needs of both [researchers](#) and [CSOs](#)?
- Are the objectives of the policy reflected in [funding](#) and [evaluation](#) mechanisms?

Example: Choose CSOs that can deliver results



In one case CSOs were involved in a technical development project for disabled users. One of the CSOs involved felt that there was an overdependence on organisations that were included because of their proven ability to secure European funding. The CSO representative felt that the best people should be involved based on their capability to deliver results. The actual needs of people did not inform research as much as the strategic manipulation of some key players who get funding. This was seen as detrimental to the overall research objectives. Being clear on the objectives to be pursued when including CSOs could counteract this emphasis on funding track record.

One CSO representative put it as follows: *‘There are people who know how to do it and how to get it. They have their offices in Brussels and in the end I don’t think that’s beneficial. So, maybe Brussels should leave Brussels for a bit and go out and look for research needs’.*

P2. Create an environment conducive to CSO participation in research

As existing institutional and funding arrangements are often not conducive to the inclusion of CSOs, a key recommendation to policymakers is to foster an environment that allows CSO inclusion. This means rethinking of current arrangements and being sensitive to whether they unjustifiably favour research institutions. Many of the more detailed recommendations below contribute to the overall aim of creating an environment where CSOs can positively contribute to research.

Guiding Questions

Policymakers devising research policy of relevance to CSO involvement should ask themselves:

- Do you understand the [goals of CSOs](#) and how these can be reflected in research policy? If CSOs can see that their goals are taken up by policy and that research with CSOs influences policy agenda, then this will be a great motivation for CSOs to get engaged.
- Do you [understand the range of different types of CSOs](#) and how research fits their needs and agendas? While there are some large and prominent CSOs, the majority are relatively small and have limited financial and organisational resources. This means that bureaucratic requirements such as financial reporting can cause significant problems for them. They also often lack the capacity to follow research calls and react to them.
- Is your view of science compatible with the ethos of CSOs? At present most research funding allocations are highly competitive and this is desired as it promises high quality research. While scientific excellence is a cornerstone of all publicly funded research, it is [important to consider what constitutes such excellence in particular in research addressing societal problems](#). The current funding regime promotes a particular view of science and research that some of the CSOs we encountered were not comfortable with. CSOs are often community-oriented and inclusive rather



than competitive. For such CSOs to feel welcome, research should [aim at collaboration rather than competition](#). While there are doubtlessly benefits to be derived from scientific competition, more collaborative views of research could foster CSO engagement.

Example: Limited engagement of informal patient group

A collaborative EU funded project looking at an ICT enabled system for patients with a chronic disease incorporated a CSO for trial and feedback purposes. The CSO which was a patient support group had an indirect role in the project because it had no budgetary allocation and therefore did not constitute part of the consortium. Although the patient support group contributed significantly to the research, their participation could have been made better. This could have been achieved especially through a conducive environment which should have factored in funding for the CSO's research efforts in the project. As it was, the arrangements were more favourable towards researchers and therefore privileged them over CSOs who had no funding outside reimbursement of travel for their part in the research.

A conducive environment would entail policymakers recognising the different status that CSOs hold. Our research has shown that CSOs without the required EU demand of a legal entity struggle to be recognised as bona fide partners in research because as one research participant observed they are seen as a 'Club' and not an official organisation.

This makes it difficult for them to acquire funding that scientific researchers are normally in a position to acquire. Due to this they are usually unable to co-fund research which leaves them with little or no influence in research, other than as entities that are there to give feedback as well as to help researchers establish links with interest groups that the CSOs represent.

*'And there is no, there is no society for that. But this is only that club. They are not an organisation so they cannot receive funds or something like this. And this was the problem we had in ***** project somehow' (Researcher).*

P3. Rethink scientific excellence

Scientific excellence is a key criterion for evaluating and funding research. While scientific excellence is important, the question what constitutes excellence may have more than one answer. The evaluation of scientific excellence is typically left to expert reviewers who are scientists from the same field as the proposers. This approach is well established and ensures that research meets the expectations of the scientific community. While such a view of excellence as an internal factor of the scientific system will remain important, one can argue that research that aims to achieve social goals needs to be excellent in ways going beyond purely scientific excellence. In terms of European funding such excellence beyond the scientific system could be expected in research focusing in industrial leadership and societal challenges.



CSO involvement is most likely to be found in such research because CSOs typically promote aims that benefit society or particular stakeholder groups. If the aim of research is to achieve outcomes beyond the scientific system itself, then the achievement of such broader societal goals constitutes one integral aspect of scientific excellence. If this position is accepted, then it calls for ways of integrating such a broader view of scientific excellence in research [funding](#) and [evaluation](#) mechanisms.

Guiding Questions

Policymakers may wish to consider questions like:

- How are policy goals underpinning the research policy expressed and communicated to potential proposers?
- Do review and evaluation principles provide space to reflect on excellence in all aspects of the research, including its relevance for civil society?

Example: Excellence in delivering augmented communication for patients with degenerative diseases

The involvement of CSOs in a research project investigating Affective Computing for Augmented Communication is a good example of how policymakers can rethink scientific excellence. This is because, although the CSOs involved in the project were not typical research institutes concerned with scientific excellence, their involvement was central to achieving the research outcomes which were to use brain and neural computer interfaces to increase human capabilities and develop applications for patients with a degenerative disease. Their role was at the very early stages of the project and involved contributing to proposal writing and having specific work packages related to end-user testing and dissemination. By so doing, they were involved in setting the research agenda from their own standpoint, which was a concern for patients and how well the technologies would work and be received by the patients. This shows that research excellence requires a sound basis in the relevant science, but to be truly excellent, research has to be relevant to users.

CSO representatives suggested additional criteria for excellence: One refers to the communication of the research output to wider society:

'In terms of communication with people outside of your area, outside of the scientific community [...].'

The second one refers to the impact of someone's research on the concerned field:



[The] demonstration that you can have of actually identifying the output, their impact on industry and how you might actually use those to impact the industry or to transfer to the industry’.

P4. Simplify processes

Administrative and bureaucratic requirements linked to research are daunting for all research project participants. CSOs often do not have the relevant knowledge, fail to comprehend the terminology and do not have the resources to address these demands. Non-research organisations including CSOs are already disadvantaged with regards to these processes because they lack the organisational capacities to comply with processes (e.g. co-funding, reporting, financial accounting).

Research policymakers need to understand this situation if they are to shape research policies that are welcoming to CSO involvement.

Guiding Questions

When designing research policy and principles of research administration, policymakers should ask:

- Are the bureaucratic and administrative burdens appropriate and justified?
- If CSO involvement in research is sought, has thought been given to how processes fit with the specific needs of CSOs?
- Is simplification of processes or requirements possible for specific stakeholders such as CSOs who struggle to comply with them?

Example: Ethics review as an administrative hurdle for CSO

One CSO experienced particular difficulties in managing a required ethics approval process. Tasked to undertake user testing of severely disabled users for whom a brain computer interface technology was being developed, the CSO found obtaining the required ethical approval very challenging. The problem stemmed from the fact that the technology being developed was seen as a medical device which required a full national ethics review. However, because the CSO had no experience of acquiring ethical approval and the fact that the process of acquiring such approval was a long drawn out and complicated process, it meant that they were at a disadvantage which could have resulted in delays or a lack of realisation of results on their part.

Fortunately for the CSO, they were able to partner with a University they had prior historical connections with. Although not part of the consortium, that University was able to help them with gaining the ethics approval in time for the CSO to conduct their part of the project work.



'Having the help and support and being able to more easily overcome all the ethical problems that work and testing with end users has. That's clearly something that would help' (CSO Representative).

P5. Recognise the diverse nature of CSOs

There is no unambiguous [definition or understanding of the term CSO](#). The EU sees CSOs as legal entities that are non-governmental, not-for-profit, not representing commercial interests, and pursuing a common purpose in the public interest. This points to some of the problems. Many CSOs are not legal entities in a formal sense. It is contested whether social entrepreneurs could be viewed as CSOs.

The main issue in this recommendation is that CSOs come in very different forms, from a loosely organised neighbourhood organisation to a highly structured internationally active NGO. Policymakers need to understand this fluid nature of CSOs and recognise that CSO involvement in research is determined in large parts by policy they produce.

Guiding Questions

Policymakers should consider the following questions:

- Which assumptions about CSOs are reflected in the policy?
- Which type of CSO might be best placed to fulfil the policy aims?
- Does the policy favour CSOs that are likely to participate in research anyway and disadvantage other types of CSOs who might still make important contributions?

Example: Exclusion of CSO from research due to lack of legal status

In one of the projects investigated by the CONSIDER team the role of CSOs was to create a link between patients with a particular type of disease and the researchers developing an ICT system that was supposed to help these patients. The work undertaken by the CSOs was important to them because they saw a possibility that the research would help their members. However, it turned out that some of the CSOs were not eligible to receive European funding because they lacked the required status of a legal entity. While they had a formal organisation this did not suffice for EU funding and they subsequently had to be removed from the project.

'It was interesting to learn that the EU says to the researchers 'you need to have these persons in your project' and then you bring them into the project you are not able to have them as partners because the EU doesn't do that [accept non-legal entities]' (Researcher).

P6. Foster collaboration over competition

Research funding is often highly competitive. Funders appear to be privileging competition over collaboration. It is important to remember, however, that competition is not an end in itself, but serves aims and objectives. The purpose of competitive award of research funding is to increase quality. While this aim is achieved through competition, it is important to note that a highly competitive environment is not necessarily conducive to the inclusion of CSOs. These normally do not have the understanding of funding processes required to compete successfully. Moreover, many CSOs have community-based goals and objectives and are therefore not comfortable working in highly competitive environments.

Guiding Questions

Policymakers may want to consider questions like these when developing research policy:

- How important is CSO input into the funding instrument under consideration?
- Which quality assurance mechanisms are required?
- Can collaborative mechanisms or incentives be integrated into the call?

Example: CSO collaboration in research on ICT for disabled children

One case involved a number of different CSOs that worked together for the benefits of disabled children. The idea was to provide the children with a technical device that could restore some movement to their limbs. The different CSOs in question were all patient or parent organisations whose remit covered the specific disability of the children. This project was largely CSO driven and co-funded by the CSOs. Despite this strong role of CSOs, several respondents remarked that the competitive nature of research and research funding can be detrimental to working with CSOs, in particular those CSOs that have a strong caring focus. The competitive structure of research funding is not necessarily conducive to the inclusion of CSOs that are interested in pursuing the interests of their constituents. It may also not always be conducive to achieving the best research outcomes.

‘What is very important for the EU is trying to create a funding mechanism in which it’s actually interesting to work together instead of competing. Because we have to valorise things we want to develop’ (CSO).

‘That’s something - to create an environment where it’s actually stimulated to work together. I don’t know how it should be organised but it would be wonderful if you could sort of facilitate that’ (Project manager).



References

1 <http://www.bizmanualz.com/blog/whats-the-difference-between-policies-and-procedures.html>



2.2 Guidelines for Researchers

Who is a researcher?

Researchers here refer to those project members who are skilled and experienced in [research](#) projects and methodology. They are ‘professional’ researchers (it is their main activity) and they belong to research institutions. Their specific aims compared to other stakeholders relate to enhancing knowledge and publishing the research results in academic contexts.

Why would researchers be interested in including CSOs?

[Our findings](#) show that 21% of EU-funded Project Coordinators currently collaborate with at least one CSO. The added value provided by CSO members tends to be focused on improving the contextual relevance of the project, for policy requirements, or in line with the needs of other beneficiaries (such as patient groups, children etc.). According to our survey, when researchers do not seem to be interested in CSO participation it is primarily because they did not think of it as an option, or because it was not necessary (either in terms of the topic being investigated or as a funding requirement of the call).

There are a wide variety of [reasons for including CSOs in research](#), for example to better shape research to societal challenges, provide an opportunity for participatory research with the communities of interest, improve the translation of research results back into society, and fundamentally improve the research (and its benefits) through the input of specialist expertise and context.

Key Recommendations

Recommendations to researchers:

[R1. Clarify your reasons for CSO involvement](#)

The crucial recommendation for researchers when deciding whether and how to work with CSOs in research is to come to a clear view of why this is an option worth pursuing. Clarity of purpose is key to formulating expectations and preparing required actions. There are a variety of possible general [advantages of CSO engagement](#) that have been identified as part of the CONSIDER project, and there may be others that are linked to a particular topic or context. Additionally, it is important not only that the researchers are clear about why they wish to involve CSOs in the project, but also that such reasons are shared openly and discussed with other project partners.

It is important that all parties build in dedicated time at the start of the project to clarify the roles, responsibilities and expectations of all project members - researchers and CSOs alike. This is particularly important if CSOs were originally included in the project in order to fulfil funding requirements or other externally-driven motivations; in such cases the researchers need to make their expectations of the CSOs explicit in order to avoid later conflict. If CSOs are actively contributing to the



research process, respective expectations should be discussed and overlapping elements identified.

Including CSOs does not imply that the research must focus solely on market-oriented outcomes. Within CONSIDER there is evidence that CSOs are just as interested in expanding the boundaries of our knowledge as researchers. According to both project coordinators and CSO members, they consider the primary outcome of the project to be to enhance scientific knowledge (75% and 50% respectively). Both groups are also keen on policy-oriented outcomes.

Guiding Questions

When starting a new research project researchers should consider questions such as:

- What added value would CSO involvement be expected to contribute to the project? The answer to this key question should be communicated to potential partners as part of the initial negotiation and bid preparation processes.
- Why would a CSO want to participate? CSOs normally have social aims and the project needs to contribute to these.
- Which types of CSOs exist in the field and which CSOs would fit the requirements of the project?
- Are there any potential disadvantages to the CSO in being involved? If the research takes place in a highly contested field, the CSO's engagement should be well defined to protect both the CSO and the project.
- Is there an existing relationship in place, and/or sufficient time available to develop trust between the researchers - CSO partners? If the involvement of CSOs is expected to be of high importance for the production of knowledge, then the researchers need to trust in the CSOs. This trust can be based on shared experiences of cooperation which take place before the start of the project.

