**How to support us in the public consultations on Horizon Europe**

Disclaimer: This document provides arguments you may want to consider when taking part in the public consultation. It offers text parts in response to the sections of the questionnaire, which are open source and thus free to copy and use when filling in the public consultation. The text provided builds on the authors' analyses of the orientation document.

It takes about 20-25 minutes time to fill in the questionnaire.

Please open the following page:  
<https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/HorizonEurope_Codesign_2021-2024>

**Input for Section A:**

Please provide the necessary personal or organizational information.

**Input for Section B:**

Please prioritise the provided issues according to your personal or organizational perspective. We recommend that your contribution to the consultation provides a bigger picture, a context, in which you embed your stakeholder perspective.

**Input for Section C (300 characters max.)**


Please prioritise the provided issues according to your personal or organizational perspective

**AND**

use the text fields along the five projected strands of impact of Horizon Europe (each 300 characters max.).


Please provide the following information (*marked yellow*) in the section ‘Protective Europe’ in Section C, Field 6:

*The following impact should be included in Cluster 3: ‘Address socio-economic, psych. and human & citizens’ rights factors of security needs and aim for socially engaged development of technological and non-technological security solutions via disruptive co-construction with all societal actors.’*




Please provide the following information (*marked yellow*) in the section ‘Competitive Europe’ in Section C, Field 8:

*The following impact should be included in Clusters 4: ‘increased support for(a) non-technological and social innovation oriented towards building circular systems and (b) grassroots development by engaging all societal actors aiming at better aligning solutions to the needs and values of society.’*




Please provide the following information (*marked yellow*) in the section ‘Fair Europe’ in Section C, Field 10:

*The following impact should be included in Cluster 2: ‘A stronger integration of the European citizens into the production of knowledge, technology and impact via appropriate participatory or representative approaches to their inclusion in process and outcomes of science, research and innovation.’*



Please provide the following information (*marked yellow*) in the section ‘Sustainable Europe’ in Section C, Field 12:

*The following impact should be included in Clusters 5: ‘Foster passion for climate neutral life styles and address issues of necessary behavioural change by investing in societally engaged research, which increases the likelihood of finding socially desirable and disruptive solutions.’*



**Input for Section D (5000 characters max.)**

**Here, there are several options.**


***OPTION 1 (suggested by Ulrich Schoisswohl, Austrian Research Promotion Agency on behalf of the ‘NewHoRRIzon project' transnational working group of funding agencies’ and in coordination with the ‘Network of National Contact Points for Science with and for Society in Horizon 2020’ (***[***http://www.sisnetwork.eu/***](http://www.sisnetwork.eu/)***). The text was created under consideration of the ideas promoted in the Pathways declaration (***[***http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/***](http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/)***) an initiative supported by SwafS projects and individual researchers, experts and practitioners for societally engaged science, research and innovation.***

Please mark the following options:

* Culture, creativity and inclusive society (cluster 2)
* Widening Participation and Strengthening the European Research Area

**AND**

use this text field

****to provide the following information (*marked yellow*):

*Having read the orientations document a number of times I am altogether convinced that the proposal is comprehensive and extremely ambitious.*

*After some reflection and debate with colleagues I would like to suggest the following four amendments:*

*Page 16, Cluster 2, the following impact should be included: ‘A stronger integration of the European citizens into the production of knowledge, technology and impact by means of appropriate participatory or representative approaches to assure their inclusion in the process and outcomes of science, research and innovation.’*

*Page 20, the following cross-cutting factor should be included: ‘Placing public interest at the heart of Europe's knowledge-based economy: the cooperation of all societal actors (researchers, citizens, policy makers, business, third sector organisations etc.) during the whole science, research and innovation process will better align both the process and its outcomes with the values, needs and expectations of European society.’*

*Page 20, line 28: ‘Gender equality and a consideration of the gender dimension’ instead of ‘Gender equality’.*

*Page 25, line 8: ‘gender equality and a consideration of the gender dimension’ instead of ‘gender equality’.*

*For amendments 1 and 2, the argument is the following:*

*What is, according to my reading of the orientations document, not sufficiently addressed is the integration of the European citizens and their values, needs and expectations into the production of knowledge, technology and impact. Public engagement in science, research and innovation is essential to the publics’ further support of future framework programs and trust and appreciation of science, research and innovation.*

