Reflecting On Evidence Session Part 2

[background conversation]

Well, from what I was overhearing, it sounds like you all really got tuck into this and have some hopefully really interesting discussions [00:19] [inaudible] hearing about them. So, we've got a bit of time now to share some of what we've been talking about with the group and really start to compare and contrast some of these different documents we've been looking at and see what kind of picture is emerging. So, I don't have like a rigid structure for this discussion, but I thought maybe if we just start with one of the documents and then just see where this goes really. And hopefully, we'll cover all of them one way or another. So, I thought maybe we could start, just 'cause its documents one and two, with the SET­Plan document. So, does anybody who was discussing the SET­Plan, or indeed who wasn't but has an opinion, would tell us something that they took away from this exercise, something that stood out for them. I think there was a cluster here wasn't there of SET Plan...

[overlapping conversation]

Okay, do you wanna tell us a bit of what you were discussing?

Sure, well, yeah. Thank you. Yeah, we have read this document and, like I said, it was kind of a flashback for us, because the [removed for anonymity purposes] was part of the development of this document in several ways. But we came up with three main comments. One is that these papers are very well written and theoretically, we believe that the role of social sciences and humanities is well addressed as a concept; however, it seems that this is far from reality. So, what we would need from this document would be more clear ways of implementing this and how to achieve real integration of social sciences and humanities. Some of these objectives are still highly technical, suggesting a linearity between the work [02:08] [inaudible] of the scientists, technologies and developing solutions, and then welcoming social sciences and humanities at a later stage, trying to make these solutions acceptable.

And we agree that this acceptance thing is not a good thing to promote. That we would need to promote more of an understanding. Understanding how society needs to change and that there has to be some, of course, technical solutions to move forward to a different society, but that would require, I think, the engagement of the way social sciences and humanities work at a much earlier stage than a pure role of working on acceptance or how we can manage with these solutions. So that's the first one. Second point was more on the specific contribution of social sciences and humanities, through that methodology, first in understanding our different motivation to energy saving or [03:11] [inaudible] energy expenditure in a different way. And how social sciences and humanities methods can help us in understanding how citizens react to different ways of encouraging a better use of energy. As well as to measure the impact of what is our expenditure today and what it can be in the future.

So, that, I think, it would be very good. And how more platforms for exchange between researchers in part­time doing social sciences should be fostered just for the sake of understanding better what is the different methodologies and what can be the added value of each part of science in a very broad sense. And the last point was about the language/terminology that these documents use, which is very well written, very coherent, but still with a very policy language that is far away from a scientific language or even a citizen language. So, how to make this document understandable for different public, that's not evident, because you have to kind of have a mastery in Brussels.

[laughter]

[04:33] [inaudible]. To really know when you read the sentence to really know what that sentence means and there is room for interpretation.

Can you give us an example of what sentence do you think was written Brussels language?

Well, I don't know, for example, if you look at page seven, and it says that, "The SET­Plan has been at the forefront of European energy technology policies." I wonder how many people outside Brussels area would understand that sentence and what it means. If they asked me or any other members of the community or the stakeholders that have contributed to build the SET­Plan or in consultation, we will know what to do, but how can I explain that to even my colleagues here in the [removed for anonymity purposes], they will not understand. They will have to believe me. They would never understand it. So how can we provide examples so that non­expert people, but people who are able to understand tech that are well explained could really understand what it means. That's just a small example. But there are others when we have here this list of technical solutions about [05:47] [inaudible], about strategies, socioeconomical challenges.

I mean the person down in the street may have a very different understanding of socioeconomical challenge than those that in here. So how we can make this document, I'm using this word “translated", or that's why I am saying, there is a language issue here.

Did you notice actually that term, socioeconomic challenge or socioeconomic factor, or socioeconomic issue, it comes up in all of them, doesn't it?

Yeah, yeah.

[06:21] [inaudible] what does that actually mean? Where is that defined?

Yeah.