Example: Engaging a local patient group to prepare a European proposal

A southern European research institution decided to develop a proposal for a European call that sought to develop ICT applications for stroke victims. The coordinator of the proposal was an experienced researcher but her main expertise was in a related field, not exactly in the area of the call. However, as a senior scientist in a well-run research centre, she was confident enough to approach some of the leading research centres in the technical area and convince them of the value of collaboration.

As the project was aimed at a particular patient community, it was clear to the consortium members from the outset that these potential users and beneficiaries of the project would need to be represented in the project. This was also a requirement of the call. Here the reason for CSO involvement was the need for an intermediary role, linking scientists and patients and helping to build trust relationships, as well as a call prerequisite.



The coordinator included two CSOs in the consortium. One was a specialist healthcare foundation in another country. The second one was a smaller patient organisation that was located in close proximity to the coordinator. This second CSO was not research-oriented but had worked with the coordinator on previous occasions. The shared language and physical proximity facilitated discussions and the collaboration history had created mutual trust. This set-up was evaluated positively by both the coordinator and the patient groups. It did create some problems later on, however, when the lack of a shared language made collaboration of the smaller CSO with other consortium partners from different countries more difficult.

'I think they [the CSO partners] were very important and the project could not have been possible without them. They helped in the writing of the proposal first of all, identifying precisely who would be our target users and also helping to define a methodology. ... When we started the first thing we did was meet with them, do some focus groups both with clinicians and also with carers and patients and end users. They helped us define the road map of the project, and there were continuous interactions with them in the development and testing of the prototypes and getting feedback. So they were key in the whole project' (Project Coordinator).

R2. Be aware of your local institutional support and recognition

Researchers work within a variety of institutional environments which may or may not support participatory research projects. Such institutional settings include the organisation they work for (universities, research institutes, etc.), their evaluating agencies, and the global research context of their research area. For instance in environment and health fields there seems to exist an open-minded turn toward CSOs' participation in research projects, whilst in other fields this is less common.

Some researchers therefore receive positive institutional recognition when they work with CSOs, while others are disadvantaged. Importantly, participative research may require more time to set up and drive the projects than traditional science-led research (that is, research that is defined, designed and executed solely by researchers). If the institutional setting does not easily support or appreciate the additional challenges involved it may create further difficulties for such researchers to cooperate with CSOs.

Guiding Questions

Useful questions to consider when setting up a new participatory collaboration include:

- Is participatory research a standard approach within this research field? Is it worth including a partner that has previous experience of such processes rather than 'reinvent the wheel' in learning how best to conduct such work?
- What support and/or familiarity are there within the local institution for participatory research? For example are administrative staff available and/or skilled in managing such processes?



- Will the advantages of a participatory approach outweigh the challenges that arise in conducting such research?
- Are there wider career implications relating to the choice of whether or not to take a participatory research approach?

Example: Conflict between individual and institutional priorities

One researcher we spoke to specialises in organic food at a national public research institute. Though participatory research is recognised within the wider discipline, it is not regarded as the ‘best way’ to conduct such research by her own research institute. She manages to progress and gain recognition within the discipline due to her success in securing external funding such as FP7. Without such financial support she could not gain any funds from her own research institute. Her perception is that even though she receives strong academic reviews, publishes in high-ranking journals and obtains excellent evaluation of her projects, the lack of recognition of participatory research at local level has prevented her from being promoted, nor does she receive other forms of support such as administrative assistance.

R3. Clearly define the roles of consortium members

Time is a scarce resource. A project rests on strict deadlines and is often based on long-term or mid-term perspectives. Depending on the expected results, time might be seen very differently from the standpoint of either research or societal needs. Research projects usually need time to deliver concrete outcomes. CSOs expecting short term results like quality of life improvements or new tools might be disappointed they haven't arrived sooner.

Additionally, partners might not stand on equal footing with regard to time allocation and time availability. Partners entering into a new type of CSO-research collaboration should not only individually evaluate how much time they will need to handle a task, but also discuss this with the other partners in order to avoid over- or under-estimations. Otherwise such issues might endanger the global project development. Timescales, time commitment and project progress in relation to both of these are thus all necessary points of regular discussion throughout the duration of the project.

Guiding Questions

When starting a new research project researchers should consider questions such as:

- What timescales, deadlines and milestones are relevant across this project? Include likely durations for all elements, for example planning and preparation; implementation and data collection; data analysis and synthesis; report preparation; and dissemination.
- Have I discussed these timescales in depth with my partners; are they sufficiently clear? How can I better present or explain these timescales to avoid misunderstandings?



- Am I sufficiently familiar with the timescales involved in my partners' activities? Do I know where the likely 'pinch' points will be, and how they interlink with my own responsibilities?
- Are there any other stakeholders that need to be aware of the relevant timescales involved in my research? For example citizens or policymakers? Should we incorporate a timeline of the research process into all of our standard materials about the project?

Example: a citizen observatory of biodiversity

A CSO created a local biodiversity observatory in a natural habitat near an area of high industrial activity. The local inhabitants feared the pollution of air and land. The observatory was able to organise several collaborations between researchers and local inhabitants. For example they monitored different plants in the surrounding area. The citizens were trained to follow specific observation protocols, the results from which were sent on to the researcher. He or she then analysed the results. Whilst the local citizens were very keen to get involved and even contribute directly to the research, they had not anticipated the long time period between data collection and the point when the results could be explained and disseminated to the citizens. This left many of them feeling very disappointed.

'Scientific analysis takes time. During the training nobody thought of telling them they would have to wait before knowing the results. And at first we did not think either to send them newsletters. Now we do it differently'.

R4. Agree on project management principles in advance

Within the case studies explored within CONSIDER there were a series of common factors related to project management processes which predicted a successful outcome in terms of the CSO involvement in the research. Here we summarise the main project management principles which should be agreed within the consortium at the start of a project in order to ensure success.

Consortium management

In FP7 research projects there are two different management levels: first the consortium and its rules, and second the structure of the work packages. The project leader might be either a researcher or a CSO member. He or she might drive the project and, if named as Project Coordinator, be responsible for the project towards the European Commission. The consortium has to set up rules dealing with decision making, conflict resolution mechanisms, evaluation, ethics, publications, etc... From our research a clear tasks division between partners seems to be an important asset in successful projects. The structure of the work packages should reflect the way the project is managed.

The consortium communications processes should be designed to facilitate trustful relationships. A particularly important element within European projects is that



language barriers may mean that it is necessary to pay extra attention to definitions of key terms and provide an opportunity to discuss explanations of each other's expectations and skills. To enhance this process over the course of the project, one consortium member (or a group of people) may be allocated the explicit task of linking and mediating between researchers and CSOs, ensuring that both groups are fully involved at all stages.

The consortium management structure should be designed in order to support timely and effective communication and collaboration between members. This may include adapting and reorganising the work packages in order to create synergies and links between different partners. In particular, face to face meetings have proven to be necessary to strengthen relationships and to favour collaboration processes. According to the evidence from CONSIDER, social events (project dinners, cultural visits etc.) are highly useful tools in avoiding conflicts.

Rules for third parties

Careful consideration should be made when deciding whether a CSO partner is involved as a full consortium member or a third party. Entities providing external support are called 'third parties' because they do not sign the Grant Agreement. The evidence from CONSIDER has demonstrated that CSOs are in a better position to contribute when they are consortium partners, but that in specific circumstances it is easier for them to be a subcontractor, for example because of issues relating to budget thresholds. Nevertheless, it is still important to justify such involvement within the proposal, and to [clarify and communicate the reasons for CSO involvement](#) regardless of their contractual status. Rules for third parties should then be incorporated into the Grant Agreement.

Publication rules and Intellectual Property

As beneficiaries within the project team CSOs have an interest in the publication of results and any potential intellectual property that is produced from the research collaboration. Results normally belong to the beneficiary that produced them, however joint ownership might be an easy and appropriate solution when cooperating with non-profit organisations. To make it easier to negotiate a joint ownership agreement, the consortium members are advised to include general principles on joint ownership in the consortium agreement. Establishing clear publication rules at the start of the project regarding who and under which conditions partners can publish the results will prevent major problems from arising later in the project.

Conflict resolution mechanism

Instating guiding principles about conflicts of interest, equity of partners and so on at the start of the project is likely to help manage and support the resolution of potential problems should they arise during the project. For example, the grant agreement might contain management principles and bodies (steering committee, scientific committee, etc.) that include decision making process and a clear conflict resolution mechanism.



Guiding Questions

When setting up the management structure for a new research project the consortium members should consider questions such as:

- Do you need a simple majority or unanimity to take a decision?
- Are third parties (if present within the project), able to vote in consortium matters?
- How do work package leaders report to the Project Coordinator?
- How can the communications be designed to maximise the development of trust and mutual understanding between partners?
- Do the benefits outweigh the costs of involving CSOs as a consortium member / third party?
- What are the main indicators for success that will allow the project team to evaluate progress and confirm that the project results have been delivered? (see quality insurance plan for instance)

Example: The challenges of being a small organisation with little experience of EU research within a large and successful project

Despite the project being overall well managed and resulting in successful findings, a small NGO encountered key difficulties in fully participating in the research process within a large-scale collaborative programme involving more than 25 organisations. There were three key barriers that were identified:

- The management structure and project organisation meant that the CSO representatives were not always able to be available at exactly the right moment, nor for sufficient time. They were solicited and took part in the writing of the project, but the time dedicated to such tasks in their organisation wasn't enough for them to have a real impact on the design of the project as they would have liked.
- Being new to European projects, the FP7 vocabulary commonly used by the other partners was confusing and put them on the fringes of crucial discussions. The project was their first experience of a European project and they were not very comfortable with specific vocabulary such as 'deliverable', 'milestones', 'work package' etc.
- More generally, the language used within consortium discussions was never questioned as it was assumed that each European partner spoke fluent English. This was not always the case for the CSO staff and restricted the participation of certain individuals.

'We were really involved, even before the project existed, so what is embarrassing for us within the project is the language - neither X speaks English, nor myself, almost nobody within the association speaks in English and all the documents are in English' (CSO representative).



2.3 Guidelines for CSOs

What is a CSO?

[Civil society organisation](#) is a term widely used in the European policy context but less widely known elsewhere. The notion is not easy to define as it may vary according to national context and from one policy field to another.

According to the CONSIDER project, the working definition of a civil society organisation is an organisation that is non-governmental, generally not-for-profit, not representing commercial interests, and that pursues a common purpose for the public interest. CSOs are responsible for articulating the opinions of various social spheres, and cover, for example, environmental groups, minority groups, consumer representatives and patient organisations.

Why would CSOs be interested in participating in research projects?

There are various motivations that encourage CSOs to become engaged in research:

- To ensure that the interests of the group(s) the CSO represents are central to the research undertaken. This could include the new knowledge created, the methodology chosen and any innovation that may emerge from the research. The CSO is able to act as an intermediary between a given social group, academia and industry.
- Because CSOs work on the ground, they are able to contribute field-based knowledge to research, drawing on tangible and relevant sets of feedback, data, studies, etc.
- A CSO may want to act as a guardian for ethical issues in terms of methodology and outcomes.
- As research findings' may inform policymaking in a field that affects the interests or causes they represent, CSOs may want to get involved in order to help shape the research and favour a more evidence-based policymaking.

[Our results](#) show that in addition to knowledge production and feeding into policy guidelines, CSOs are primarily motivated by a desire to contribute to achieving the agreed goals of their members, or to contribute to solving a pragmatic question. The CSOs contributing to research projects often hire skilled staff who are familiar with research processes, for example they hold PhDs themselves and are experienced in the research topics being considered.

Key Recommendations

Recommendations to CSOs

[C1. Dare to take the initiative](#)

CSOs should dare to take a leading role in the design and implementation of a research & innovation project, not underestimating the knowledge and skills they can bring. Being close to a particular social or environmental issue, a CSO has good knowledge about the needs and gaps in its area of work: a CSO can work with researchers to see how research could lead to innovation to help their cause.



Therefore, by contributing actively at the development stage of the project, the CSO helps to set the right tone for equal collaboration with research bodies. CSOs should, of course, be open to different levels of engagement in projects (data collection, experience sharing, action-research, interest representation, dissemination, etc.)

Guiding Questions

The following questions could guide CSO leaders in their decision-making:

- Can we take the coordination role of the entire project or should we concentrate on leading certain areas of the project that are relevant to our activities?
- What are the research priorities that we want to put forward and how could we involve end-users in the research?

Example: CSO as project coordinator

This project focused on solar energy. Several CSOs were involved, including the project coordinator, an SME representing plumbing and heating professionals. The CSO took on both the coordination and technical aspects of the project, having the necessary technical expertise to do so. The fact that a CSO was at the helm seems to have been a major success, not least because the CSO took on more than their fair share in the project tasks. They were keen to ensure that the project succeeded in the interests of their members, even if this meant a heavy workload.

C2. Act in line with your mission, priorities and reputation

CSOs should make sure any research which they support is relevant to their interests, cause, membership or beneficiaries in the first place. The research should also be a good fit with strategic priorities for a given period. CSOs should carefully analyse the research field, the research partners, expected results, possible innovations arising and the ultimate impact before they commit. It is also important to consider what benefit or harm participation in research may have for the CSO's reputation.

Guiding Questions

The following questions could guide CSO leaders in their decision:

- To what extent does the research further our organisation's mission and priorities?
- Are we clear about the limitations as well as the potential of the research and its likely results?
- How might our participation affect the CSO's reputation?
- What is the risk that the research could harness our CSO for its own ends without real involvement?

Example: Patient organisations in medical research



Several CSOs representing patients with a chronic condition became involved in a research project without funding or being formal project partners. They did so because they had high expectations regarding the ultimate goal of the research. They were very keen to give their input and ensure that the research could improve the lives of patients suffering from the chronic disease by creating a new medical product. The CSOs influenced the project through patient feedback on the use of the product – this was vital to its success.

