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[00:02] So yeah, no, that's very interesting. And maybe, maybe just, sort of to add to that, I suppose that brings the discussion for the [00:09] [inaudible] there around notions of [00:10] [inaudible] and around how we bring this thing together with more expectations. And if we do that sort of model could that end up with SSH just being bolted on to service the needs of an agenda that wasn't quite there? How can they really be integrated? I think, I think those, those are valid questions. Were there any other comments that we want to collect before we... Yeah.

I also think maybe it's [00:38] [inaudible] meaning that, I mean, with everything that is questionable for the mission, it's sort of a window of opportunity that opens a new program that is not locked in such as energy where you have a number of [00:50] [inaudible] who are essentially for... To industry [00:51] [inaudible] and is influencing the text of the core that we've been discussing today to a very large extent. So, I mean, from that perspective, we can honestly say that "Hey, maybe we shouldn't be too pessimistic." But now, but then get into discussion what the mission can actually be and try to have SSH mention into that [01:10] [inaudible]. It's not easy but as far... I mean we can [01:13] [inaudible].

Oh yeah, yeah of course.

And with, and with the missions you also mentioned the clusters earlier and obviously, so, so climate, mobility and energy will be a cluster for us in Europe, so they'll be coming together. But yet, there's no detail how they'll actually be brought together, and you could imagine that there'll would be a cluster, but yet [01:34] [inaudible] receive a content page where there's a load of cores around climate, a load of cores around mobility, a load of cores around energy and then they'll have a cross­cutting themes, one where they'll attempt to bring... So that's the model that they'll support. So again, questions around how you bring different distance together around different challenges as well. And so, I mean there's a lot in there, but if there are any reflections... Who hasn't spoken for a while? [removed for anonymity purposes].

Yeah, I mean I... On this point about SSH whatever we take that to be framing the research, because I mean this, this is my fourth point, and it's about taking SSH seriously and the relevance of it in it's own right, that could be about framing research questions. Also, in terms of... I mean the question I would put out to you is, "Can you tell me an example of a large multi­million pound, we're talking of a Euro, over 10 million Euro, research center initiative program that is led by beyond naturalistic SSH, critical, and interpretive social sciences into humanities? And that framed the research agenda and then STEM comes into play an equal roll or a service role.

I'm just putting it out there as a... I'm painting an example of something that could exist and everyone's kind of laughing a little bit. And my students come up with ideas like this, when I'd go through it with my students. And they say, "Why doesn't this exist." At global level, if we're talking about in the IPCC, global environmental change. Why doesn't this exist? Why doesn't it exist around energy was... And so yeah, but this, again, comes back to my point. We can say these things. But actually thinking about the possibilities of this happening would mean that the value of beyond naturalistic SSH, being taken seriously. And like I say, the long-term impact, so an impact agenda leads us down this path of immediate kind of policy impact. But some pure research, natural science, or SSH we will have very long-term impacts, will produce radical changes that improves societies in 20 years or so. And so, and we need to be able to stick up for that. So, I think there's multiple things in there. Now, yes, SSH does need to be framing the research program.

Probably also, in terms of coming up with the... Yeah, the drafts of the various cores. But would that be allowed to happen?

Well, and I think there are [04:22] [inaudible] room who actually knows how this works. Do you know the person in your country that you have to, who you have to contact in order to make sure that what you think is should be in the next work program energy­related research. At least this person can talk... You can talk to this person try to convince him or her that she or he should represent this...

You wanna raise hand.

Yeah, who knows that? Okay there are a few, more than [04:57] [inaudible].

Yeah.

But many [05:00] [inaudible]...

[05:01] [inaudible].

No, no, but, I mean, look that's, that's exactly what the STEM are... What in the STEM area, is actually happening. Of course, there is a lot of knowledge and there is, of course, each country has a program officer, a program representative in the program committee who brings in whatever the country’s research community in this area thinks should be represented in the next work program. And this is actually the missing link. This is one of the reasons why we wrote this, why we wrote this document. So far, this has been happening is once the work program is out there and the research question has been posed, they try to scramble and find SSH people who can then contribute to this research questions. What we tried to argue in there, it's already in the design of the program, already in sending up the work...

Of course.

