



Horizon 2020 Societal challenge 5:  
Climate action, environment, resource  
efficiency and raw materials

## Minutes

### **Engagement Strategy Meeting (WP2)**

03 November 2016

Exchange Avenue, Schiphol Airport, the Netherlands

#### **Participants:**

Thomas Voelker (JRC), Kerry Waylen (HUTTON), Kirsty Blackstock (HUTTON), Roger Strand (UiB), Rudolf van Broekhuizen (WU), Abigail Muscat (WU), Jan Sindt (CA), Violeta Cabello (UAB), Zora Kovacic (UAB)

### 9.00-10.00 Intro: Where do we stand after the MuSIASEM training?

- Welcome and setting/agreeing on the agenda and goals for the meeting
- Update on documents on google drive and negotiations with EU-staff
- Remind ourselves if and when other parts of project need inputs

We started late as we were waiting for UAB and CA – so started at 9:50.

Thomas: Idea for this meeting came from September meeting and further emails about how to engage policy makers and how to deal with concerns around the deficit model – need to have a common vision and response by social scientists. Share ideas and develop a coherent approach. All were content with the agenda.

Outcome = set of research questions for MuSIASEM and for the social science policy interests – conceptual and theoretical backgrounds – what RQ are interesting for us and profitable for the project in the wider sense. And then to agree how to go about it, how the WPs interrelate and who will do the work and by when – what is feasible and necessary. Formulate next steps and timelines (realistic). Interview guidelines.

Thomas gave an overview – provided documents on google drive were very useful to identify people – lots of input on CAP, some are less developed, however there are names to snowball from. JRC have started contacting people who work on Nexus issues within the JRC, using the invite list from JRC August meeting on NEXUS – they will be interviewing them in November, they are head of units in JRC so they will have good contacts with the Commission. They share a strong interest in evidence for policy wrt Nexus but a different take on Nexus from us. Violeta attended this workshop, focus was on science for policy and how to do it, nexus was a topic to focus the ideas around science for policy but wasn't really looking at the nexus per se. Mario visited a group of JRC scholars working on Nexus (**AP for Mario to send the names to Thomas for his information**). Angela has been communicating with STOA in European Parliament and will interview members of STOA (some of the names are MEPs). Angela has another contact at the European Parliament who is a champion of Science-Policy interfaces – Zsolt Pataki. Because of their role (advisory think tank) they might be more open to new approaches?

An interesting question is how did the idea and interest of 'nexus' emerge in the EU? Kirsty noted Keith's work (see WP5 sustainability strategies) where he thinks an interest in nexus may be traced to the Sustainable Development Strategy and the Environment Action Plan. However, be aware of ideas of science-policy that uses a rational/modernist model of science can contradict our approach. Look at WP5 Sustainability historical documents – key areas to work with. **AP: please send names of academics working on Nexus e.g. Simon Mesch (Germany) to Violeta.** Nexus came from World Economic Forum launched Global platform for Nexus, Dusseldorf meeting 2011, or 2008 *origin [Kerry and Kirsty to look at our notes for June meeting, we did some digging about this]*. There is a strong Managerial perspective within the notion of the nexus.

If and what other parts of the project need input. Zora – Mario wants to start preparing material for the QST so he wants input from us and coordination with the quantitative analysis – feed results to those doing the quantification in WP4. WP4 would like to know what the specific interest/question from those in the commission to use in WP4 – what the quantification should be about – and also we have some ideas about the directives and type of quantification we can do – so how do we present these results to the stakeholders? Between now and May 2017. Also tone and guidance on how to present and interact.

We need to move away from the model of “evidence presentation engagement” – can be part of our engagement strategy but we need to open beyond ‘tone’ to the model of engagement and how we do it. Once we have agreed, we need to compress these into simple messages to convey to our wider consortium and Mario. Accept that we will have two modes of engagement – dissemination using u-tube/slides and also deliberation.

The outcome of today should be an interview guide, with the purpose of mapping people to engage with. Interviews are about what stakeholders want and need from this project, and who to contact. The **presentation** of results will come later in the focus groups etc (Inspirational Workshop, April 2017). We need more clarity on the process.

Principles for the rest of the project might be useful as the project is a learning process. Some interactions will be in the information-deficit model and some will be more dialogic, depending on who we engage with.

We can come to an agreement amongst ourselves but we may not be able to influence all the interactions in the wider project. Some will continue in the evidence for policy model style, no matter what we want or think, particularly as some of those we are working with are also more familiar with technocratic science for policy approaches. Many stakeholders will be interested and seeking ‘facts’ and quantification.