CSO Quote:

'I am listened to quite a lot. If I say that something is good, they will be happy to take it that way. But if I say things need tightening up, then I always feel that they go back to the drawing board and come back with ideas and ask what I think of these'.

C3. Be clear about your resources and be ready to raise funds

A CSO may have limited financial capacities and restricted staff. Research projects can be highly time-consuming and require staff dedicated to the project for management, data collection (interviews, surveys, action-research etc.), drafting and reviewing reports and articles, dissemination, financial management (expenses follow-up, financial reporting, etc.) and so on. Available resources and funding possibilities have to be discussed thoroughly with the potential research partners, and where possible, funders.

If a CSO wishes to develop its research activities, it should consider fundraising specifically for this purpose. Some CSOs are very successful in this type of activity that helps to use funding for diversification of the organisation's activities. This way, the organisation can steer research in the desired direction and demonstrate leadership that will benefit the goals the organisation pursues.

Guiding Questions

The following questions could guide CSO leaders in their decision-making:

- What are the financial resources that we can allocate to research & innovation activities?
- What are the staff resources that we can dedicate to research?
- Can we launch a fundraising campaign to launch research ourselves?
- Can we raise funds to co-finance research?

Example: CSO funding as the starting point for research

An organisation of parents of people suffering from a particular genetically inherited condition managed to attract funding to then successfully bid for national research funding. There were several CSOs involved in this research project, all of them co-funding the research. The leading CSO had created a foundation specifically with the task of funding research; it then put together the proposal which secured the national



funding contribution. By providing significant initial funding, the CSO had substantial power to shape the research to secure benefits for its cause.

CSO Quote:

'I think patient organisations could really do this more [...] It is a model that I see really works because you are the one who started it, who gave the seed money [...]
'

C4. Grow your research skills

Employees working for CSOs rarely have a research background (unless the CSO contains specific research elements). There are different levels of commitment that a CSO could make to its own research (or research funding) capacities in-house:

- invest in current staff through basic training in scientific research with a relevant specialism
- recruit a research advisor to make the link between the CSO's activities and mission-relevant research projects
- a research unit or even a separate research centre could be established.

Each level of commitment or potential stage of development would need to follow a clear strategy and adequate funding.

Guiding Questions

The following questions could guide CSO leaders in their decision-making:

- Do we have adequate funding to support the creation of a new body/set of activities?
- Will we be able to train our staff to participate in the project?
- Do some of our staff members already have research skills or interests?

Example: Home-care services research in a CSO

A CSO specialised in research and in home-care services for people with disabilities. This CSO was approached to be a partner precisely because of their research credentials. The CSO had recruited an academic researcher with a background in occupational therapy who had researched emerging health technologies. The CSO's role was to provide patient access to the researchers and technology developers for testing and feedback purposes. The CSO also supported the ethical governance of the project.

C5. Raise your visibility

As a first step towards participation in research, a CSO can gradually build up strong relations with research & innovation bodies. By collaborating on occasional activities (e.g. events, volunteering, field visits) on a regular basis and not only on specific research projects, trusting relationships and mutual understanding are established. This helps to raise visibility and give the CSO access to academic settings. CSO



leaders should use their networking skills to build relations in academia. In turn, as the CSO's activities develop, their credibility and capability to shape and lead research & innovation projects grows, thus advancing their cause.

Guiding Questions

The following questions could guide CSO leaders in their decision-making:

- What are our current connections with universities and research centres?
- Which universities locally are conducting research relevant to our mission?
- What are the experiences of other CSOs in building relations with researchers?

Example: Academic board member of a CSO

One project focused on the difficulties that female refugees and asylum-seekers face once in their destination country. This project was led by a CSO that also carries out research as part of its core activities, and involved another CSO working with the specific group. The two CSOs and the academic partner had collaborated in the past on similar projects. The academic and the main CSO were particularly close and the academic went on to become a Board member of the CSO. It is clear that collaboration in the project was based on good relations between individuals. This prior contact allowed mutual respect and understanding to grow between the academic and civil society sides.

2.4 Guidelines for Funders

Who is a funder?

Funders are those organisations, individuals, or groups of individuals that provide resources, but also administer, research projects, from the publication of a call through proposal evaluation and award to project reporting and reviews. They are intimately involved in the structure of research activities and the translation from research policy and agendas to research practice. By administering research funds they are in a strong position to shape future research directions. The key role they play in research explains the significant number of recommendations aimed at them here.

Why should funders promote civil society engagement in research?

Funding mechanisms are ways of implementing policy goals. Funders therefore need to understand research and innovation policy and shape their instruments and actions in a way that allows them to achieve the desired research & innovation policy outcomes. Their motivations for CSO inclusion mirror the underlying policy priorities. Building on the more general [reasons to involve CSOs in research](#), the main justifications for funders to include CSO involvement within funding calls include:

- To enhance transparency and accountability to the public
- To bring knowledge that comes from working with a specific societal interest
- To improve links between cutting edge research and societal interests
- To improve commercial viability of any innovative product that may be developed
- To give feedback during the research process

Key Recommendations

Recommendations to funders:

F1. Raise awareness of the issues to consider in CSO engagement

[Our results](#) show that within FP7 only 21% of research projects included CSOs, despite clearly identified [advantages to CSO participation](#), and dedicated policy goals encouraging greater civil society involvement within EU-funded research. Funders play a crucial role in emphasising and enhancing the importance of CSO involvement in research. In particular, by encouraging CSO participation, or even making it a requirement of certain calls, the relevance and status of CSOs to the research are highlighted, and a wider range of researchers and other consortium members become familiar with CSO collaborations. However, such collaborations are not without their difficulties, and it is important that such calls explicitly emphasise the need for dedicated effort in developing and maintaining the collaboration, in building trust between the various different partners, and in ensuring the project meets the expectations of all parties. By acknowledging the [challenges to CSO participation](#) upfront, funders ensure that all parties enter



the project in a more realistic mindset, and are thus able to more effectively plan and manage their resulting research programme.

Funders have the resources to contribute to such awareness raising, for example by:

- making researchers aware of the potential benefits and disadvantages of CSO involvement
- running events that highlight the opportunities for CSOs
- providing information specifically relevant for the needs of CSOs
- ensuring better visibility of funding opportunities - it was felt that CSOs are often unaware of funded research opportunities.

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- What is the purpose of requiring CSOs to be involved in this research; what is intended to be achieved as a result?
- What are the specific benefits to the involvement of CSOs in this research?
- What challenges are likely to be faced, and [how could the funding structure be set up](#) to best overcome such challenges?

Example: The importance of expectation management

A recurring theme in many of the case studies was the importance of expectation management. It is important that the different types of partners have realistic views of each other's capabilities, interests and contributions to a project. This is true for all types of partners but it often raises specific challenges for CSOs as they tend to be less familiar with practices in research projects.

This expectation management requires growing familiarity between different partners as well as a fundamental understanding of the nature of various types of organisations. Funding organisations can provide mechanisms to achieve this, for example by funding preparatory workshops or short pilot projects that allow partners to understand each other as well as the advantages and disadvantages of collaborating.

'I would say don't promise too much too soon. So you have to be careful of what you say your abilities are. On the other hand, often people take off with an idea when I make a suggestion. In a scientific setting there's a different impact compared to when I make suggestions to a patient organisation. Because the patient group will make assumptions or expect something from it. They assume that it's already been done and they expect it in a year or something like that. So one of guidelines should be don't promise too much. But on the other hand they also have to be interested. And so the way we did it was by showing the other things we developed and things like that. So we could show examples of what our work was. But also mention that a lot of this work is not yet on the market or



takes a lot of time etc... so there should be something to match the expectations of each of the partners in such a cooperation.’ (Principal Investigator)

F2. Allow CSOs to help shape the research agenda

By allowing CSOs to influence the research agenda, funders can ensure a better fit between CSO needs and requirements and the content of the research. Early inclusion of CSOs is furthermore useful to achieve certain policy goals, such as ensuring a strong link between societal needs and EU-funded research.

In order to achieve CSO input into agenda setting funders can:

- Include CSOs when developing the research agenda and calls for proposals
- Ensure CSO representation in the [proposal evaluation stage](#)

In cases where CSOs are part of the agenda setting, it is important to clarify the funders' expectations to ensure that CSOs are in agreement with their intended roles, and are capable of fulfilling their tasks in shaping research agendas.

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- Is it necessary to actively encourage participation by groups outside the community of 'usual' EU funding applicants, for example to attract smaller civil society groups or those with specialist interests?
- Is sufficient time allowed for building relationships between the CSO representatives and those involved in the strategic funding decisions?
- Are appropriate briefing mechanisms in place in order to ensure that the CSO representatives are able to take a full and active role within the agenda setting and/or proposal evaluation processes?

Example: Voices project as an example of agenda setting through public engagement

The [VOICES](#) (Views, Opinions and Ideas of Citizens in Europe on Science) project, although not one of the case studies of the CONSIDER project, is a good example of civil society engagement for the purpose of setting research agenda. It explored citizens' views on urban waste as a resource and its results were fed into the development of the next work programme in the Horizon 2020 funding programme. VOICES interacted with citizens using more than 100 focus groups and made extensive use of CSOs, in particular science museums, as means of communicating with citizens.

‘The first port of call I would make in terms of who the facilitators would be is to look to the ECSITE network, and the kinds of science museums and science communicators who I think provide a fantastic job in mobilising that

process' ([Richard Watermeyer, Cardiff University, evaluator of the VOICES project](#))

F3. Create funding structures that are sensitive to CSO needs

One frequently repeated concern voiced by CSOs was that existing funding structures do not cater for CSO needs. Many CSOs are relatively small and have very limited funds as they rely on the contribution of their members. They often lack the financial accounting capabilities required for large and bureaucratic research projects such as those required by the EU but also by many national funding regimes.

A number of detailed suggestions were made in order to overcome these problems, many specific to European funding rules. These included:

- There should be enough funding available for the CSOs to play the expected role
- CSOs should not be obliged to contribute their own core funding to a project, because the necessary money is often not available for CSOs
- Even if CSOs play a vital role in a project they should be eligible to be a subcontractor in order to reduce the bureaucratic barriers
- Funding schemes should be consistent and reliable
- Funders could provide seed funding to start up collaborations prior to a larger-scale funding call
- Bureaucratic requirements linked to funding should be reduced and streamlined

One proposal involves having open calls specifically aimed at societal issues not covered by existing work programmes. An analogy at the European level is the European Research Council which does not have a work programme but uses scientific excellence as its sole evaluation criterion. A similar institution using societal impact as its main evaluation criterion could play the role of opening up research to societal needs driven by CSOs.

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- Have [CSOs helped shape the research agenda](#) relating to the call, including the phrasing of the call document itself? If not how could their involvement be further encouraged to ensure that their needs are taken into account?
- Is there clear guidance on the appropriate distribution of funds and role of the CSO partners?
- Is sufficient emphasis placed within the call on allowing time (and resource) for team development and building trust between consortium members, especially CSOs and researchers?



Example: Avoiding tensions by recognising CSOs' funding needs and expertise

CSOs can feel alienated from research when funding structures seem to be insensitive to CSOs' needs. One project we investigated included the involvement of CSOs within most parts of the project. In particular they gave feedback on project progress at regular intervals, and provided access to representatives of end-users and the patients themselves for testing the technology being developed. However, of the total financial allocation, the CSOs involved only received a small fraction of the budget which did not sit well with them. In addition, they felt they were not being seen as equal and influential contributors to the research by the researchers because they had no specific work package responsibilities. Their perception was that a more even funding and responsibility structure was necessary, which would put them on an equal or near enough equal footing with the researchers.

'It'd be easier to cut down on the bureaucracy and this whole invoicing and things, it's just no sense. Keep it fairly simple because we're dealing with simple organisations. I think the structure of it needs to reflect the people you are dealing with.' (CSO Representative)

F4. Facilitate building connections between CSOs and researchers

Funders can be in a good position to support the relationship building that is an important foundation of CSO engagement. The building of relationships needs time. Once relationships exist and the different partners develop a better understanding of each other, further collaboration is more likely to be successful. There are many mechanisms that could be used to support such relationship building. This could be done through:

- Hosting events specifically aimed at the needs of CSOs and aiming to provide possibilities for CSOs and researchers to get to know each other.
- Implementing staged funding mechanisms that can be used initially to identify and build promising collaborations, which are then developed further in subsequent stages.
- Encouraging more pilot projects. Such 'test' activities are by their very nature considered to be new and innovative, and as a result, they instigate a willingness to take more risks. The success of such projects would be potentially very large, whereas their experimental nature means that failure would have less negative connotations than usual. Consequently, the involvement of civil society in such projects is thus viewed as lower risk, thereby becoming more likely.

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- Is it necessary to actively encourage participation by groups outside the community of 'usual' EU funding applicants, for example to attract smaller civil society groups or those with specialist interests?
- Do the necessary collaborations already exist or does time need to be allowed for this as part of the research?
- How 'established' does the relationship between the CSO and research partners need to be at application stage? Would an initial pilot programme be best to allow the establishment of relationships and testing of ideas prior to the full call? Or are there other appropriate mechanisms for connecting relevant groups?

Example: Familiarity and experience breeds conducive collaboration between CSOs and Researchers

The partners involved in one of the projects, including the two CSOs, were familiar with and had prior knowledge of each other. The familiarity stemmed from interactions at joint events such as conferences, which meant that the partners already knew and respected each other's work, and had a clear preference of working together. In addition, one of the CSOs had previously collaborated with some of the partners involved in the project.

The familiarity and experience of the CSOs and other partners in the project meant that from the start it was acknowledged that the CSOs had a crucial role to play within the project, as explained by the Coordinator in the extract below. That role included proposal writing, agenda setting within the research process through to data collection.