Okay. Well, thank you. That's fantastic. You have a lot of really good points that we'll be discussing, I'm sure. I just wanted to ask [removed for anonymity purposes] and [06:31] [inaudible], 'cause you're also [06:32] [inaudible]background, were you thinking along similar lines or was there different things come out for you [06:37] [inaudible]?

I simply couldn't agree more [06:43] [inaudible]. In the first group and we also picked up similar things. We both had a very positive opinion reading introduction of the documents, but then when it got less into the technical part [06:57] [inaudible], the action proposed. It kind of loses this nice language and it gets very technical. For example, we think that in the first document when you go into the actions, they seem very model based and hard science based and they integrate less policy measures [07:25]

[inaudible]. We think that, then, an effort should be done to kind of transpose the aims and objectives into concrete actions.

We also think that SSH [07:40] [inaudible] these undefined concepts should not be siloed, so there should not be a group talking about specific economic aspects and a group talking about secondary aspects so as [07:54] [inaudible] was saying, there should be an integration from the start, of the understanding. And it also seems to us that when the documents refers consumers engagement is actually just to provide information to involve them at the later stage as [08:11] [inaudible] says. But never to really understand before what are the barriers, not only in technology but also in uptake of technology. We should move away from discussing the economic view of rational consumer and understand why consumers don't behave as you would expect.

So, I think that there is also a missing part in the policy testing that is not, is never really written here. So, to test policies before you have to approve them, because then it could be [08:40] [inaudible] work. And also, something that as we mentioned before, the gap between, especially between the academia world and policy world, I kind of experience it the other way around. So, every time that we have results presented by our project, they are explained in a very academic language, that policy makers tend not to understand because, we are presented with papers, with an abstract, which is very nice, but never the policy [09:12] [inaudible].

And I think that there is probably a lack of understanding that people that are actually shaping policy will never read the paper. They would need some points with the main outcome. And then, of course, [09:25] [inaudible] conclude the study. And that's the limitation of the study. They're never really highlighted, and this is not from this document, from my previous experience, but I think it should be very... There should be a better two-way communication. Not only for policy makers to research, but also the other way around. And also including the normal citizens which probably [09:53] [inaudible] how to involve them and how to change the language. So I think a lot of effort should be put also in this common language that needs to be developed.

Yeah.

[background conversation]

I just [10:10] [inaudible] it was really interesting from both of these points. This idea of what people are and where people fit in the energy system and related to that what social science and humanities research is kind of for. And if social science and humanities research just about accessibility because people are consumers, or whatever, and we have to meet and do what we want. And I was wondering, does anyone else from the other documents have any thoughts about how people are presented and understood in these documents? And indeed, the role of social science, the agenda of social science, in kind of view of people. Is that something that anyone else...

[overlapping conversation]

We had document four, so the consultation questionnaire.

[overlapping conversation]   
  
Our main point was actually that it's mainly about consumers, and energy is mainly about an energy market. So, the idea that people can also be other than consumers. Citizens or activists or people that have basic rights to something like energy provision or whatever is not really [11:33] [inaudible] in the questionnaire or in the text. We thought there might be some entry points in the questionnaire which is where they speak about access to justice or local ownership of renewable energy or whatever. But, in general, it was very much on consumers and energy market and [12:04] [inaudible].

To be fair to the text, not just to be fair to the text, it says right away that this is based on a deliberate policy decision. The European Commission Energy Union said if we put the consumer at the centre stage. So of course, the rest of the text is about consumers. You can discuss the policy decision behind that but the text itself is carrying out this [12:34] [inaudible].

But I think at the same point... You're right, it's actually one level higher.

[overlapping conversation]

Where the Energy Union strategy looks at putting consumers instead of people [12:44] [inaudible] someone who starts. I mean there's something... I'm not a scientist in any way, but and borrowing consumers, [12:52] [inaudible] contradiction. Like it's like [12:57] [inaudible] you cannot empower [13:00] [inaudible].

Yeah, it's like the core of mainstream economics.