Yeah of course, everyone now agrees it's of course. But what is missing is that we need to fora where people from the SSH communities actually can engage on a regular basis with those who then fly to Brussels and represent this and bring this in. Those who sit in the program committees, those who are in the ministries, in the national ministries, we tried this once in Austria, as a follow up from this presidency conference. We gathered the six, not the SSH one, but the six other, from the six other societal challenges, the program officers and the entities in Austria and asked people from the Austrian Research Community, from SSH, "Could you please come and sit for one morning session and learn to know this person". And in that case, establish a link to this, so that when he or she is flying to Brussels again, he or she will think of you and ask you, "What do you think about this program draft?" Because there's always a draft with an answer which's so physical and where you can make suggestions also. And when I asked around in other countries, "Have you ever done this to the SSH community people?" They said, "No, we've never, never stepped that far."

This is safe for an organization, that's what you have to do. Because that's how you get in the monitor of those who then actually sit on the table of the 27, or 28 or how many there will be and make this decision. And of course, it's negotiated, but it's easy to complain about the STEM people, but actually there is something that the SSH people also have to [chuckle] have their...

Someone complained about FAMIS.

Have to get their act together too, and it's way past complaining. We complained in 2013, now we have to really get this act together, I think.

Okay, I think what we'll now do, is before we come to the final comments, what we'll maybe just do, is not quite a go around, but just sort of... So maybe you can tack on and then if anyone else has any final thoughts that they just wanted to throw in just as a, I suppose, as part of almost being a bit of a summary for the day, then they'll be able do that. Do you want to go?

Yeah, I wanted just to comment on this. I think that's what scientists from social... From SSH, let's use the label, may want to do also... To advocate for being part of from the beginning, is the way... It's another way to present themselves to present the work. Yesterday I attended [chuckle] a bit of a very, well, a weird experience for me, I attended a workshop, the Sunrise Workshop. That is a project, a major project, finance and the H2020, and it's all about energy and it... I didn't understand it, a single word of what has been discussed, because it was very technical and I do not have a STEM background, so I was really lost. I felt like an alien. And someone talked to me at lunch, over lunch, and then she really kindly asked what was my background and what I was doing before, and why I was there, and what I was expected. And so, I said, bluntly that my background was in cognitive neural science, that I was... I've been studying consciousness, and then she was like, "Really, what? Why?" she was really like, "What is the purpose? And really?" and she was a scientist.

She could not see the reason why we would be interested in studying something like that, because it obviously doesn't have a short-term impact on working on that. But if you... And I was really, really... I was shocked being asked such a question by a scientist. And I think that if the way also we could work on another way of presenting ourselves, and to convince others that there is more than the short-term impact, and that sometimes it's not about "Why" and "What is it for" that is not the question we should be asked.

Okay, thank you. If it's okay, just in the spirit of [10:34] [inaudible], what I'll probably do is I'll collect notebooks and then we'll come to you first. Is that alright? And then...

Yeah, I can, I can...

You can... You'd like to have the luxury of picking out what you wanna say as the final comments, that's okay. Does anyone else have any final thoughts? I had a couple of very final things that I noted down. We've been talking a lot about core wordings and from being part of the process something that has semi frustrated me, is the fact that many cores that are SSH focused, end up falling for almost a theory of everything, and the reason why that is, is because all of the different peer of viewers who just say, "Oh well, we need aptitudes. Oh, we need reliefs. Oh well, we need practices, oh, we need this." And suddenly everyone puts their own theoretical stamp in it, and those that perhaps understandably don't understand all the theoretical nuance and baggage that goes into that space, end up producing a line in a core which this policy rather than project needs to look at and then a long list separated by semi­colons on all these different theoretical concepts, and lots of people don't feel quite comfortable in designing a project for that.

Or at least don't think that they'll be able to sufficiently argue why one bit doesn't, because they just think, "Oh, well they'll follow the core wording, that's the way they evaluate toward the money, but I won't engage with it." So, it's this really difficult balance 'cause obviously the cores are wanting to be open all of these, but by doing that end up only prioritizing half of the SSH community. So that's something that I've been reflecting on. But with these points feel free to say anything else.

May I comment?

Yeah.

Can I, can I stand up?

No, it's the final...

Oh, okay.

No. But yeah, the final sum­up. Go for it.