Though useful from the perspective of emphasising the value of civil society in research, merely requiring the inclusion of CSOs within certain funding calls is not enough to ensure a successful collaboration. Through encouraging and actively stimulating the initial development of such collaborations, and then incorporating a consideration of the strength of the partnerships into the evaluation processes of subsequent (larger) calls, funders could play a crucial role in ensuring the successful integration of civil society in research.

'I think they [CSOs] were very important and the project could not have been possible without them. They helped in the writing of the proposal first of all, identifying precisely who would be our target users and also well from the very beginning, also in the proposal helping to define a methodology. To work and to define the work plan. We defined a work plan with three iterations. Iterations that involve in each of the iterations a specifications, well requirements, well research, testing and validation and feedback to start...to specifications again. So we did this iterative process, these three iterations. And this methodology was devised with them from the very proposal; and during the project when we started the first thing we did was meet with them, do some focus groups both with Clinicians and also with careers and patients and end users. They helped us define the road map of the project, the specifications of the three incremental prototypes that we were going to develop. And there were continuous interactions with them in the

development of those prototypes and testing of those prototypes and getting feedback from the tests to feedback the research and development process. So they were key in the whole project.’ (Researcher)

F5. Emphasise the importance of dissemination and impact

By their very nature, research projects that involve CSOs are likely to produce results that are of interest to wider civil society. Due to their existing connections and networks CSOs are often well placed to assist in disseminating such findings, however they frequently have little incentive to publish academically, and may not have the resources centrally to support dedicated dissemination efforts outside the main project.

To ensure project findings are disseminated as effectively as possible to civil society, funders could:

- Provide dedicated funding to support CSOs in widely disseminating the project findings outside the academic community, especially once a project has finished.
- Encourage long-term impact and follow up activities (including advocacy and dissemination of results) by making such efforts a requirement for project proposals.
- Provide follow-on funding for successful projects. The European Research Council’s Proof of Concept grants could serve as an example of how such follow-on funding could be shaped.
- Ensure that project results don't just disappear following the end of the project and facilitate the exchange of results and work between past, current and future projects.

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- Are the expectations regarding dissemination and impact clear, in particular with regard to the potential role that CSOs could play? In particular, are the financial expectations and regulations likely to assist in encouraging better commitment to wide distribution of project findings, including the involvement of CSOs in such processes?
- Are there alternative funding mechanisms that can better embed achievement and monitoring of research impacts over time?
- Is it appropriate to ring-fence a certain proportion of the budget for these purposes?

Example: Disseminating beyond the life-time of a project

CONSIDER’s research has shown that CSOs have been instrumental in disseminating research results as they unfold during the course of a project, or in raising awareness of the project itself within their communities of interest.



However, such dissemination usually ends when the project ends because of lack of continued funding and therefore focus. Given that many projects only achieve their main results towards the end of the project life-cycle, this means that the CSOs only have a very limited window of opportunity for dissemination and that arguably a much greater impact could be achieved if such dissemination work was able to continue for longer. As such funders ought to consider ways of providing extra funding that can allow CSOs to continue their dissemination efforts in order for the work to have continued impact.

'Everything we find out is disseminated in academia but also into society. It's a big part of the research, a big part of why we got the grant money in the first place. So creating value for society.' (Researcher)

F6. Celebrate positive research outcomes involving CSOs

CSOs are primarily motivated through their interests in solving (or at least improving) a particular societal challenge. It is therefore important for them to understand how research can achieve this. Highlighting specific examples of how research incorporating CSOs has led to change will allow CSOs currently lacking research experience to appreciate its relevance.

A publicly available online database containing good practice examples and short vignettes could provide an overview of current and past activities. Such a repository could furthermore support some of the other objectives such as the creation of networks and [establishing contacts between researchers and CSOs](#).

Guiding Questions

Funders who are considering encouraging the involvement of CSOs in research projects should consider:

- What existing success stories can we promote relating to the involvement of civil society in research? Do we need to establish a mechanism for specifically capturing such stories (for example through commissioning the drafting of the vignettes mentioned above)?
- How can CSO involvement be highlighted within existing publications and mechanisms to showcase excellent research that we fund?
- What communication channels exist within civil society through which we can disseminate our research highlights?
- Is civil society involvement sufficiently emphasised within our websites, brochures and other materials?

Example: Sustainable results of a project on aquacultural development

The field of work for this research project was the development of aquaculture in the Mediterranean area. The project aimed to identify the research infrastructure of all the countries in the consortium and promote ways of grouping and harmonising the research activities, through the creation of a stakeholder platform that will be sustained after the end of the project. All the individuals we

interviewed recommended that there is a need to identify ways to share the results further after the end of the project, instead of ‘shelving them somewhere’.

The dissemination partner further argued that a project is *‘Successful not only when it reaches the research objectives of the project, but also when they are able to transfer that knowledge to the relevant user.’*

F7. Ensure sensitivity to CSO-related issues during evaluation

Proposal evaluation is a key first step in deciding the success or otherwise of a research project. Most funding bodies work with peer review as their main evaluation mechanism. Research proposals are normally written by researchers and most evaluators are active researchers, therefore there can be a competence gap in evaluating CSO participation. Additionally, one way of ensuring that CSO involvement is valued and explicitly considered by project partners is to separately focus on CSO engagement during post-project evaluation of projects.

If funders want to ensure that CSO engagement is planned and implemented in a way that fulfils their objectives they should make sure that the individuals evaluating the proposals and final reports both understand those objectives, as well as the practicalities of involving CSOs in research. It is important that evaluators understand [the nature and motivations of CSOs](#) and the [organisational practices](#) that can determine the success or failure of CSO collaboration. This means that evaluators need training and instruction to ensure that they can evaluate relevant proposal appropriately. Further information on this front is contained within the [Evaluators and Reviewers](#) recommendations section.

Guiding Questions

- What are the expectations around [evaluating the success of the CSO involvement](#)? Is this explicit within the funding call?
- Are the existing evaluators aware of the issues relating to CSO involvement in research, or is it necessary to provide separate guidance / briefing?
- Is the existing evaluation pool broadly representative of stakeholders' interests; should more civil society representatives be encouraged to contribute?

Example: User Panel to Evaluate Proposals

In one of the national funding streams investigated in one of the CONSIDER case studies, the funder set up a panel consisting of users and their representatives with a view of ensuring that their views were considered. The funding stream focused on technology development for dementia patients and the panel represented patients, carers and other stakeholders involved in dementia care. This user panel that comprised several CSO representatives evaluated both proposal and project outcomes.

'I think there were about - I am not sure but maybe 50 projects or so we advised. And the good thing was that the scientists were thinking 'oh yeah we have to go to this group, it's important for them so we can arrange our research in this way. I think it's a success because now they come voluntarily to us for advice.' (CSO Representative)



2.5 Guidelines for Evaluators

Who is an evaluator or reviewer?

An evaluator or reviewer is an individual who judges the value and/or success of the research, either at proposal stage (as part of the funding decision making processes), or during the progress of the project itself. The EU-Commission recruits high-level experts from academia, business or from the Civil Society to evaluate proposals and review running research processes. The experts are contracted by the Commission on a limited basis. Their motivation to be involved might be to support the scientific mechanisms that aim to supporting good research quality or they could also be interested in extending their networks through the collaboration with other peers across fields from different parts of Europe.

Why would an evaluator or reviewer be interested in the role of CSOs in research?

CSOs are involved in a research project because their specific competences are expected to boost the project somehow, e.g. by having transformative effects on the knowledge production, by providing expert knowledge, by increasing the legitimacy of the project, by using their often wide dissemination networks to share insights from the project etc. Sometimes the practices of CSO involvement are based on scientific methods like transdisciplinary research, action research or community based participatory research but often they are not well structured. We expect the wide application of [Responsible Research and Innovation \(RRI\)](#) within the Horizon2020 which will lead to more projects involving CSOs. Against this background, the recommendations listed here are hints for evaluators to examine structural necessities for successful projects involving CSOs.

Key Recommendations

Recommendations to evaluators or reviewers:

[E1. Consider the public relevance of the project](#)

In contrast to regular proposals and projects, research work involving CSOs should have a specific public relevance. The proposals should not only entail a vague connection to societal overwhelming topics like ageing or sustainability but should make clear why, how and to what extent the results will inform and support the work of CSOs or will contribute to solving explicit public problems.

Guiding Questions

When evaluating proposals or projects including CSOs, evaluators and reviewers could ask:

- Is it clear how the project relates to broader public interests?
- How do the CSOs relate to the public relevance of the project?



- Are the CSOs involved well positioned to represent or communicate with social groups affected by the research?

Example: Sustainable indigenous economies

One of the projects we studied aimed at spreading knowledge on how to organize the economies of indigenous communities in an ecological and sustainable way. It involved several different CSOs who have been engaged in activities around environmental safety and ecological education before. Through the project, the personnel of the CSOs learned how to apply various research methods, to analyse data and draw scientific as well as practical recommendations. The interviewed CSO leader ensured that these activities will support the CSOs' future work as they can work with the methods and the results on a daily basis. The results will inform the education programmes. Besides, the cooperation between the CSOs and the researchers attracted the attention of national politicians which led to regular press conferences and thus made the CSOs' activities public through various media channels.

The researcher we interviewed pointed out that in order to emphasize the public relevance of a project it might be necessary to involve the CSOs from the very beginning:

'For me, the inclusion of CSOs into research projects is important for being connected to current societal problems and needs. Pure science is missing this part. You need to adapt science to the needs of those who are the end-users, for instance in the case of technologies, or where the actual problem has emerged from. You need to make the connection which might be missing in the realm of pure science. Taking this aim seriously, we involve CSOs in different stages of the project – not only in the end for dissemination, but also in the beginning for agenda setting.'
(Researcher)

E2. Review the appropriateness of the proposed co-operation structures and funding allocation

One can differentiate between two types of projects involving CSOs, those where CSOs play a transformative role for the knowledge production and others where this is not the case. For the latter types of projects an evaluator needs to check how and to what extent the involvement of CSOs relates to broader societal concerns ([check recommendation E1](#)). For first types of projects where CSOs have an important effect on the scientific outcomes the cooperation and communication structures should be adapted towards the expected contribution of the CSOs with regards to possible outcomes. This does not mean that the CSOs necessarily need to play an authoritative role but that it should be clear and transparent at the beginning of the project how their expectations are channelled to support solving the research problem – and to prevent disappointment which can cause serious problems or a premature end of the research activity.

The cooperation structures need to be based on appropriate funding and resourcing. The cooperation between CSOs and researchers creates extra costs when compared to normal research projects. Mutual expectations need to be adapted



because whereas researchers relate their activities to theoretically relevant problems, CSOs need to draw practical consequences. It has proved to be true that the problem-definition process between CSOs and researchers takes longer than in a typical project (often double of the normal time). This means an evaluator reviewing a research proposal should examine if the interests of both sides are considered in an understandable way and that the project will stay on track because its governance structure provides enough mechanisms of communication and maybe even problem and milestone adaption.

Guiding Questions

Evaluators and reviewers could ask:

- Is the CSOs' role in the project described in a way that is clear and unambiguous?
- Are the cooperation structures conducive to the researchers' and CSOs' aims and objectives?
- Where CSOs are meant to have a transformative role, will the project allow them to fulfil this?
- Are there sufficient resources available to support the cooperation between CSOs and other project partners?

Example: A complex community-based environmental project

We conducted research on a community-based research project where several CSOs and local communities were involved. The project aimed to determining the dangers and consequences of an industrially caused environmental disaster for the members of the local communities. The project was sponsored in a funding stream that made the participation of CSOs and communities as a success criterion of the proposal. The process of setting up the proposal was initiated by the communities and CSOs. They had a vital interest in the research results and it took the consortium (consisting of 5 research partners, 2 communities, and 5 CSOs) one and a half years from the first idea to finalising the proposal.

The project structure included two individuals who are mostly employed for caring for the problems of the communities and CSOs on the one hand as well the problems and conflicts of the researcher on the other hand. They talked to responsible people each week. The leading research partners and the leading community/CSO partners had telephone conferences on a monthly basis, organized trips to visit each other on a regular basis (at least once every three months). Further, a board of decision makers consisting of CSO representatives and researchers was established which was responsible for urgent decisions or for developing action strategies for existing conflicts. The sponsor set up a commission where CSOs, communities and researchers sent representatives. This commission was supposed to monitor and supervise the projects funded within the same stream. And of course, all these activities were costly and expensive but had been reflected in the research proposal.

The coordinator of the project made it clear that the project structure contained



several different evaluation and feedback mechanisms to ensure the project stays on track and receives support from all involved:

'We evaluate our project in several forms. One is by virtue of our frequent interactions both amongst ourselves and with our community partners, constantly reminding us of where we are in the equation, how things are progressing. In addition to that, we are expected to provide annual evaluations to [the funders]. And they actually have the authority to make changes to our program if they deem them required. Our consortium has an external advisory board made up of experts in both community based participatory research and our relevant sciences, who can look at us on an annual basis as a functioning entity to determine whether we are meeting the objectives of the project. And then, I think, we get through these semi-annual committee interactions with our partners a more formal evaluation based on what we are able to report. So I think there are levels of scrutiny that collectively provide the necessary oversight and checks and balances making this project stay on track'
(Project Coordinator)

E3. Take into account the dissemination potential

Projects involving CSOs have an advantage which other project often cannot make use of: large networks. Being connected to other CSOs, to decision-makers, to companies but often as well to the general citizens is one of the key conditions for a CSO to survive and to spread their normative ideas of the world or how it should be. That is why proposals need to entail explanations how this resource will be used. This can be the case in the end of the project, but should actually be considered in the beginning and during the complete project life cycle. At best there should be a strategy to continuously attract public attention.

Guiding Questions

Evaluators and reviewers should ask:

- Who are the stakeholders that the project should communicate with?
- Are the CSOs involved well placed to facilitate this communication?
- Does the project structure allow such communication?