But there's, if I can come in, because there is... This is one of my hobby horses. When I give presentations [13:12] [inaudible] stage to say it's not just about consumers, but it's also about citizens there's difference in policy choices. But there is actually a set of ideas of how you can empower consumers, and it's about providing better information to consumers to enable them to make different choices in terms of energy. So if you use different providers for instance, and for that you need information, then it's about the whole digitalisation of the energy systems, and the technologies that go along with that, that you have greater control of how you heat your home and when you wanna heat and all these things, and smart meters and all that, they will enable you to do that.

So, there is a package of ideas behind that, how we empower consumers. But then of course if you go and say people consume say when they become members of energy cooperatives, they may be consuming energy but when they start relating with the municipalities or energy providers and they'll have the political element, and that's when they become citizens...

I don't wanna jump [14:21] [inaudible]. First of all, let me say that I'm a really big fan of the energy citizenship in general and I think if we talk about energy related social sciences, the relation that people have with energy really changes completely the moment they are part of owning or they are a shareholder or engaged or, so I think it's quite an interesting topic for this entire project. As you [14:45] [inaudible] like to call it energy democracy more than energy citizens because it's really [14:49] [inaudible], it comes with an entire value set that is really essential, I think. But [14:56] [inaudible] the text starting from the energy union consumers, actually move into the right direction, the moment you introduce the local ownership, from that point on you start talking about citizens. [15:09] [inaudible].

At the same time some people just want to be energy consumers, they don't care about the citizenship aspect. So, from the policy maker perspective you have to realize that too. Some people just want energy to be there and cheap and available and that's it.

[background conversation]

What struck me was so from an SSH perspective perhaps we would welcome maybe digging behind exactly why would certain people just want cheap energy. Are there socioeconomic barriers that are not listed here that potentially mean that they cannot become citizens and there are other things that are... What struck me with the consultation document was that there is another box that can probably account for a lot of SSH contributions to understanding consumers in the energy market. And how those social science and humanities aspect perhaps are diluted because they fall mostly into this other box. And they don't come to the fore when you take the question, in the other box you have maybe 30 different examples and barriers, but they're not given the same weight because they’re not in the list.

But I think in the design of these consultations, the question that stands out to me and we were talking about precisely because we were looking at this based with the task of unpacking it for the reason from the perspective of SSH. Perhaps if we didn't have that specific task, we might have been more or less critical of it in that regard, but because we were given that task, we really felt, okay, we're looking for where this point, they're missing. And I think this was one of the things that we needed to ask, what does somebody who really has an SSH perspective who would integrate it in the design [17:01] [inaudible], it wasn't clear. And somehow you felt from an SSH perspective that maybe you were being a little bit manipulated in the response because you had this list and the other box was a catch all, [17:15] [inaudible].

Just picking up on the point about design of the consultation document. It might be interesting to hear from the people who are looking at the other consultation document which was the UK Department [17:34] [inaudible] whatever it is. Because that consultation was written in a quite different way, wasn't it? [17:41] [inaudible]...

Yeah.

Up here. Yeah, 'cause you really talked about how that consultation was framed and designed.

Well, this was more of a parliamentary inquiry, so it wasn't a consultation to publics really. The guys' response was, well, this is very narrowly framed to invite experts, it was very particularly targeted at experts. So you very much looked at it in terms of, this was a consultation that could have involved other actors, right?

Well, [18:13] [inaudible].

[laughter]

It struck me that because I know this from our own consultations that the way you actually put out the question has a very big influence on who will actually come back and respond to them, if you phrase the question in such a way that it's hard to understand, and there's jargon in it, or there are concepts in there that you wouldn't [18:41] [inaudible], then many people will not, especially ordinary citizens, if I can call them that, they will not take the trouble to actually do that, they will just say "This is not for me." Whereas the interest groups and the lobby associations, they will of course know this is for them, and they know what's behind those terms and they respond. So if you phrase the consultation a certain way, you direct who the input will come from, you have a big influence on that. And it struck me that in this case they probably want input from experts who know what this policy is all about, but not from people who may sort of be out there and thinking whether or not it's relevant to them.