We need to coordinate our ideas of how to do the engagement and how to do the quantification. This is why Thomas needs to know what are the controversies in the different fields for the interviews.

### **10.00-10.45 Broad issues: social science agenda and interests in MAGIC**

- Discuss and fine-grain the research interest of MAGIC from a social science perspective in addition to and apart from ‘identifying’ policy-makers for ‘dialogues’
  - Emergence of policies
  - Different practices and institutional cultures of decision-making
  - Practices and sites of giving advice to policy-makers
- What are our ‘social Science’ objectives and questions structuring our research? What is our purpose?
- What type(s) of outputs do we aim for or aspire to?

Nexus – sustainability, Anthropocene, integration/integrated assessment, where does nexus intersect these other ideas. But we also need to ground this in an understanding of what the policy makers need. At the start, we ask questions about their views, knowledge, experience that we can translate into the concepts relevant for MuSIASEM and later on we present and discuss the results. We map what people think is happening in policy processes with our results and quantifications. The more concrete the question, the easier it is for people to engage.

Specific controversies – compare the declared goals to the policy tools and targets set and look for consistencies and mismatches – specific topics to talk about that is more refined and linked to the directives and problems that the directives themselves mentioned – how to monitor progress, set targets, etc. **AP: Zora will share this text analysis guidance with us.**

How the goals have been developed and how decisions are made – different institutional cultures and decision making logics - this is important and will be developed from interviews and focus groups.

We need to know what is behind these aims/goals/targets etc – we won't find these within the texts. We need to get a handle on the narrative expressed in the official document, and recognize that there are multiple stories out there. We can start with the story in the text and then ask about what other stories the interviewees see in the text. Framing behind the policies.

Start from the stories/themes in the text but also the interpretations and stories/themes-in-use; both what is current and also the genealogy of these changes.

We can show differences and contingencies in the text and then ask for an opinion on them, how they emerged.

We have an interest in where things came from but we need to be forward looking so we model where the policies are going – that is what MuSIASEM needs to simulate. E.g. CAP in Netherlands more about food security or provision of public goods?

EPI-NET experience: going to policy makers and asking what are the controversies didn't work. The experience was that we were running after them, interests are short term, they last for a few weeks, policy is dynamic and short-term, erratic and non-predictable. Reality is policy making is continual crisis management not a slow and predictable rational process as it is presented, so understanding the process and culture and practices of decision making is crucial; and the challenges/goals for their world as a policy maker and the long term process.

Interviews: we can ask about current controversies, but also what makes the policy-maker's life difficult on a systemic way. We should look for long term problems. We need from WP4 that address systemic challenges of policy making, need to support these; we need to understand well what MuSIASEM can do and not do; we need to engage people with their problems but we also need to reflect on and critique the 'taken-for-granted' stories.

Policy makers know what they need next week, not in 2 years. This is difficult to elicit. Think about long term slow changing variables in policy making. Idea of policy windows – discourse around what the problem is. Understanding the politics of how a problem comes to persist.

At SNET meeting we discussed the position we take inside MAGIC: it is not a neutral project, it takes a stand. MuSIASEM talks about the framing of a practical problem – but ambiguity is functional, that what makes politics possible. Ambiguity between what is written and the aims behind. How we work with functional ambiguity, complexity, uncertainty that allows politics to happen. MuSIASEM is a way to destroy ‘politics’? Or illustrates how framings play to different interests; and the hegemonic projects at work behind directives or ideas. This comes down to explicit value-position taken in our project. Recognition of our normative positions. E.g. choice to look at GMOs – is this to strengthen opposition or change the boundaries of the debate?

MuSIASEM can have 3 different uses: (1) exposing the framing, and showing how the framing changes the results. (2) Translation of the policy objectives into quantified targets – how is it done? Can it be done differently? It is more ‘neutral’. (3) monitoring problem – long term need – we can help with the quality assessment of monitoring whether the objectives are being achieved. So we can look at different uses of MuSIASEM. In each case, QST can identify different stories/perspectives/tools to show different outcomes. Makes comparative analysis possible; and also answers a long-term need.