Example: Sustainable energy production

A research project in the context of sustainable energy production is led by an environmental safety organisation which has scientifically trained staff. The only research partner is a company. We asked the person responsible in the funding organisation why a project was selected that is led by a CSO. The interviewee answered that he knows by experience that the CSO is capable of doing research work. Based on this experience, the sponsor expects the CSOs to widely disseminate all results of the research project. The reason given for that was that the sponsor described itself as a state-related actor for environmental safety. The sponsor wanted to make sure that all information is communicated widely but mostly to the normal citizen so that further activities in the research and action field will find



much support.

'It is important to reach the practitioners and science on an equal level. We need to fulfil the scientific demands of quality but also disseminate our information to the ones applying it in practice. That is why project results are published in a scientific series of publications and in handbooks. You need to be a two-timer. You have the scientific data which is important and you have the human.' (Funder)



2.6 Additional Information

Also see our [note on distinguishing between these different stakeholder groups](#).

Further information

In addition to the recommendations themselves we have prepared a series of supporting summaries. These texts are designed to provide further context and insights from the CONSIDER project.

Where do these recommendations come from?	This section provides further background into the CONSIDER project and its methodology, which were the basis of the identification of the above recommendations.
How has civil society been involved in the CONSIDER project?	An overview of the ways in which the perspectives of CSO representatives were integrated into the project, through both formal and informal channels.
Typology of CSO involvement	As a result of our in-depth case studies we have been able to identify six main types of CSO involvement in research projects. Find out more at the above link.
What is the current state of CSO involvement in EU-funded research?	A summary of the results from our survey of 14 000 EU-funded research projects.
Why include CSOs in research?	An outline of the main arguments for involving CSOs in research, based on the findings from our empirical evidence.
What are the potential risks and challenges of CSO participation?	We also identified a series of issues relating to CSO involvement in research projects - making efforts to overcome such barriers is more likely to result in a successful collaboration.
How can the recommendations and guidelines feed into the European Research Area (ERA)?	This section explicitly maps the CONSIDER findings onto the ERA's strategic priorities.

You may also be interested in our [Glossary](#) or relevant [Links and resources](#).

Frequently asked questions

- [Is there really a difference between CSOs and researchers?](#)



- How can researchers identify suitable CSOs? (under construction)
- [What advice do you have for CSOs who are interested in getting involved in EU projects - especially about identifying suitable research partners?](#)
- [What is the relationship between research and innovation?](#)
- [How does this link into the European Commission's emphasis on Responsible Research and Innovation \(RRI\)?](#)

3 Limitations and Future of the Guidelines

These guidelines are based on the conceptual and empirical findings of the CONSIDER project. They represent the best knowledge available to the consortium at the end of the project. The consortium believes that following these guidelines will help render CSO involvement fruitful and help avoid possible pitfalls and downsides.

However, the consortium realises that by the nature of its approach (focus on the project level) it was not in a position to cover every conceivable aspect of CSO engagement. Moreover, CSO involvement in research projects should be understood as one particular example of public engagement in science and innovation. As a consequence it is clear that there are numerous aspects of CSO involvement and public engagement more broadly that are not covered in depth here and need further attention.

One example is that there are further stakeholder groups that may have an impact on the way CSO's engaging research and that therefore might warrant specific guidelines. These will include industry, university managers and administrators.

It is therefore clear that the guidelines have to be understood as a contribution to an ongoing discourse, rather than a final product set in stone. This is the reason why they are disseminated via the website which not only allows for further modification but also for commenting and discussion.

It is hoped that the guidelines will be taken up by relevant related projects, groups and other activities. They can inform policy on organisational, national and European level. They can also provide the basis for further research as they contain a number of hypotheses about the relationship between various actors and their role in research which is open to more detailed investigation.



4 Background Information: Development of the Guidelines

The focus of this deliverable is on the presentation of the Guidelines in printed form to submit a suitable document to the European Commission. While this finished product and outcome of the CONSIDER project is the key of the deliverable, readers may be interested in how the guidelines came into being why they took the shape they now have. This final section therefore outlines how the consortium defined the requirements and used numerous available sources to arrive at the guidelines shown above.

4.1 Requirements According to the DoW

In the original proposal work package 4 contained three deliverables that correspond with the three tasks. During contract negotiation the initial deliverable that aimed to outline the structure and principles of the guidelines handbook was deleted, so that the current deliverable has to report on the work undertaken in tasks 4.1 and 4.2.

To clarify this structure, the full wording of the two tasks is reproduced here:

**Task 4.1: Development of requirements for guidelines (DMU) - Start: M6
End: M12**

Partners involved: DMU, UCL, SPIA

The CONSIDER research needs to be conducted in a way that will render it amenable to practical policy recommendations. It is therefore important that this requirement of practical relevance is injected across the CONSIDER project early in the research phase. This will be achieved by developing a clearly defined set of requirements that will serve as an input to the work conducted in earlier WPs, as well as ensure that the resulting guidelines will be both useful and relevant, and involving a large number of Associates, a number of whom will be policy stakeholders in the project from the outset.

Task 4.2: Development of Guidelines (SPIA) - Start: M12 End: M24

Partners involved: DMU, FUNDP, CNRS-LU, KIT, EN, UCL, SPIA

The development of the guidelines will be integrated into the data analysis and model development processes conducted in the other WPs. It will be a separate but closely linked process, which will be supported by the entire consortium. This will ensure that new insights and knowledge will find an appropriate place and that all areas of expertise will have the opportunity to contribute. The final guidelines will provide a blueprint for researchers and CSOs for efficiently and effectively being engaged in research by defining the core principles such as accountability and democratic legitimacy a CSO should follow in order to participate in R&D.

In order to be practicable the CONSIDER consortium recognises that the guidelines must be specific and concise. It is therefore envisaged that distinct versions of the guidelines will be developed for specific stakeholder groups, which are likely to include the following:

1. Civil Society Organisations
2. Researchers and public research organisations



3. Industry, commercial research organisations
4. Policymakers
5. Participation facilitators (e.g. organisers of participation exercises or projects).

In order to facilitate the usage of guidelines and recommendations by stakeholders, CONSIDER will develop a number of simple to use ICT tools to guide users through recommendations and findings. These might be implemented using standard spreadsheet or database applications.

It should be clear from this quote from the DoW that the present deliverable has to cover the requirements for the guidelines as well as the substantive guidelines and the way they were assessed and evaluated and disseminated.

The Description of Work uses the terms 'guideline' and 'recommendation' interchangeably. A guideline can be defined as a statement that aims to determine the course of action¹. The term recommendation can have similar meaning but it can also mean appraisal or approval of something². Importantly in the context of a European research project, one should note that recommendations in the European Union have the status of non-binding acts.

In the context of the CONSIDER project in general, and this deliverable in particular, guidelines and recommendations are interpreted as statements suggesting good practice that will allow their audience to act in ways that are conducive to a positive integration of CSOs in research. To avoid confusion the term 'guidelines' was preferred wherever possible.

4.2 Methodology: Constructing Useful Guidelines

The CONSIDER DoW is explicit that the guidelines are meant to be practical and useful to the range of stakeholders involved in activities related to CSO engagement in research. At the same time, the guidelines needed to represent the unique insights of the consortium arising from the various stages of the research.

In order to come to a good understanding of the principles and presentation of the guidelines and the form of the handbook, the consortium started by looking for examples of good practice arising from similar projects or from activities that aimed to provide policy advice and practical guidance in comparable ways. This was done by asking the European Commission and other stakeholders about their views of good practice in the area.

4.3 Stages of the Development of the Guidelines

Following the general project approach, an initial plan for the development of the recommendations was developed at the beginning of the project (see **Error! Reference source not found.**).

The principle of the development of the recommendations was: first, to develop a set of formal standards and criteria that they should meet; second, to collect candidates for inclusion in the project recommendations from theoretical and empirical research

¹ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guideline> accessed 05.01.2014

² <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/159715#eid26614394> accessed 05.01.2014

within the project; and finally, to explore the usefulness of these in collaboration with potential users and stakeholders.

This deliverable gives a brief overview of the development of the recommendations and how the consortium arrived at the versions listed below.

4.4 Structure of Guidelines

In order to ensure that the guidelines were useful and practical, the consortium aimed to develop a set of criteria that would characterise a successful set of recommendations.

4.4.1 Good Practice Examples According to the Project Officer

On 14.02.2012 the CONSIDER coordinator asked the project PO for guidance on what the European Commission considers good practice and good examples of comparable projects and their outputs. The PO answered in two emails on 06 and 07.03.2012 listing the following good practice examples:

- TECHNOLIFE: <http://technolife.no/> (good practice in terms of ICT tools that can be used)
- CIPAST: <http://www.cipast.org/>
- Meeting of Minds: <http://www.meetingmindseurope.org/>
- CRÉPE: <http://crepeweb.net/>
- SAFMAMS: <http://www.ifm.dk/Safmams/>
- GAP1- GAP2: <http://www.gap2.eu/>
- MASIS (monitoring policy and research activities on SiS in Europe) - the website contains 37 national reports mapping activities and actors in all EU and associated countries (only Malta is missing) www.masis.eu
- the collaborative project SIAMPI (**S**ocial **I**mpact **A**ssessment **M**ethods for research and funding instruments through the study of **P**roductive **I**nteractions between science and society)
- RISKBRIDGE: <http://www.riskbridge.eu/> (in German)
- CEECEC project: <http://www.ceecec.net/handbook/>

A review of these projects and their outputs showed a wide variety of practice in terms of output style and dissemination. A shared feature that most of them display and that was confirmed by a range of discussions with stakeholders was that guidelines arising from projects need to be specific to stakeholders, take their circumstances into account, offer actionable advice that the addressees are able to implement.

The review of good practice in this area did not lead to a clear structure of guidelines but informed the process of their development. CONSIDER always aimed to be a reflective and participative project and it used the input from its various interactions with stakeholders (e.g. surveys, case study interviews, workshops) to formulate guidelines and gather feedback on these. In this document we present the main milestones of this process. It should be clear, however, that there was much informal interaction that shaped the structure and content of the guidelines.



4.4.2 Stakeholders Targeted by Recommendations

Following the original ideas for the guidelines as described in the DoW, which was confirmed during the research, it was decided to develop a set of guidelines for the main stakeholder groups. In the DoW the groups mentioned were:

- Researchers
- CSOs
- Policymakers
- Industry
- Participation facilitators

During the project it became clear that there was little that the CONSIDER project could say to industry. The reason was that our data indicated that there is relatively little co-involvement of industry and CSOs, at least in the projects we investigated in detail. The research thus did not provide a basis for recommendations to industry. The final group of the original list, participation facilitators similarly played no major role in the findings. The proposal assumed that there were specialist individuals and organisations that create links between civil society and researchers and other project participants. During the project we found that such a role does indeed exist, but that those who play this role tend to be CSOs. As a matter of fact, this is one of the most important roles that CSOs play. We therefore did not distinguish between these facilitators and CSOs and any guidelines for them are found in the guidelines for CSOs.

While two of the designated target audiences for the guidelines were thus lost, it turned out that further groups were important and were added. One important distinction contained in the final version of the guidelines is that between policymakers and funders. The research indicated that there is a difference between them, even though they can be represented by the same organisation. On the European level, for example, the European Commission plays both roles simultaneously. However, there are important aspects of a strategic nature that are determined by research policy that influence CSO involvement in research. Research policy determines which aims CSO involvement is to achieve and thus influences what type of engagement by which type of actor is likely to be conducive to this. Research policymakers are thus a key audience for the guidelines.

At the same time it became clear during the course of the project that there are also numerous actions taken on a more operational and administrative level that can make a crucial difference to the success of CSO engagement. We therefore developed a specific set of guidelines for funders whose remit it is to implement research policy through funding programmes and the administration of grants.

Finally, it was decided to include research evaluators as a separate group who are the subject of a specific set of guidelines. Research is generally evaluated by peer reviewers who determine the quality of proposals and their implementation. If CSO engagement is to play an important role in research, then the individuals tasked with evaluating the concept of such engagement as well as the quality of realisation, i.e. the evaluators, need specific insights and guidance.

The final list of guidelines arising from the CONSIDER project therefore includes the following specific audiences:

- Researchers



- CSOs
- Policymakers
- Funders
- Evaluators

4.4.3 Additional Content of Guidelines

In addition to the specific guidelines for the groups just outlined, it was seen as important that individuals engaging with them would be aware of their complexity and the context within which they were developed. Guidelines to stakeholders are by necessity simple and accessible. This means that they have to simplify reality and present complex situations in highly reduced but not simplistic ways. The CONSIDER project has clearly shown that each case of CSO involvement in research is unique and that abstraction beyond individual cases comes at the cost of loss of detail. This is, of course, not surprising and a feature of most research, in particular large scale social research.

It was therefore deemed important to provide readers with some of the context, caveats and background to the guidelines, so that research so inclined could develop a more detailed appreciation of the guidelines.

4.4.4 Medium of Delivery

One important discussion in the course of developing the guidelines, concerned the medium or media in which they were to be created and disseminated. As the name of this document suggests, the original idea was to produce a 'handbook', i.e. a comprehensive stand-alone document containing all of the guidelines.

This idea was originally pursued and, as is discussed below, the first draft of the guidelines was actually presented in the form of a separate document. The feedback on this document as well as discussion within the consortium showed, however, that this was not the best format for the guidelines. While the distinction between the stakeholders tends to be fuzzy (e.g. a CSO representative may well work for a university and be a researcher), it became clear that individuals would be likely to be more interested in particular guidelines pertaining to their activities than in all of the guidelines simultaneously. Printed documents do not make it easy to navigate and focus on issues one is interested in. A cross-linked website is a better medium for this purpose.

A further concern was that of availability and the ability to survive after the end of the project. Stand-alone documents such as this deliverable have the advantage of being able to be stored separately, but by the same token, they can very easily disappear. A separate web-search of prior research on public engagement in FP6 and FP7 provided anecdotal evidence that in many cases these outputs can vanish without a trace.