We found... So, we looked at the inquiry and then one of the responses as well and what struck us was first of all, that wasn't a call for evidence, it was a call for opinion. Because the phrasing of the questions is very much... I'll just read the first question. "Who should have the responsibility to pay for energy efficiency? Should energy efficiency be considered a national infrastructure priority?" So there was a very strong formulation of okay give us a Yes No type of answer or just give us your opinion and there's actually very little instances that they're asking to give the substance of why you might have a certain type of opinion. And on the other hand, we completely agree that it was very, very narrow in who would be able to respond to this. But my response was that a lot of these questions you couldn't even answer from an individual or an individual organization or community initiative type of perspective because they're very much umbrella questions as well.

So, another example, "Is there sufficient support in place to deliver targets for all homes to be EPC BAND­C by 2035? Who can answer that type of question other than those who are the experts but also who have kind of this overview of the entire energy efficiency... Building efficiency in the UK then. And we felt that the phrasing was very leading. So "should energy efficiency be a national infrastructure priority?" that comes a paragraph after they say, "They recommend that it would be." [chuckle] So in those ways we felt that it started out slightly open talking about energy poverty, etcetera. But then in the end, if you look at the questions, it's narrow in who can respond, and it's also very leading in the type of responses that they actually want to get, and no call for evidence just for opinions really.

They're looking for an endorsement, basically I think, [21:46] [inaudible].

It was interesting as well the fact that there's just this implied linearity to the whole problem. The fact that just tell us what the barriers are. And that once they know what they are, they dont even ask for evidence on how to address them which would be good but... So then... And embedded in that is the assumption that the... That it can be overcome not just that but the... They just need to know how to do it and of course, critical social scientists would say there's a messiness here and it's not always a neat and tidy policy solution. We've just got to do the best we can and adapt and there's this we're in a constantly changing dynamic environment. So there aren't any neat and tidy solutions, technology works or not.

That word barriers, it comes up so often that you'd almost think that the whole of SSH was just barriers so that you basically we're gonna tell you how to overcome your barriers basically. So, am I right, we haven't even got on to the Horizon 2020 calls. So, shall we talk about those for a minute? Does anybody have... Anything that surprised them about those calls and the way they were phrased and maybe that you're very familiar with them already.

I think, [removed for anonymity purposes], you should make the point about cost and [23:10] [inaudible] because I thought that was... The way you frame these consultations, and the way you conceptualise them has such a big impact on again, the kinds of responses and also the policy agenda that results from that and I think you should at least mention that that point. [23:31] [inaudible] the same trick on you.

Good. Thanks 'cause I was waiting to get that one in. So, we looked this and the response from the CRED Centre which is an energy demand centre massively funded, it's 20 million British pounds for five years. And so, the framing of this call is granted there are these issues around its phrasing maybe expert terminology and these things, but I think let's just say well, they are looking for professionals, people who are expert in this area, possibly including NGOs and such like so... But on those terms, this exchange is very revealing in terms of how... I don't just think in terms of energy efficiency frames but more broadly energy policy written up.

So, this is framed very much in techno­economic terms, we thought. And so, there's talk about fuel poverty and such like but this is all linked to a clean growth strategy. So, it's like, we're gonna cut carbon and we're gonna have growth at the same time, there's no question that we're gonna grow and we're gonna make lots of money out of doing that. So, this kinda tech, this economic or techno economic framing is so dominant in the call for evidence but see the CREDS Centre which is a bunch social scientist... This is, [removed for anonymity purposes] said this at the start, this is probably the biggest investment in social science into humanities trumped up in a centre in the UK around energy demand that there is right. So, it's interesting that they come back, and they say... They initially tried to broaden the framing by talking about multiple benefits, there are multiple benefits to energy efficiency such as productivity, health and welfare I quoted them on that. But then what's interesting, they have this chance to open up the framing a bit and they revert back to the techno­economic framing to gain access to power in terms of informing policy. So, they dish back up to the policy maker the framing that they think that they want to hear. So, a very good example of this is...