Rudolf is unsure how this would work for CAP – it fits better to the WFD than others. Abigail - there is still a formalisation of how to monitor and evaluate policy – this is a ready-made audience for our work. Evaluations are very difficult, and often done to legitimise the policy, lack a critical dimension. Hard to disentangle the effect of the policy measure from other drivers so this would hard for MuSIASEM to simulate. Roger this is an interesting social science question – how monitoring is set up to illustrate success; and our role is to increase transparency and accountability between aims and targets. Useful does not mean that the recipient will be happy. The selling point can be increased accountability. Quantification is very difficult (due to causality); analysis of CAP illustrates ‘non-governmentality’ e.g. impossible to ‘steer’ complex world. Zora argues that not all the results of the project will be quantifiable, and the role of social science is to provide these results that are not quantifiable.

Two areas of potential research interest – themes/stories in use regarding nexus ideas on the policies, where they come from, the power effects etc AND how quantification works in the SPI process. But we need to do the 2<sup>nd</sup> within a long-term relationship of trust. Recognise that problem framing is political – but this is known already.

Understanding the nexus is required – others are doing this too – but we can do it more strategically across directives and at EU level. Mario is writing a paper on this that we can reflect on this.

Role of knowledge/quantification is important: this is the topic of PNS, but it is a practical type of literature oriented to uncertainty management and assessment (communicates well to natural

science people), and it is nostalgic, about what should have been – not well integrated with social theory and political theory. We could improve on that analysis, with a critical view. Chilvers' comments to Kirsty at RBG conference: they said they are doing post PNS because it is more reflexive, what is the role of power, what is our position – more theoretical position on PNS. Martin O'Connor's work is useful here. Also social constructivist takes the quantification a bit too lightly – quantification has some impacts on policy. There is a niche here where we have strong natural and quantification science but we can bring normative dimensions and more overt links to social theory to this.

Jan arrived during the coffee break.

Context of post-factual society (Brexit and Trump) and how this will affect our interactions. May increase an interest in science communication. Magic is premised on the understanding of crisis in European institutions and austerity. We don't know how this will play out, this can go both ways, opening up or going back to technocratic management. Nothing has happened yet. In UK talk about "we have removed some constraints". Can identify different roles of narratives/stories in politics and facts/science communication in policy making. Relationship between the bullet points – nexus is one example of how bring systems science into policy making – nexus opens up complexity/uncertainty/systems/integration ideas but can be seen as technical problem to solve a governmental problem. The problem with the EU is technocracy – we can't solve the problem by providing further science. We need more participatory approaches, looking at the questions arising from society (using media discourses etc) etc.

JRC and EC very technocratic, this is seen as desirable – move from cognitive deficit to democratic deficit [with representative democracy] – the illusion of participation and representation – innovations (WP6) work more from [local] case study perspectives – local concrete sites etc – bottom up problem framings with local communities; context specific issues. Agree that we need early integration of these stakeholders, Jan feels that working at aggregation at Member State is already problematic and need to recognise the heterogeneity of voices across the EU.

Previous experience of TECHNOLIFE on engaging with people around emerging technologies in a deeper way. Centered on imaginaries and imagined communities. Issues make communities – that's why nanotechnologies fail, the technology does not spark interest. Identify underrepresented narratives in the policy debate. Issue framings and how they create communities is useful to show the multiplicities of narratives/ideas/themes. **AP: Roger will upload some materials from this project to show what they learnt.**

Public as heterogeneous. Intelligence of the public, publics are capable of dealing with ambiguity. Public has and should have an influence in policy making. People don't have an opinion about the CAP, but we can identify issues linked to the CAP that people care about.

There are different levels at which we work: in WP5 we start from stakeholders influencing policy at EU level. Innovation work can take a more grounded bottom-up approach. We have entry points at

different levels. we can start with policy influencers/makers and take some emerging stories from WP6 and feed them into WP5.

We can bring together the narratives and perspectives and issues from a ‘top-down’ arena from the ‘elites’ in Brussels and the ‘bottom-up’ issues associated with innovations. The purpose of project is reducing distance between elites in Brussels and other groups, rather than criticizing technocracy. Understanding these situated nature of policy making, not really evidence driven.

In water, innovations come from research in private sector who then lobbies the public sector for funding. Wsstp refers to grand challenges and lacks policy perspective. Innovation narratives come from a different path, although it speaks to similar challenges. Technologies and policies are promoted both to resolves the same ‘problems’ but they do this in parallel and within their own logics and power effects; not an integrated approach or clear political diagnosis. Innovation as technological fixes – different stories from local level about the situated nature of technologies.