Finally, it is clear that the guidelines presented here are subject to further research and development and should not be seen as a static product. A medium that allows users to contribute, share ideas and experience is thus much preferred over a static document.

As a result the consortium decided to display the guidelines as a set of interlinked webpages. During the final year of the project the project website was migrated to a



Google site. Google sites offer limited web functionality but they have a number of important advantages:

- They are free to set up and maintain and therefore promise continued existence and visibility of their content.
- They are well indexed by Google and thus easily accessible through search engines.
- They are based on technologies that are accessible by the widest range of computers and browsers, thus ensuring broad coverage.

For these reasons it was decided to develop the guidelines as a set of web pages and integrate them into the CONSIDER website. With the end of the project the guidelines will take the central place on the project homepage, thus ensuring that they are the key legacy of the project that could be easily retrieved and used by anyone.

4.5 Possible Guidelines to be Included

Having decided on structure, audiences and delivery of the guidelines, the crucial question was which specific guidelines were to be included. The consortium decided to answer this question by starting with a broad collection of possible candidates and to narrow down the guidelines to be put forth by the CONSIDER project in the next step.

When developing the guidelines the consortium agreed that these should be primarily derived from the research undertaken in the CONSIDER project. At the same time, the consortium is clear that its work is not undertaken in isolation and that a considerable number of recommendations and guidelines already exist. Hence, while focusing on development of new guidelines, the consortium agreed to also emphasise the importance of relevant guidelines already published.

In collecting guidelines the consortium started with those that arose from its unique contribution, i.e. they model of CSOs in research (see deliverable D3.3). Further guidelines originating from the project include those provided by respondents during the interviews as well as the various workshops and stakeholder activities. For the sake completeness the consortium also looked at guidelines arising from other European and nationally funded projects.

For reference purposes all these candidates were collected and are included in this document in Appendix: Guidelines Candidates. It is important to reiterate that this raw material did not lend itself to simply be adopted, as the various sources and context mean that some of them are contradictory and many of them were not consistent with the insights of the project.

4.6 Process of Developing the First Draft of the Guidelines

The guidelines represent the heart of the findings and contribution of the CONSIDER project. The significant theoretical and empirical efforts undertaken by the consortium and documented in the project deliverables all aimed to provide insights that could be communicated to stakeholders with a view of helping them improve the way CSOs are integrated into projects. The collection of candidates for guidelines described in the previous section was one step in this lengthy and complex process. The consortium was clear that the guidelines proposed by the project had to be



supported by the empirical, conceptual and analytical work undertaken in the project. The collection of potential guidelines was one of many steps in this process.

The consortium engaged in an extensive discussion of the principles of selection and the key aspects of guidelines to be proposed. The first priority was going to be guidelines arising from the model of CSOs in research, which is an original contribution of the CONSIDER project. In addition it was agreed to include guidelines that resonated with insights from the theoretical and empirical work undertaken.

In order to allow these guidelines to be presented and communicated in a coherent manner, structures were discussed that would allow for such presentation. A first suggestion was to look at the stages of research during which guidelines might be of relevance as well as the potential audiences. It was proposed to distinguish between four main stages of project development: Strategic Preparation, Project planning, Project execution and Post-project. In addition there were a number of guidelines that did not fit into the temporal structure and which were characterised by their relevance to the research environment, infrastructure and conditions. Combining these temporal stages with the various stakeholders to whom the guidelines are directed, led to the following matrix of guidelines:

	Strategic Preparation	Project planning	Project execution	Post-project	Environment / Infrastructure / conditions
Researchers					
CSOs					
Policymaker					
Funder					

Table 1: structure of early guidelines

Using this structure the consortium started to identify the most important guidelines to be communicated. As indicated above, this was a lengthy process involving numerous meetings of the consortium and much discussion on priorities and details of the guidelines. For the sake of easy communication it was decided to express each guideline with a brief heading which could then be supplemented by more detail. This led to the following overview of guidelines which was used for initial collection of feedback from stakeholders.

	Strategic Preparation	Project Planning	Project Execution	Post-Project	Environment / Infrastructure / Conditions

	Strategic Preparation	Project Planning	Project Execution	Post-Project	Environment / Infrastructure / Conditions
Researchers (in organisations other than CSOs)	Clarify your reasons for CSO involvement	Build relationships and trust Start to understand each other Build support structures	Strengthen relationships Establish communication Build good project (management) structures	Learn from and build on successful experience	Create awareness Develop networks Develop capacities
People working for CSOs	Dare to take the initiative Develop partnerships with researchers Choose research in line with your priorities	Mobilise resources Clarify capabilities	Sustain partnership and trust		Create partnerships
Policymaker	Create an environment conducive to CSO participation in research Rethink scientific excellence	Provide preparation material	Simplify processes	Ensure visibility of outcomes	Clarify concepts Highlight potential advantages of CSO involvement

	Strategic Preparation	Project Planning	Project Execution	Post-Project	Environment / Infrastructure / Conditions
Funder	<p>Raise awareness of pros and cons of CSO engagement</p> <p>Allow CSOs to shape the research agenda</p> <p>Facilitate relationship building between CSOs and researchers</p> <p>Cater for innovative project formats</p> <p>Create funding structure that is sensitive to CSO needs</p>	<p>Create structures to sustain networks</p> <p>Shape calls to encourage CSO involvement</p> <p>Set incentives that promote CSO involvement</p> <p>Allow for more time and flexibility</p>	<p>Show flexibility in project plans</p> <p>Provide specific funding to allow CSOs to obtain their goals</p>	<p>Make available extra funding for dissemination and impact</p> <p>Evaluate CSO engagement separately</p>	<p>Recognise the specifics of CSOs</p> <p>Simplify bureaucratic procedures</p>
Industry	<p>Understand CSO involvement as a way of reaching out to users and developing mutual understanding and trust.</p>	<p>Timescales for industry are different from researchers'. Clarify expected timescale of research</p>	<p>CSO inside the project: play the interface between the world of the research and the world of the industry.</p>		

	Strategic Preparation	Project Planning	Project Execution	Post-Project	Environment / Infrastructure / Conditions
General / not specific to any of the above or more than one	Early involvement of partners in agenda setting facilitates demonstrates that partners are being valued and therefore creates a positive starting point.	Clearly define roles of different partners in the consortium Choose partners who share the vision of the project and are capable of fulfilling their tasks prior determination of clear and specific division of work: all members know what their roles are Mutual knowledge of the different partners. Have a partner dedicated solely to dissemination	Be flexible for surprises! - The theoretical expectations of scientists and the practical experiences of CSOs might often not match. One person of the consortium specialised and dedicated to supporting and animation methods to help good relations between participants and so to contribute to the good running of a research project More meetings, especially face-to-face meetings, can improve relations between		



	Strategic Preparation	Project Planning	Project Execution	Post-Project	Environment / Infrastructure / Conditions
		Diversify stakeholders and participants in the project	partners Recognise that there are differences between stakeholders and use them to create synergies		

Table 2: First draft of headings of guidelines

This table contains the core of the guidelines that were included in the first draft of the guidelines Handbook. This first draft is available here in **Error! Reference source not found.** It was used for the purpose of collecting feedback on various occasions and from a variety of stakeholders.

4.7 Expert Workshop

The most notable event used to collect feedback was an expert workshop held on 1 July 2014 in the premises of the European commission (see appendix C for an agenda of the event and list of participants). This event that counts as one of the project workshops and is therefore also covered in the workshop report, was a crucial step in the development of the guidelines. It was a whole-day event bringing together various types of stakeholders with the specific purpose of collecting feedback in the process of developing the final version of the guidelines.

This workshop and the feedback received on the first draft of the guidelines was of crucial importance in developing the final version of the CONSIDER guidelines. The full text of the workshop description is available in D 4.2, the Expert Workshop Proceedings.

The workshop brought many new issues to light regarding CSO participation in research projects. Both the initiative and the proposal received positive reception, with participants underlining that the overall rationale of the guidelines should be that multi-stakeholder cooperation in research should be supported. Through effective multi-stakeholder relationships, research will be strengthened by broader engagement, knowledge and capacity.

The workshop focussed on two key areas: content and dissemination. Participants agreed that the document contains novel and relevant content but it lacks actionable guidance. Furthermore, CONSIDER's vision of the proposal is unclear. The guidelines and recommendations cannot fulfil the needs of all stakeholders, across all projects, at all levels. The document must be clear in its limitations, delivering quality as oppose to quantity. However, CONSIDER must not restrict its knowledge

base. The depth of theoretical and empirical research should be included in the guidelines and recommendations, through both a methodology of CSO participation and use of supporting evidence.

The guidelines were seen to have great potential. Through innovation, engagement, and interaction, it was recommended that CONSIDER should ensure that the guidelines and recommendations target a variety of audiences. The document should be presented as a living contribution, adapting to structural changes and new considerations in the future.

This expert workshop highlighted key development points in order for stakeholders to realise the effective participation of CSOs in research. The event provided a constructive space in which CSOs, researchers and policymakers could discuss their needs and understand the advantages, challenges and issues in collaborative research projects.

4.8 Process of Construction of the Final Version of the Guidelines

The consortium worked hard to address all the suggestions and recommendations in the further development of the guidelines. Key changes that were made or additions arising from this feedback include:

- Simplification of language and structure. This notably meant that the idea of structuring recommendations according to the temporal dimension of project development was abandoned.
- Publication of the guidelines online. At the same time a set of additional dissemination material was developed this includes an animated video giving overview of CSO engagement and a brochure to be distributed at the final event that gives a very brief summary of the guidelines.

In order to be able to address the numerous suggestions for modification of the guidelines and ensure their consistency, it was decided to split up the stakeholder groups and have one partner responsible for developing guidelines for each of them. The allocation of work was as follows:

- Researchers (UL)
- CSOs (EN)
- Policymakers (DMU)
- Funders (DMU)
- Evaluators (KIT)

The process of assembling the final version of the guidelines was distributed between partners. In order to ensure consistency it was overseen by UCL. The final template for individual recommendations including a brief explanatory case and quote was developed during the proofreading of the recommendations. In addition to the recommendations to particular stakeholders, the guidelines website includes some further information about the CONSIDER project as well as some of the caveats and further links.

As discussed the principles of the guidelines and the method and process used in their development, the next and most important section of this deliverable presents the actual guidelines to the reader.





5 References

CIPAST. (2008). *CIPAST - Publishable Finale Activity Report & Final*

Recommendations. Citizen Participation in Science and Technology.

Retrieved from http://www.cipast.org/download/CIPAST_FINAL_REPORT.pdf

European Commission. (2009). *Goverscience CivilSociety Organisations Seminar*

(No. EUR 23912 EN). Brussels: Directorate-General for Research. Retrieved

from <http://ec.europa.eu/research/science->

[society/document_library/pdf_06/goverscience-civil-society-org-seminar-](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/goverscience-civil-society-org-seminar-090610_en.pdf)

[090610_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/goverscience-civil-society-org-seminar-090610_en.pdf)

European Patents' Forum. (2010). *The Value+ Policy Recommendations - Patient*

Involvement In Health Programmes And Policy. Brussels. Retrieved from

<http://www.eu->

[patient.eu/Documents/Projects/Valueplus/doc_epf_policyrec.pdf](http://www.eu-patient.eu/Documents/Projects/Valueplus/doc_epf_policyrec.pdf)

European Research Advisory Board. (2007). *Research and Societal Engagement*

(Final Report No. EURAB 07.013). Retrieved from

http://ec.europa.eu/research/eurab/pdf/eurab_07_013_june_%202007_en.pdf

European Science Foundation. (2013). *Science in Society: caring for our futures in*

turbulent times (Science Policy Briefing No. 50). European Science

Foundation. Retrieved from

http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/spb50_ScienceIn

[Society.pdf](http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/spb50_ScienceIn)

Gall, E., Millot, G., & Neubauer, C. (n.d.). Participation of Civil Society Organisations in Research.



PERARES. (2014). *Making a Difference to Research Strategies* (Living Knowledge Policy Brief No. 1). Retrieved from <http://www.livingknowledge.org/>



Appendix: Guidelines Candidates

This appendix includes all candidates of guidelines for inclusion into the CONSIDER guidelines. The different sections reflect different origins. These candidates were looked at from the perspective of CONSIDER's theoretical and empirical insights and used as inspiration for the development of the CONSIDER guidelines. It is important to note that they come from a variety of sources and are not consistent. In many cases they are even contradictory. They were nevertheless included as an appendix to this deliverable as they provide an insight into the rich field of varying views on what could be done to improve the practice of including CSOs in research.

Due to this status of the candidates, they were copyedited to some degree, but still contain the idiosyncrasies of their original creators. It was deemed important to leave some of these, caused by non-English native speakers, particular disciplines or specific experience in projects, as an expression of their diversity.