Page 29 onto 30.16, where they say, over the last five years there's been new policy in developing these multiple benefits. They even say a focus on non­cost multiple benefits for energy efficiency. If you look at the top of page 30, have a look at those bullet points on the multiple benefits and every one of them is about cost and benefit in terms of economics. So, they talk about businesses being more productive, about rental income, about easier to mortgage, about business models, boosting productivity, high value jobs, the economy. I mean, I underlined... I pretty much underlined every single word in this bullet point.

There's a lot of potential to go off in different direction and [26:51] [inaudible] they could say energy efficiency is a means to foster regional development or skills development strategy or something. In fairness perhaps also the policy making step formulating the consultation, they should set this context. They should say, "We are interested in input on this but not on that." Because that's just in the interest of fairness and transparency because otherwise they get all sorts of input, and they don't know what to do with it. They can't do anything with it and that again may then make people angry because they thought they had influence, but they didn't have influence. So that isn't also very well done from the policy making perspective because the context isn't really set very well.

So did CRED's recommendations get narrowed down to subsidies and regulations, so there's no sense that there can be social change, social innovation... And there's no radical dimension to the offer that's coming back and... I think this said something about the science, the evidence policy interface, not just in the UK but kind of anywhere in the world.

Do you reckon that's something that they intentionally did to mirror so that they could gain access? Or...

[overlapping conversation]

Yeah, and maybe that's not really how they even write a response, because they're just on the same sort of level.

Yeah, I think it's probably a bit of both, but I think there is a sense of the imagined user of their response to the call for evidence, and there's a bunch of points that they probably could have put in here, but they didn't put them in because they thought that either it wouldn't be taken seriously, or they would just be seen as being trouble makers or crazy... But it would just be silliness. The idea that there are the other kind of ideas of how we measure progress other than GDP and growth, actually bringing that in which directly relates to issues of policy. Sorry, but this is just not on the table here. There are people in that centre who might have those kinds of [29:09] [inaudible] value coming from them. It closes down the possibilities.

I have a question which might sound [29:19] [inaudible], but is there such a thing as a call for evidence? The way... I was actually surprised to see consultation documents for our discussion in there, but I find it very, very interesting because what you were calling for are opinions and what the role of evidence then is, is to for example, legitimise or back certain opinions so... Actually, no one is calling for evidence in that sense to phrase it critically, and I was wondering, that made me think about the role of evidence is then something which has a political component to it because such process is used by different stakeholders, for example, to put forward different arguments, so I was wondering if we should make that distinction clearly in the discussion?

Yeah, that's a really good point. So just focusing on the Horizon 2020 call then [30:19] [inaudible]anybody who has not already contributed, is there anything that simply stood out in terms of how those calls are kind of defining and expecting certain kinds of evidence?

[background conversation]

We looked at document five as well which is the Horizon 2020 call, socioeconomic research conceptualising and modelling energy efficiency and energy demand. This was two calls for 2018 and 2019. So, 2018 was about the conceptualisation part, making the energy efficiency principle more concrete and operational. And the 2019 call was more about the modelling which was... The aim is to deepen the demand side related parameters and existing models with the impact expected to have quantified indicators [31:21] [inaudible].

And the thing that struck us particularly from a social science and humanities perspective, the title was Socioeconomic Research, but the two calls seem to be in fact disconnected from each other, because the question then would be in the 2019 call which is modelling [31:43] [inaudible] methods and so on. What conceptualisation do they use if the 2018 call is still ongoing? For me that was like, if you are actually conceptualising something and the call is for 2018, do you expect to have the results available to implement into 2019 model exercise?

So, in somehow it seems like we want to have this general conceptualisation and some people help make this operation, but we will continue doing the modelling anyway, whatever the conceptualisation output will be. So, for us there was a bit... Perhaps we needed to take a bit more of a [32:24] [inaudible] approach towards the modelling exercise to really be able to integrate [32:29] [inaudible] from the 2018 call which had a bit of a wider socio [32:37] [inaudible] perspective than the 2019 call. At the same time, we saw that even the 2018 call, the socio­economic aspects of that call were far more linked to the technical and economic than to, for example, issues of justice, or, even ecological within this, it didn't come out as strongly in the call. I think the main point for us is this disconnect or seeming strange sequence which didn't allow for the [33:10] [inaudible] actually integrated in this model.