**AP: to move on from broad issues and to refine these ideas into a more concise set of RQs on google docs**

### **11.45-12.30 Broad Issues: Conceptual issues**

- Discussion about theoretical concepts that might be useful for our work (e.g. how to think about different European institution such as EC, parliament, stakeholder associations)?
  - Post-normal science (Funtowicz/Ravetz)
  - Regulatory science, science for policy debates (Jasanoff, Irwin)
  - Organizational theory (e.g. Weber, Vaughan, Bourdieu, ...)?
  - Expertise
  - Policy cycles and /or policy integration / governance literature...

What are the ideas that we need to help us understand the empirical work. E.g. Vaughan, sociologist looking at the Challenger example and the institutional culture of acceptable risks and the outcome of decision-making processes – the idea of contingency etc. How possible is it to understand the institutional culture and practices of the EU? Can we do this within our resources? There are literatures about how the EU/EC work – **AP: Jan can share some seminal papers on how the EU/EC functions.**

We need to understand where these policies came from, and how it is evolving and changing? We do need to go behind the text to understand the stories-in-use and who is benefitting. The focus is the directive. With the CAP that’s a lot of work, but it may be doable with the Circular Economy directive. Rather than mapping organizational mapping of EC, we do it for a specific directive.

We need a common broad shared focus to agree the interview schedule and analysis and then we can bolt on further perspectives in the analyses. There are some common aspects from a wide range of interests/theories – actors, cultures, practices, decision processes, issue emergence and prioritisation, rules-in-use, power. PNS, STS etc very focussed on the role of scientific knowledge

whereas we need to start with the wider ideas of policy formation and then look at role scientific knowledge as expressed in MuSIASEM and QST work within these wider ideas.

Point of departure for PNS is normative, is that true for other social science perspectives? PNS would be interested in how the interviewee understands and validates the content of knowledge; imminent content of the knowledge. What do they believe about evidence, how they assess uncertainty, what value do they place on facts etc. therefore the interviewer ideally knows quite a bit about the topic/policy – able to have a real debate about the issues.

Co-interviewing is a good idea. Ideally, we have a social science partner and an expert (could be a PhD student), but if this is not possible should coach the other or come to one meeting, and get their input on the interview guide. So we have an informed perspective able to communicate as expert to expert.

Policy frame analysis; deliberative/interpretative and critical policy analysis – these might be useful wider concepts to frame our ideas.

Our view is that there is an area/niche by which we provide empirical/applied examples of application of ideas around policy integration, mode 2 science/Post-normal science, IPA etc – the latter tends to be abstract without application; also there is lots of applied work that does not really use any social theory.

It would be useful to have ABC of political science on the institutions we are dealing with (EU). **AP: Jan will put some material on the drive on institutional analysis of EU**

### **11.00-11.45 Broad issues: overview of methods to be used**

- Discuss the overall methodological approach to policy and stakeholder engagement
  - Combination of interviews, focus groups and ethnographic approaches
  - Interview and document analysis methodologies, scope of each (e.g. feasible #interviews?)
  - Grounded theory approach and the concept of ‘the situation’
- When and how to engage broader society? Carry out formal stakeholder analysis?
- Review timeline, roles and responsibilities

We started this after lunch.

Document analysis/text analysis necessary for different WPs. How to do this and how to agree on documents and which WP will do policy analysis of documents.

Zora is developing a text analysis guide for analysis of the directive. She has done this and piloted it and will share it with the wider consortia. Interpretative coding to analyse the text [can do it manually but also could use other software] – she has short-list of codes to work with for all to use; and also to use memos to capture other ideas e.g. ambiguity. We will also need to understand the context for the text.

Five directives from WP5 minimal; maybe more. [directive on climate change from land use and sustainability strategies] – UAB + lead team do this and between them decide what the texts are to analyse. Would be good to do this as soon as possible, to inform the interviews and WP4, but it is time-consuming.

What is the purpose of investing the effort? Two things from this work: semantic framing (aims, benefits, needs) and formal framing (measures, expectations, targets). Remember we will only get the ‘formal’ aims etc but not the hidden or real aim in use etc. ... do we need to do coding of the actual text to understand these broad categories or ideas? Doing this text analysis is useful to help us understand the language and technical specification for the monitoring etc. However, many of the details are not in the directives themselves. The texts are the democratically agreed foundation even if the civil servants agree that no one expects to achieve this. Suggest adding a set of codes for WEF nexus e.g. references to energy, food, water and biodiversity security.

This provides a foundation for the interviews and further analysis. It is not an end in itself but to complement other work. It is also useful to summarise and provide a common basis for the partners to understand the different policies.

We will need to look at different understandings of WEF nexus in the interviews for example. We need to ask about how they understand joined up connections.