5.1.1 Guidelines Arising from the Model of CSO Participation (Ideal Types)

These guidelines are closest to the unique contribution of the consider project. They were derived by looking at the model of participation, which is the key output of work package three and described in detail in 'D3.3 Model of CSO Participation in Research'.³

The guidelines deduced from the model and the ideal types embedded in it are:

- For researchers
 - If CSOs are included into the project, in order to fulfil a pre-selected function (which might look like instrumentalisation), scientists need to make clear their respective expectations of the scientists towards the CSOs in order to avoid later conflicts during the project. (A1)
 - If the CSOs' interest in a project becomes vital, the possibility of funding for CSOs' activities turns into a secondary question. In order to successfully include CSOs, the topic of a project should be well aligned to the CSOs' interests. If this is the case, the CSOs could provide a real added-value with regards to the production of new knowledge.
 - In order to improve the transfer of knowledge between CSOs and scientists, activities encouraging this transfer should be organized, e.g. a week together for exchange.
 - Routines of scientists which do not relate to the core production of knowledge might be unknown to CSOs, e.g. addressing ethical issue at an ethical committee. In order to ease up CSOs' inclusion into research projects, scientists should consider support for CSOs when they are facing such challenges. (B1).
 - If CSOs are to be included into a research project in the context of a highly contested field, their role should be well-defined (limited) so that the CSO's engagement does not endanger the project. (B1)

³ <http://www.consider-project.eu/deliverables-1/D3.3%20Model%20of%20CSO%20Participation%20in%20Research.pdf?attredirects=0&d=1>, accessed 26.01.2015

- If CSOs are not included into the consortium, a consortium member should be in a trustworthy relationship with the CSOs so that they still have the possibility to bring their insights on the consortium's agenda. (A1)
- In all cases, a CSO is expected to have transformative importance for the production of knowledge but in case the CSO is outside of the consortium, a consortium member should be in the role of an intermediary between the consortium and the CSO (A2, B2, and C2).
- CSOs and communities can be personally entangled with the topic of a research project. If this is the case, there should be an intermediary between the CSOs/communities and the scientists, who translate expectations, wishes or occurring problems. (A2)
- If CSOs are expected to substantively contribute the production of new knowledge (e.g. apply research methods, set research agenda, collect data), the expectations of scientists and CSOs towards the project and its results need to overlap (C2)
- In order to strengthen the participatory idea and to facilitate the organisation of participatory projects, scientists should reflect how participatory methods could become part of their teaching curricula (overall).
- If the involvement of CSOs is expected to be of high importance for the production of knowledge scientists need to trust in the CSOs. This trust should be built on common experiences of cooperation which take place before the start of the project. (C2)
- For funders
 - In order to increase awareness of CSOs for funding possibilities, funders should provide information specialised for the needs of CSOs. Funders should organize events specialised for the needs of CSOs and provide possibilities for CSOs and scientists to get to know each other. On the other side, also funders need to make clear the limits of expected CSO participation. (A1)
 - CSOs' activities in a research project could be encouraged, if the financial funding fulfilled different criteria.
 - There should be enough pre-fixed funding available for the CSOs to play the expected role. (A2)
 - The allocation of funding to CSOs' tasks should be flexible. (A2)
 - CSOs should not be obliged to provide own funding because the necessary money is often not available for CSOs. (A2)
 - Even if CSOs play a vital role in a project they should be eligible to be a subcontractor. (B2)
 - If CSOs are to be included into a research project in the context of a highly contested field, their expected role should be well-defined so that the CSO's engagement does not endanger the project. (B1)

- If the knowledge produced within a project is relevant for the CSO's work, CSOs should be supported to publish project results in a scientific context so that the produced knowledge is secured and made available. (C1, C2)
- Scientists should be encouraged to publish their participatory approaches to research in handbooks to give orientation for colleagues. (C1, C2)
- The results produced within a research project can be of interest for civil society. CSOs do not have the resources of publication and dissemination as scientists do. The funder should provide CSOs with extra funding after a project has finished, facilitating the wide dissemination of results. (B2)
- For CSOs
 - In order to be able to lead scientific projects, CSOs should consider setting up a trustworthy relationship with scientists. This relationship could be built on prior cooperation.
 - CSOs could be considered as the leader of a research project, in case results of the project could contribute to practical needs and the research focus is put on application possibilities. (C1)
 - CSOs need to be aware of their own capabilities and the expectations scientists have. Following questions should be answered before a CSO joins a consortium:
 - Why is the CSO included into the project?
 - Which expectations do the scientists have towards the CSO's role in the project?
 - Which expectations does the funder have towards the CSO's role in the project?
 - Which expectations does the CSO have towards its own role in the project?
 - Which authority will the CSO have? Which activities will the CSO be involved or responsible for?
 - What will be the outcomes of the project?
 - Which advantages will the CSO have from the expected outcomes?

5.1.2 Results from Case Study Research

During data collection for the case studies all respondents were asked whether they could suggest ways of improving CSO participation. This forms an important source of information about form and content of useful guidelines:

- Recommendations for policymakers
 - Provide a clear definition of 'CSO'
 - Streamline ethics approval processes, which can be too complex for CSOs



- Low budgets of many CSOs may require additional funding or lower co-funding requirements
- Awareness raising: policymakers should be aware of the potential benefits of CSO involvement
- Foster collaboration over competition
- Publish manuals or guides for organizations who are not familiar with EU jargon
- Create a policy agenda out of project findings
- Improve government policy in order to make solar more viable for people
- Improve infrastructure in order for renewable energy to become a reality
- Recommendations for funders
 - Be flexible with regards to inclusion of CSOs that fulfil the criteria relevant to the research in question
 - Show flexibility in project plans
 - Streamline bureaucracy of funding
 - Include CSOs representatives in research agenda setting (writing calls) and proposal evaluation
 - Evaluate CSO engagement separately
 - Awareness raising: Make researchers aware what potential benefits of CSO involvement are
 - Clarify expectations: Where CSO participation is required, define the purpose of this participation is and how it can be evaluated
 - Conditions of CSO involvement: CSOs tend to have different structures and capacities. If CSOs are to be included, these need to be catered for (e.g. by easing administrative burdens or budget requirements).
 - Multi-staged funding mechanisms can be used to identify promising collaboration
 - Provide incentives for research projects willing to involve CSOs. Incentives do not have to be directly funding related (e.g. include in evaluation criteria)
 - If CSO involvement is desired, ensure that evaluation criteria reflect this and that evaluators are informed about these criteria
 - Projects involving partners from science and CSOs should have a longer runtime or an extra phase before the project starts which allows the consortia to establish trust
 - Avoid changing the funding schema between the call and the approval. For a small Eastern CSO, which has not sufficient financial resources, between 75% and 50% the change is huge



- Take into account the differences between big and small CSOs as well as CSOs from eastern UE and western UE
- Better visibility of funding opportunities- it was felt that CSOs are often unaware of funded research opportunities
- Encourage long-term impact and follow-up activities (advocacy+ dissemination of results) by making them a requirement for project proposals. The Commission should also allow for time and financing to be included for these in the projects
- Ensure that project results don't just disappear following the end of the project; facilitate exchange of results and knowledge sharing between past, current and future projects (i.e. no need for people to reinvent the wheel)
- Provide more time for projects with CSO participation
- Recommendations for people doing research
 - Take an active approach to expectation management.
 - Awareness raising: researchers should be aware of the potential benefits of CSO involvement
 - Capabilities of research projects should be described realistically (do not oversell / overpromise). Provide examples of successful prior research
 - Take your time to find a common perspective and language (!) when cooperating with a CSO - it usually takes longer than conventional collaborations among researchers
 - Include CSOs in the project from the beginning. It is important to exchange ideas and learn from the experiences of each other. This reduces the risk of coming up with an unrealistic plan
 - Approach non-scientists on an equal-footing in order to avoid conflicts about authority
 - Pay attention to the use of a widely understandable language when you interact internally.
 - Involve several disabled people if you cooperate with them. If you have an interactive situation, the same number of researchers and disabled people should be in the room
 - Build relations with CSOs prior to calls - this is to ensure that researchers do not skip involvement of CSOs in a project simply due to lack of time to search for one. Building prior relations would also ensure better collaboration during the project proposal design and implementation stages
 - Involve CSOs to ensure practitioners' expertise and practicality- it is vital to involve the end user and have their feedback in order to avoid blind spots and losing touch with reality (being abstract)
 - Revise the evaluation of scientific excellence classification so that it also includes 2 additional factors:



- communication of the research outputs with society and demonstrating the impact of your outputs on industry/society/etc. and
 - how you might use those to impact industry/society or to transfer them to industry/society
 - Allow CSOs to participate in research activities
 - Keep a social aim - research is being carried out for end users; therefore, the improvement of the situation of those end users should always be the goal
- Recommendations for people representing CSOs
 - Consider the advantages of research participation, even if this is not the main activity
 - Depending on the organisation, matching funding should be seen as an opportunity
 - Mobilise resources for seed funding
 - Dare to take the initiative and start research projects, thereby set research agenda
 - Give yourself an attractive and clear image in order to be a reasonable partner in a research project
 - Do not engage in research projects if you do want to keep your position in society. Civil society is interested in societal solutions but does not want to be functionalized because then it does not fulfil the role of a CSO anymore. CSOs should carefully check which agenda is hidden behind each call for participation
 - the ideal would be that the structures of the civil society on one side answers the demand, the requirements stemming from a knowledge which they have of the reality and, of other hand than it spreads the results towards their members, towards their associative network'
 - Be aware of your capacity- time and personnel is often limited so bear that in mind when applying for research projects
 - Be open minded and not dogmatic
 - Include research trained staff among staff
 - Take part in participatory research
- Recommendations for Industry
 - Timescales for industry are different from researchers'. Define expected timescale of research
 - Understand CSO involvement as a way of reaching out to users and developing mutual understanding and trust.
 - CSO inside the project: play the interface between the world of the research and the world of the industry.
- Project-related recommendations



- Clearly define roles of different partners in the consortium
- Provide guidelines for methodologies that include practical examples
- Choose partners who share the vision of the project and are capable of fulfilling their tasks
- Early involvement of partners in agenda setting facilitates demonstrates that partners are being valued and therefore creates a positive starting point.
- Be flexible for surprises! - The theoretical expectations of scientists and the practical experiences of CSOs might often not match.
- prior determination of clear and specific division of work: all members know what their roles are
- Mutual knowledge of the different partners.
- One person of the consortium specialised and dedicated to supporting and animation methods to help good relations between participants and so to contribute to the good running of a research project
- Have a partner dedicated solely to dissemination
- Diversify stakeholders and participants in the project
- Do a mapping of relevant CSOs to be included in the project
- More meetings, especially face-to-face meetings, can improve relations between partners
- Recognise that there are differences between stakeholders and use them to create synergies

5.1.3 Guidelines from Workshops

The consortium conducted a number of participative workshops with civil society organisations across Europe. During these events participants were asked whether they could provide suggestions for guidelines which were captured and fed into the process of developing guidelines.

- Porto
 - Solve clashes between researchers and CSOs by using simplified language and a third party in charge of coordination, due to different views and understandings between CSOs and researchers.
 - Simplify bureaucratic procedures to allow partners to focus on research than dealing with bureaucracy, particularly as CSOs rarely have specific people to deal with the bureaucratic aspects only.
 - Encourage also CSO-led projects - do not discriminate against them by opting solely for research institutions.
 - Encourage more pilot projects - they are considered to be new and innovative, and as a result, they instigate a willingness to take risks; the success of such projects would be potentially very large, whereas their testing nature means that failure would have less negative connotations than usual. Consequently, the involvement of civil society in such projects



becomes more likely, viewed as low risk due to the lower levels of expectation

- Prague
 - Harness the full potential of CSOs- they represent a cross-section of society; researchers should perhaps, therefore, aim to engage with CSOs from across the whole spectrum and not just the 'usual suspects' in order to better reflect the diversity of the sector.
 - Acknowledge the full breadth of organisations currently involved in research- at the moment, distinction is made only between CSOs and research institutes at a funding/affiliation level (i.e. non-governmental vs government affiliated)
 - When looking beyond the scientific and technological communities, it is important that the position of end-users is considered. In some cases this might be an opportunity for CSOs to get involved; in others, public sector organisations or profit-making organisations might make better partners.
- Open Forum Lille
 - Involving CSOs is vital- Researchers can't be both on the ground amongst citizens and progressing science on the international stage. We need to establish networks that allow researchers to experience the world they are seeking to improve.
 - Use innovative models that encourage the collaboration between science and civil society- By prioritising bottom-up schemes with a focus on public engagement, Science Shops overcome the challenge of balancing the management of limited resources with the need to get public recognition
 - Prior collaboration and networking is essential- knowing and trusting your partners is vital for research projects. Furthermore, to solve local and global problems, it is necessary to share knowledge which is done through networking. Although networking is a crucial process, it is not organic and therefore must be sustained. A database or platform of CSOs and research projects, research topics, or competencies-knowledge could also become a self-sustaining platform.
 - Collaboration is the way forward- In science, progress is the main goal so bringing people with new views together is the key to realising this. CSOs are often invited to partner on a project in order for researchers to satisfy criteria or receive funding. Yet it was remarked that as the project develops, researchers come to understand the value of CSOs and look to continue the partnership in the future.
 - CSOs are more in favour of taking risks which means that they contribute to both responsible and innovative research. Their involvement brings a new perspective to the project and is the biggest added value of CSO participation in research.
- Living Knowledge, Bonn Germany
 - Long-term partnerships have a greater chance of resulting in meaningful impact as partners build up relationships of trust and understanding. Integral partnerships and co-research are essential for producing research



that is relevant to all stakeholders, is able to influence policy and is closer to users' needs. This relies on having willing academics that are open to new partnerships.

- It is important to bear in mind that CSOs are normally inside the public debate which can either be constraining as they do not wish to dialogue or beneficial because they may be able help to recruit others.
- Though science shops facilitate a connection between citizens and science, CSO and academic cooperation often relies on the good understanding of the researcher or student and the CSO. In this regard, science shops can often only make the connection and review the results.
- For research projects with CSO involvement, there are expectations that CSOs will have access to the literature and use the research findings for lobbying. Successful partnerships are reliant on equal and long-term partnerships built on foundations of trusts and there is a need for a lot of diversity in CSOs' activities.
- Expert Workshop, Lille
 - Science Shops constitute an intermediary body that connects citizens with university research to offer research for, with and by society. As they are open to all and driven by demand, working in an upstream process, this supports interaction between the two communities.
 - CSO participation in research projects should not be affected by prejudices regarding CSO academic expertise as CSOs and Project Coordinators do not differ particularly in their educational background. Furthermore, CSOs greatest strength is the diversity and new experiences that they can bring to a research project.
 - A clear understanding of the roles and expectations in collaborative research projects is essential to effective partnerships.
 - Research governance can be enhanced qualitatively with the construction of a comprehensive procedure that incorporates CSOs in the decision-making process.
 - The transdisciplinary research approach is important in solving the complex issues of society. In contrast with other methods, transdisciplinary research encompasses the implementation of research findings in society. As such, the gap between research and practise is bridged and a joint reflection on research is possible. Transdisciplinary research also involves multiple stakeholders that cover a wide range of fields and concerns, while also encompassing the non-academic viewpoint.
 - An evidence-based approach promotes user-involvement and allows for a greater voice to be given to the concerns of the community. CSOs support a flexible, innovative, bottom-up research design with user-led methods.
 - A 'meta-governance' model can give CSOs a strengthened voice through political reform in the research governance and allow science to become more responsive to societal needs and goals.