That's a really interesting point. Because with the other Horizon 2020 calls, there's not really any connection [33:20] [inaudible] social innovation part in 2018 and [33:24] [inaudible].

If I may? I'll give you a bit of a conceptualisation of the reason why that is. I kinda get a little too much into detail, but of course [33:38] [inaudible] process on how these calls are shaped.

Yeah, of course.

And it's not our intention at all to use 2018 result and to feed them into 2019 calls. Those are completely disconnected. And they respond to different policy notes. So, the one in 2018 was the conceptualisation and operationalisation of a principle that was written in the governance of the Energy Union but not defined. So, we wanted to include, let's say, bottom­up researchers and include the wider community in helping shaping both qualitatively and quantitatively what this concept might be.

Whereas in 2019, the need was different and was to enhance the action modelling [34:26] [inaudible] in here to do the impact assessment of policies and [34:33] [inaudible] for example, the energy efficiency directive comes from. But doesn't really say anything on consumers. So, there is only a percentage of this country that can be changed. But that's the only value that can be changed in order to include consumers into the impact assessment of future policy. So, it's completely disconnected.

I understand that from your introduction; I understood that already. It seems like a missed opportunity, to not take this further into account when you're developing...

But maybe we will. The problem is the results of this [35:04] [inaudible] 2019 call, we will have 2021. So, it was just to... This is a challenge I guess for us, at least, I think for [35:14] [inaudible] is that between when the need arises, the call is written, the project starts, and you get the result, there is a lifespan of five, six years. So actually, what even our... Apparently, he says, "I need the results now." But then we have to finish the call to get these results, and in seven years maybe those results are no longer needed. So, there is a bit of mismatch into the need and then the results of [35:41] [inaudible]. But this is how it is.

We do need to wrap up quite soon, but I just wanted to kind of open it up if there was anything else that anybody thought hadn't really been covered yet.

Yeah, we were a bit [35:58] [inaudible], and I think what struck me now that I've heard everyone is that it’s probably the only one that really focuses on SSH.

[overlapping conversation]

You can't really avoid that [36:13] [inaudible] correct me if I [36:17] [inaudible] broad range of disciplines both humanities and social sciences, I thought that was quite good. But however, and maybe that's my own background, reading too many policy documents, and speaking of that. I kind of felt that, well, it's about sort of the two project or about the [36:39] [inaudible] SSH perspective on how to achieve the [36:43] [inaudible] transition. But it really felt like the commission's trying push down your throat its three priorities of energy security, [36:49] [inaudible] that much. And it felt that this isn't necessary very well... I mean you don't really understand when you read it and I am supposed to work on the transition aspect or more like how can we achieve these three goals which are very commission talk and you don't necessarily understand what does that mean for me as a scientist, like what does competitiveness mean, it probably means something else, than it does for the commission. [37:13] [inaudible] aspect is definitely kind of left a bit out, even though it's about the clean energy transition.

So, I thought that was quite interesting. And it would be perhaps more interesting to have a better framing of the question bit more broadly, maybe define these concepts bit more for that. And define... Understand what's kind of asked from you, or how you can [37:34] [inaudible]. But apart from that I thought that the blueprints were sort of [37:39] [inaudible].

So maybe I noticed about this one [37:42] [inaudible], is that, at the very start you said it's gonna be about, it is relating to socioeconomic and gender and then it goes on. And then you get to the end it will provide a better understanding of gender. The research questions in the middle, no mention of it whatsoever. They were all about acceptance and factors and business models. [38:04] [inaudible] buzz words thrown in sometimes [38:08] [inaudible]. Anyway, I have one further question, which is, did anybody spot a humanity? You mentioned that there were humanities in here. What's the role of humanities and...