First interviews – getting overview of the field, who else to talk to, what are their perspectives, and what we can do for and with them.

Selection bias – if we only talk to those who want to collaborate then we miss other ideas. Those who are too busy or not interested in us may be useful perspectives for our study.

Should not present the RQ to the participants – focus on how to sell the project to the participants. Jan has done a coding of the energy efficiency directive and found lots of issues associated with framing – although the aim is environmental the majority of the text is about economics. That influences the selection of people to talk to. Don’t need a full coding of the directives to get these information and an overview of the main issues. He could do the directive in a day, but he just coded the introduction but not all the articles.

Use the text analysis as a boundary object to discuss with the policy makers in interviews to find the narratives behind the directives. We use this for the interview as “this is what we think the directive is about” and “what is it really about?” We do a basic and quick text analysis for the interviews. Delivers what is WP5 outputs.

What is the notion of narrative and framing in our proposals. Actors have assumptions and expectations that we want to access and explore by discussing what we think the directives say.

How do you want to use MuSIASEM? How normative do we want to be? We can look at what the narratives say and how to quantify this.... Or we can explore how the aims can be met and how it can be monitored, allows us to more neutral.

We can iterate this. We can do the basic text analysis and apply in MuSIASEM and then see.

Rudolph gave an example. There is a theme about resource use efficiency in CAP. But there are different interpretations of what resource efficiency means. MuSIASEM can try to illustrate the effects/results of different interpretations of resource use, to illustrate.

Are we just looking at quantifying the narrative(s) in the text, or also the narratives that we pull out from interviews with a wide variety of stakeholders? We are doing both.

We already have an idea of what we want or need to explore in the directives before the interviews. So we can do the 'deeper' text analysis in parallel with the interviews and use them to inform each other.

Use the text as a resource but don't need to do this in detail; we do need an overview of common aspects between them, looking for specific points of connections.

Contested issues can be a useful point of connection to bring the text analysis to the interviews, and then to model them, they need early input and awareness of the contested issue to ensure they can start to consider this.

WP4 case studies are already starting on: state of the play analysis of nexus issues for MS; planetary boundaries and global drivers; case studies on dairy farming and vegetable farming in Almeria and desalination. Building a new methodology for MuSIASEM 2.0 for use in the rest. So the promise of what could be modelled will start in WP5.

But we can also even feedback what the contested issues associated with nexus across the directives, learning processes to share and improve/address some of the systematic problems; how we can address or understand monitoring/setting targets. Can help broaden and deepen the debate, provide new frames and articulations for the public debates within and between directives. Map out the different positions and articulate it in a clear and concise way. Making different positions and frames clear. Allows some under-represented perspectives to be made visible, and ensure that they are equal weight in the quantification process. Setting out the architecture of the debate is valuable and useful.

Example of energy efficiency – Mario has been working on this and we can use these analyses to illustrate the proof of concept.

We should remain open minded about what might be useful and interesting to explore from the interviews.

Contested issues from water – what is good ecological status [not societal issues], water efficiency, cost-recovery principle that is poor at understanding environmental aspects

We need to look at connections between policies and how they cohere/intersect or trade-off – when do look at these issues? Are we considering how to do integration etc?

Country level analysis of the nexus in WP4 will be addressing this issue and will allow them to do this. This is the purpose of building these tools. MuSIASEM is the tool kit – can be used differently as different tools.

We will be doing within directive analyses first but looking for common areas of analyses between the directives in the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration.

Inspirational workshop in Brussels in April – collective discussions about these issues start here – so we need to have undertaken these interviews and made sense of them by then, identifying main issues etc.

Quick and dirty text analysis + key issues from the seminal papers + description of the project +interview guide and try to feedback these ideas to other aspects of WP4. We can use the example of the energy efficiency in interviews if needed, to have it in the back pocket, Zora can provide a simple example if needed, but we'd prefer to focus on a dialogue and asking questions of them... and come to an illustration of the project afterwards.

We need the dates for the Inspirational workshop. Participant observation at these workshops. Issues and themes/frames/narratives and who holds them.

We need to a rough and ready document analysis; and formal stakeholder analysis, in order to set up the interviews

What is the rough number of interviews that can be done? Probably 20-30 interviews total across 5 directives.

Who can do this? Rudolf, Kirsty and Kerry are willing to help do some interviews, possibly Roger and Bruna. We should block out one week in January and one week in February to do the interviews. Debriefing and sharing ideas every night.