- CSOs recommend forming partnerships with science, creating a more professional image of their organisations and creating their own research bodies.
- Scientists should consider creating organisational units focused on CSO participation and adapt their language to broader audiences.
- Funders should include CSOs in advisory and steering committees but also realise that it takes time and flexibility to ensure successful participation.

5.1.4 Guidelines from the Literature / other Projects

In order to ensure that the guidelines arising from the project fit in the greater context, the consortium reviewed existing guidelines from other projects. These are not used in the development of the guidelines presented here, but they represent an important benchmark indicating the relevance of the guidelines presented.

These projects were analysed with regards to their recommendations which were then summarise following the logic used in the publication. In order to render them accessible and easily comparable, they are listed below as abbreviated bullet points. For more detail on these recommendations and guidelines please see the original project documents.

- PERARES Policy Brief (2014)
 - Funders
 - Actively seek opportunities to exchange experiences on how to fund and co-fund research with CSO at both a country and European level. The development of an arena for funders to share good practice in this area on national and international level can support the necessary exchange
 - Explore a formal model of engagement with CSOs where interests are shared.
 - Consider reviewing the allocation criteria for calls for proposals and funding programmes to encourage research with and for CSOs in universities. Revised criteria could include an emphasis on transdisciplinary research or making citizen participation a condition of funding
 - Research Organisations
 - Embed public engagement with research as a concept in research training at all levels
 - Consider mechanisms for co-ordination of citizens and university research, such as setting up contact points for civil-society groups to enable an active engagement in research with and for CSOs (e.g. Science Shops).



- Consider international exchanges and mentoring on experiences and models of public engagement within the HEI context. For example this could include sharing practice on funding schemes for public engagement projects, on cooperation and networking, on agenda setting with an by CSOs, or curriculum development as a way to encourage dialogue and broaden the discussion of public engagement
- CSOs
 - Take every opportunity to lobby by attending meetings, talk to scientists, administration, and policymakers or write their specific requests into policy briefs
 - Examine ways of developing skills around commissioning and managing research and build up skills and knowledge to impact research agendas
 - Seek opportunities to become involved in developing and accessing research funding streams
 - Look out for small scale funding schemes which might be given through citizen foundations or crowd funding. Even contacting companies for financial support in the needed research field might be a promising approach.
- Project-related recommendations
 - Further research with CSOs is necessary to understand their views on how and where they impact research agendas.
 - There is a need for capacity building and improvement of communication between CSOs and research funders to build a better understanding of where agendas might be shared.
 - There is a need to share models of good practices across Europe.
- Goverscience CSO Seminar (2009)
 - setting up bridging facilities involving CSO networks, research bodies and public authorities; Fora, platforms or contact points where potential partners meet, relevant knowledge is exchanged and capacity built to manage research projects involving different types of partners;
 - establishing better incentives and rewarding researchers for their investment with communities and CSOs; this also implies a rethink of the interface between scientific excellence and societal relevance;
 - shaping the funding schemes to fit CSO-RO partnerships; giving more room to mutual learning, participatory processes;

- designing multi-disciplinary/experience approaches; treating partners equally in terms of responsibility and financial support;
- opening doors in research programmes; installing channels/structures to discuss research needs/issues with civil society actors; planning two-stages calls and assigning a part of the budget to CSO-RO partnerships;
- making the most of CSO-RO project outputs; prizing their capacity to interest scientists as well as civil society actors and policymakers, broadening the evaluation systems to encompass public participation and social innovation alongside conventional science and technologies.
- STACS Project (Gall, Millot, & Neubauer, n.d.)
 - Key principles to improve the support to Participatory Research
 - Acknowledge the value of CSO participation to research
 - Make space for alternative narratives of research
 - More opportunities to engage
 - Reward public engagement of scientists
 - A diversity of forms of engagement and more inclusive governance of research
 - Create long-term relationships and places for meetings
 - The importance of robustly designed partnerships
 - Create support structures
 - To the European Commission
 - Research Framework Programmes
 - Increased support to Participatory Research
 - Mainstreaming the use of the BSG-CSO instrument
 - Leave calls for projects open
 - Adapting the BSG-CSO to the needs of CSOs
 - National Contact Points
 - Research policy
 - Advisory boards
 - Mapping CSO research needs and agendas
 - Encouraging the professional mobility of researchers
 - Communicating and raising CSO awareness about research policy and research opportunities
 - Engaging Universities and Research institutions

- To Member States
- To Regions
 - Study the feasibility of CURA/PICRI like programmes.
 - Establish, at regional level, structures dedicated to bridging the gap between researchers and CSOs. Funding should be provided to set up 'knowledge brokering' offices facilitating Participatory Research projects. This would be a powerful way to ensure that the quality and outputs of PR projects continuously improve.
 - Organise meetings with researchers and CSOs on science and technology issues of regional/local relevance. This can be an aspect of improving research networks and service to regional/local needs
- To Universities and research institutions
 - Give scientists more opportunities to reflect about the societal consequences of their work
 - Scientists need to be given incentives to engage with society.
 - Service to community and civil society should be included in the mandate of European universities
 - Creation of support structures
 - Creation of spaces for reflection and exchange
 - More training should be provided by universities on interdisciplinary, trans-disciplinary and Participatory Research
 - Professional mobility of researchers from public research institutions to the non-profit sector should be supported
 - Reward structure and the systems of career advancement need to be adapted
- To CSOs
 - CSOs should express their views on the kind of research they would like to see carried out
 - Would be useful if some of them broadened their spectrum of activities and, instead of focusing only on policy action and of using science instrumentally as a tool for advocacy, could contribute directly to what research can bring in terms of solutions.
 - Develop a culture of research
- EURAB (European Research Advisory Board, 2007)
 - Expose researchers to other perspectives of research and innovation by integrating engagement with societal actors into the university curriculum.

- Encourage engagement as a factor influencing a researcher's career prospects
- Develop further mechanisms for societal actors to improve their research capacities
- Encourage societal actors to be more involved in European Technology Platforms
- Encourage structures for partnerships between researchers and societal actors in the research dialogue
- Integrate societal actors into the various stages of the research evaluation process
- Goverscience final report (European Commission, 2009)
 - Prioritising Science Communication
 - The Task of Evaluation
 - Representation and Democracy
 - clarity on the boundaries and expectations for all participants;
 - clarity over the working frameworks for participation;
 - responsibility to experiment with new forms of learning;
 - the embedding of participatory process in mainstream European Commission programmes;
 - the undertaking of participation also on the process of implementing participation
 - Questions of Design
 - Who to include?
 - What to Prioritise?
 - How many resources to spend?
 - At what scale?
 - When to engage?
 - What is independence?
 - Who does the framing?
 - How to convey outcomes?
 - Mainstreaming Engagement
 - Business of Persuasion
 - Towards 'Co-operative Research'
 - The process of co-operative research is as important as the outcomes.
 - The 'framing' of co-operative research is autonomous



- Co-operative research embodies at its core an intrinsically symmetrical understanding of the relationship between different bodies of knowledge
- Co-operative research integrates and addresses equally, processes of design, implementation and dissemination.
- Accordingly, co-operative research includes a wide variety of specific approaches to inclusive engagement at different levels in science governance
- Co-operative research highlights and clarifies the essential role of science
- Co-operative research embodies a richer and more positive understanding of the role of social science.
- Strategies and Research Needs
- CIPAST (CIPAST, 2008)
 - Activate and expand the existing networks of actors
 - To consider ‘cross-fertilization’ as a top priority
 - To prioritize initiatives involving new member States
 - To encourage involvement of scientific research organizations
 - To make specific efforts to bring political and industrial decision-makers to consider participation as a positive enrichment of decision processes
 - Further training programmes using the case study methodology
 - Call for (external) case studies proposed by participants and developed according to the CIPAST methodology.
 - Poster sessions with contributions from the participants, including an ‘open space’ session, where participants have the possibility to debate on problems of their choices.
 - Training participation using real and carefully documented case studies proved to be very productive for the newcomers
 - Support (action-)research initiatives on European cultures of participation
 - Create a specific observation device on participation in the field of nanotechnologies
- ESF SiS (European Science Foundation, 2013)
 - Linking excellence to relevance and responsibility
 - opening up the notions of relevance beyond economic criteria and of excellence beyond classical research

- indicators, thus also creating the necessary conditions for responsible research;
- better research-based understanding of how excellence and societal relevance relate to each other;
 - explicitly integrating science-society issues into the programmes and institutional settings dedicated to research excellence.
- ‘Science-society activities’ - integration and separation from research
 - do not pose this question in the form of an either/ or, but search for a balance between these two approaches since they serve different purposes: including analysis of broader issues at stake beyond the borders of project(line)s, capacity building in the community of researchers, and conducting concrete engagement activities;
 - avoid what we call the ‘ritualisation trap’, i.e., delegating reflexivity solely to the social sciences and humanities, to perform it ‘by the book’ - following standardised models - or to limit it to specific moments, mostly towards the end of projects;
 - reflect (and demand reflection upon) science society issues explicitly in the set-up and pursuit of programmes and projects.
 - Plurality matters
 - explicitly acknowledge European diversity in histories, values and traditions, as well as in different anticipation practices and ways of imagining sociotechnical futures. This demands both in-depth comparative research and closer consideration of diversity in policymaking;
 - address science-society issues in ways adapted to the concrete local settings; learning from each other not so much in terms of transferring ‘best practices’ as in carefully situating and re-locating experiences across cultural contexts;
 - give space to a variety of understandings of progress and futures, thus opening up a variety of pathways;
 - broaden the notion of innovation to the social sciences, humanities and arts and acknowledge a wider range of knowledge available in different sectors of society.
 - Expanding and creating new spaces for science-society interactions
 - critical reflection on the ways in which notions of ‘science’ and ‘society’ are implied or made explicit in diverse

activities; it seems essential to move away from a narrow understanding of science and society issues to activities that portray more open and flexible understanding;

- more attention to the spaces organised bottom up where science and society issues are negotiated in different ways and multiple alternative practices of engagement developed; this includes supporting and acknowledging the activities of researchers in engaging with these practices and creating such alternative spaces;
 - the courage to abandon the idea of controlling science-society relations and embark instead on the venture of exploring and engaging with those relations in creative ways.
- Making time-space for reflexive work
 - develop visible incentive structures in order to make it possible for researchers to engage in these activities without damaging their career opportunities;
 - re-connect broader societal values with approaches to evaluating research and innovation;
 - do research to create a better understanding of the reflexive work happening in different fields, institutions, cultural contexts;
 - transform science-society activities into an inspirational space which may help unleash previously neglected creative energies encapsulated in research and innovation - thus also contributing to a thriving culture of scientific research and knowledge-based innovation in a society appreciative of their beneficial outcomes.
 - Value+ (European Patents' Forum, 2010)
 - The Right To Involvement
 - Develop, adopt and promote a policy instrument on patient involvement - also addressing diversity issues and the gender dimension of involvement - to be applied at European Union and Member States' levels.
 - Set a mechanism and develop guidelines to ensure sustainable patient representation in health committees/bodies, decision-making processes (local, national, European).
 - Develop/promote the adoption of a code of practice defining principles and values for working with patients and patient organisations as equal partners.
 - Set up monitoring and evaluation systems of patient involvement in:



- EC-funded programmes and
- Policy consultation processes at EU and Member State level
- Resources
 - Establish patient involvement as an eligibility criterion for project funding in EC health-related Calls. This criterion should be evaluated by the expert teams in charge of assessing and selecting projects - patient representatives should be involved in the teams. Guidelines for applicants and evaluators should be developed for this purpose.
 - Patient involvement should also be required as one of the terms of reference for the process review and outcome evaluation, which the projects are required to undertake.
 - Reinforce the mandate and capacity of bodies/offices in Member States delegated by the EC to be contact points for specific funding programmes so as to enable them to provide guidance and information to patient organisations.
 - Waive the co-financing percentage for patient organisations in EC Calls in consideration of the fact that they are not-for profit; most of them are run by volunteers and often do not have access to loans or bank guarantees due to their annual turnover.
 - Simplify application procedures and set up specific Calls for small size not-for profit organisations and other types of organisations that have limited capacity to meet eligibility criteria of current programmes.
 - Strengthen opportunities for patients' organisations to access funds from the European Social Fund and the European Regional Development Fund by:
 - Increasing awareness and visibility about health being now among the priorities of those funds
 - Earmarking a percentage of funds for not-for profit non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and simplifying application procedures
 - Providing good practice guidelines for public authorities in charge of managing the funds
 - Monitoring how Member States administer funds with a view to transparency and equity in healthcare.
 - Increase access to resources at Member State level by: setting up funding schemes for NGOs; reducing taxes for companies/individuals making donations to NGOs and reducing taxation to NGOs.

- Capacity Building
 - Invest in a European Centre of Excellence on Patient Involvement led by patient representatives involving a Network of Experts to ensure:
 - Sharing of knowledge and transfer of best practices for patient involvement
 - Wider dissemination of projects' results so that they are delivered to grassroots patients in an accessible way.
 - Establish Patient Involvement Units in the EC and Member States to provide information, guidance, good practices and capacity building. The units would make the liaison between the European Centre of Excellence on Patient Involvement and stakeholders at national level.
 - Invest in capacity building programmes for patient involvement targeted to EC and Member States' policymakers and civil servants, health professionals, researchers, project coordinators, patients and patient organisations and other key stakeholders of the health sector.