I think [38:24] [inaudible] gender is there. I think if you read it and you think "Oh I want to participate," you could find a way to [38:31] [inaudible] that for me, kind of... But it wasn't specifically singled out.

I think the cultural aspect refers mainly to the humanities path, no?

The cultural aspect?

Whereas it's framed as socioeconomic, gender, social, cultural and socio-political, I think the cultural it's addressing mainly the humanities.

Okay, yeah, I see that was kind of meaningful then the use of the term cultural without actually... That's not the same as a buzzword, that was actually something they genuinely are interested in. And you talk about populism and anti­democratic attitudes.

[background conversation]

I talked about fuel poverty which sort of teases out issues of inequality. But it felt more like a missed opportunity, like we were saying when we first, when we read the opening, we were thinking, "Oh right, so, maybe the evidence [39:29] [inaudible] ". But there was a hint of it.

[background conversation]

Recorded the word value, but the value, it was not clear whether it was the value as for a person, like the value like an attribution, or if it's the value like economic value.

And you said the same thing actually, the word "value" comes up loads, but a lot of the time it means [40:07] [inaudible].

[background conversation]

Any final comments then before we move on to the next session?

I have another comment on the document four, but maybe this is also true for other documents. I'm aware that if the consultation is about empowering consumers or whatever, then you have a specific focus and we don't have other [40:38] [inaudible], which is true. But I think it's interesting in itself that there are no other [40:44] [inaudible]. For example, I found that for me too interesting that in this whole idea of the energy transition, there is an idea of a win win solution. So, kind of everyone wins and if there are barriers or problems then it's because of lacking consumer acceptance in a way or maybe also because there is not enough funding or whatever, at least that's what is in the bullet points.

But it's not about other conflict that [41:21] [inaudible], what about vested interests of fossil energy companies. What about infrastructure that is just not meant for decentralised energy transition? Which I think a lot of these would be core questions, or research interests for SSH, but they are not really [41:45] [inaudible] I mean I am no political scientist, that's why I said them, but I am looking for conflict everywhere. But I mean they are everywhere when you look at the energy transition, so I think it's incorrect in that there is narrow perspective on renewable energy which is clear because it's the renewable energy directive, so don't get me wrong, but this is... I mean it's integrated in a wider setting where at the moment they're very powerful fossil energy interests. And I think that might be important when you talk about the transitions or something.

That's so interesting the way that conflict [42:35] [inaudible] issue of acceptance. Okay. We probably should move on now, otherwise we won't be getting our lunch on time so.

[background conversation]

Just maybe couple of remarks because, which are important to understand the way the calls are [42:52] [inaudible]. You're looking at calls that come from the second pillar of Horizon 2020, right? Horizon 2020 has three pillars, the ERC, the challenges, and then the... What's the third pillar?

Innovation.

Innovation. Which now [43:11] [inaudible] innovation concept. So, in the second pillar, the focus is very much on application of research, investment and growth and all these things. So it has to have a result. And as such when you write a call you always have to link it back to some kind of policy [43:34] [inaudible], this is why there's the three priorities from the Energy Union in there, because you simply cannot write a call in a second pillar and just keep it very broad. You can't just say "We're interested in knowing and understanding better this and that." That's just not enough for the second pillar.

For the first pillar, it might be enough, but for the second pillar it's not enough, so we need an anchor, we need some kind of policy anchor. And yeah, so if it looks like something being shoved down your throat, that's too bad, because it wasn't meant to be like that. But you need such an anchor. There was something else I wanted to say, it's about [44:15] [inaudible], so never mind. It's just you need to look at where that is, normally these things aren't particularly strict, so you can stretch the limits, nonetheless. But you need to come in the second pillar, you need to have an anchor in policy, you need to come to impact. The impact portions are actually quite important, and they need to be as complete as you can make them. So, that's just the frame that you're working in.

That's helpful and of course we have selected these documents that are not representative of anyone or anything really. Thank you.

Thank you. So, we're almost at lunch, but we have one final thing to do [44:57] [inaudible]. [background conversation]

[45:03] [inaudible] so this afternoon we have a...