Okay. I would like immediately comment on that. You're right in a way. But on the other hand,... And you reflected on that a lot, which is really interesting. Of course, it matters a lot who evaluates your proposal, right? And yes, evaluate the terms of course to go along the lines of the core text. However, they also bring their own backgrounds in the equation. I really would say as long as you really... You convincingly demonstrate yeah, why what you're doing is needed and is relevant then that should work. And if I may then move on to my... Yeah, is it the first...

Okay.

Okay, but also to this... For me because this is one of the parts in my work where I can influence, let's say, the project to be funded, I am selecting the experts. So, this is a huge eye­opener for me also to really make sure I have very diverse experts in the panel with backgrounds really reflecting... Not just the bullet points from the call text, but having let's say more of a broader, hopefully also more systemic thinking in this [14:16] [inaudible] so thankful that this is really... This is really interesting. And, yes also for the, for the core text, I'm not drafting it, but in order to move onto the next phase and define what is it really that we require from the proposals. And I'm having...Interestingly, this week I'm having a session on core text analysis. And so, the exercise today that we did is... It was really perfect I think it's a really good. It takes the way... I will come with a new mindset to this session. So yes. So, this is what I learned today. Thanks a lot.

[removed for anonymity purposes], anything?

Well, I think that I don't know, I learned a lot of things as well, today so I really thank you for the excellent discussion we had in the different sessions. I would, just to say that... As I said before, I hope that in five 10 years we have forgotten about this topic, and we don't talk anymore about SSH and that we need to promote the transformation on the way the research is, is presented, the problems formulated and not whether they are formulated from STEM or SSH, not so polarized, but kind of formulated from the point of view of society. I think that there is room for change in all researchers that are in STEM or SSH. I think they all require a mindset change for the future to make research in a different way. I think that open science will enable that, the digital IT tools will enable that, will make that more easy. And I think that they will help us in making that mindset, a change. Yeah, and as I said, I think there is room for transformation. And I think that we are... We need to promote this transformation for those who are already there in the field, like with you, with us, and also in education, we need to translate that back into education. We need to start educating the students today for that mindset, that's coming up in the future.

Thank you. [removed for anonymity purposes]?

Yeah, just across the day. I think there's been a huge range of points and valuable discussions. I think it's been interesting to get an insight into some of these kinds of inequalities. We could go back to the 3 to 4%. Granted, it was stated that these monitoring mechanisms that are in place are probably under playing that, but I think there are certain... Certain inequalities. So, I think one thing to keep in mind is that, there's a need to kind of communicate better, there's a need to mobilize and organize, and get voices heard from SSH community. To have projects, like Energy Shift, that start to draw together there and starts to come up with programmatic recommendations for how this can be integrated in. The SSH, whichever version of it you're thinking about, is not playing into a neutral space. This is power and politics here going on in terms of what's playing out. And as I said earlier, these are collectively held, as Sheila Jasanoff would argue, constitutionally determined, collectively held ideas about what we see, as societies, as valid forms of knowledge and evidence.

And this is not gonna be changed by one person doing one thing, this isn't just about the STEM community. It's about society, it's about the media. This is upheld by the collective in our democracies everywhere and everything. So, if you want to change that, you've got to start to think in those very diverse ways. But I will end on a positive note, because I think we have to. And I agree with you that if we can come back in 10 years, this situation will have changed, right? Because the sorts of missions and grand challenges, and all of these things, what... The problems that we're trying to address, call for social science humanities in a big way we see, just in where I work, in my university an increased demand for the sorts of skills and expertise that SSH can kind of offer into whether it's energy or any other kind of field. So I think we have to end on a positive note.

Thank you.

I agree with that, I'm very grateful that I could be here. For me it was very fascinating to see the other side. I was only operating on this meta level of bringing SSH in there and I've become a little bit sarcastic as you could tell. But I think in the end, it is really a great achievement that has been made. That SSH is mentioned in the frame of the program. And this is up to us to make the best out of it. And yeah, that's it.

Well can [19:39] [inaudible].

[applause]

So, it's the end of the day. But one thing I would ask, just in terms of feedback, it would... We don't really want a big feedback forum or anything we just want, as we've had for the day, an open opportunity to say what you think. But, if everyone's able to maybe do one...