Need both an interview guide and a guide to how to prepare for these interviews, including how to engage topic experts and cover the co-experts.

Who are the social science **and** topic experts – Angela, Mario, Maddalena could cover energy? Kerry habitats; Jan low carbon energy; Violeta/Kirsty/Kerry water; Maddalena for circular economy, Rudolf on CAP.

Who will do the text analysis. Phd Students can do this. **AP: Zora will send the text analysis guidance**, we can refine it and give it to the students/us. We must do the text analysis available before December. **AP: Rudolf and Keith to help Kerry/Kerry to identify the text(s) that should be analysed for CAP.**

Stakeholder analysis – should we do a formal stakeholder mapping? How? Power and influence as key dimensions. We can use the categories in the dissemination plan? We can set this up and make sure our initial contacts are represented the map; and then use snowballing to discover how to fill up the gaps. Kirsty should consider how stakeholder analysis considers situational analysis.

So we set up the January interviews now and then use snowballing to populate the February interviews. Suggested interviews week of 9<sup>th</sup> January and 6<sup>th</sup> February.

**AP: Kerry and Kirsty to provide some short guidance on what stakeholder analysis could consider and circulate this.**

Inspirational workshop – talks and then break out discussions over a day (not sure how long the day is). The participants for this will be those who we interviewed plus any other interested in the ideas. Discussion of potential venues – Roger suggested a link (Thomas found it, Kirsty didn't) and Violeta knows about a Catalan venue very close by – **AP: JRC to clarify the venue (needs breakout rooms and about 50 people) and book it. Rest of the WP2 to put the dates in the diary.**

We should take stock of where we've got in the May meeting – we still wish to do 'slow and clean' text analysis but we can use the '**taking stock**' process to help focus these deeper analyses of the texts (and also to clarify the texts that we should be focussing on). We can then proceed to develop the social science materials and also the work to be done to support the QST process.

Thomas will circulate the interview guide to circulate on 11<sup>th</sup> November and we have a week to respond (week commencing 18<sup>th</sup> November) to have topic specific guide by 2<sup>nd</sup> December; then will send the topic guide to the content experts once populated after the text analysis where necessary. Text analysis done by Xmas.

By Xmas have final topic guides and document analysis and first step of stakeholder analysis done.

Governance arrangements – Mario to agree what we request in the minutes; then Thomas to contact interview people and Zora the text people – in subject line what is needed and by when.

Thomas will start to set up the interviews in Brussels. Allow one hour. 3 possibly 4 interviews in a day.

We can broaden the interviews beyond the EC staff but we won't broaden beyond the Brussels elite, at least for these initial scoping interviews between now and May.

Violeta and Thomas may try to set up meetings with the WssTP meeting in November.

Situational analysis – change in focus from the process to the focus on the action in specific situations. Uses spatial metaphors. Situational maps (research questions and issues). Positional maps

(different discourses and frames in use and positions taken) and arena maps (wider context and institutions in which the positions/situations take place). Important that we put ourselves into the maps to make it post-modern. Requires a thick analysis. Can be done more simplistically at the start. What data is required to do this; how much time will it take. Build up the maps from the data; elaboration of conditional matrices in grounded theory. As with the stakeholder analysis we start with some abstract and general ideas that we continue to populate through interviews, text analysis and workshops so we get a better version of maps.

Thomas will circulate the draft contact email and use the leaflet on the project when setting up the interviews.

Zora will provide a simple example of MuSIASEM for us to share.

Informed consent is essential. We may not need to promise anonymity. We could put it through Hutton ethics but no final agreement to do it – however would need to give them at least a month's notice so needs to submit by end of November. Roger will volunteer to come back to issues of how to record consent, how to store and analyse transcripts, who should have access, and what are the basics that we cover and we have to check this and add any of our own national/institutional requirements. He will circulate a draft for us to comment on by 18<sup>th</sup> November. The fact that we are researching powerful public figures, some of the traditional concerns and protections may not be possible. Confidentiality and de-identification is something to consider. WE need to double check these with Samuele and how it fits with the grant agreement. Also liaise with the data management plan (deadline is end of November). **AP: Zora and Samuele to circulate a draft of a data management plan once translated and iterated for Roger/us to add this part to the data management plan.**

We would anticipate recording – where allowed – so we should start to line up transcription arrangements now.

Meeting ended 17:30

Conferences of interest: ESEE, AAG 2018, PNS 2017, STS meetings (water/energy/innovation sessions), INGSA annual meeting – WP7 on drive. International Public Policy Association, 4S-EASST conference