*These issues have been so far pursued by the ‘Science in Society’ program (FP7) and the ‘Science with and for Society’ program (H2020). The key ambition was to allow for all societal actors (researchers, citizens, policy makers, business, third sector organisations etc.) to work together during the whole science, research and innovation process in order to better align both the process and its outcomes with the values, needs and expectations of European society. This approach was later called Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). An ambition that has not yet been realized. Mostly, because it calls for a more significant change in the way that science, research and innovation are orchestrated and performed than was originally expected.*

*Still, much has been learned from SwafS. It is my reading of the orientations document, that it features a stronger alignment with the values, needs and expectations of the European citizens than H2020 exactly because the understanding created by the SwafS program has been considered in its design. Looking ahead towards FP10 it would be a pity to give up on an even stronger alignment brought about by a strong follow-up on the SwafS program and the Responsible Research and Innovation approach.*

*Additional in past years it has become increasingly clear that to tackle todays’ large scale challenges to the European societies we are in need of a strong multi-disciplinary multi-stakeholder community capable of integrating SSH (Social Sciences and Humanities) as well as STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) with the needs, expectations and values of the European citizens. While the SwafS community is still in its early formative stages it is already the most advanced multi-disciplinary multi-stakeholder community in this respect. Still, feasible new ways of including the European citizens in the production of knowledge, technology and impact are needed. These new ways have to be developed and tested to assure desirable science, research and innovation impacts.*

*That said I urge you to continue the funding of the ambition put forward by the SwafS community so that new and appropriate participatory and representative approaches to the inclusion of the European citizens in the science, research and innovation process and its outcomes can be found and established.*

*For amendments 3 and 4, the argument is the following:*

*I strongly feel that the orientations document would profit from a wording that makes the difference between ‘gender equality’ and ’gender dimension’ more explicit and puts both terms on equal footing. This would be in line with the relevant policy objectives European ERA Roadmap 2015-2020. Contrary to that readers are currently given the impression that ‘gender dimension’ is a subtopic of ‘gender equality’.*

*How to integrate amendments 1 and 2 into the structure of Horizon Europe:*

*Funding for the SwafS and RRI ambition could be provided via (a) Cluster 2 and (b) a strong follow-up program to ‘Science with and for Society’ implemented in form of a subprogram to ‘Reforming and Enhancing the European R&I system’.*

*Funding aiming at 1 % of Horizon Europe budget could be a reasonable target and would be comparable to funding under H2020.*


***OPTION 2 (suggested by Stephanie Daimer, Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research ISI) on behalf of the NewHoRRIzon project' social lab group for "Science with and for Society" (***[***https://newhorrizon.eu/sl15/***](https://newhorrizon.eu/sl15/)***) and following the ideas promoted in the Pathways declaration (***[***http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/***](http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/)***) an initiative supported by SwafS projects and individual researchers and experts for societally engaged research.***

Please mark

* ALL clusters
* Widening Participation and Strengthening the European Research Area

**AND**

use this text field

****to provide the following information (*marked yellow*):

*Having read the orientations document I am altogether convinced that the proposal is comprehensive, ambitious and entirely the right cause of action to be pursued.*

*I would like to suggest the following amendments to the orientations document:*

*(Amendment 1) The additions provided for clusters 2-5 in the impact sections (chapter 3) above fostering societal relevance of R&I and engaged research. Cluster 1 and 6 are not excluded from this approach of engaged research, rather the opposite: a lot of this is already in the orientation document, perhaps still somehow implicit.*

*(Amendment 2) Page 20, the following cross-cutting factor should be included: ‘Placing public interest at the heart of Europe's knowledge-based economy: The cooperation of all societal actors (researchers, citizens, policy makers, business, third sector organisations etc.) during the whole science, research and innovation process will better align both the process and its outcomes with the values, needs and expectations of European society.’*

*The argument is the following:*

*Introducing engaged research (a term embracing Responsible Research and Innovation and other forms of engagement) is a logical consequence of the ambition expressed for the part on* ***Strengthening the European Research Area****. The orientation document reads promising, where it says: (p. 24f):*

*" Opening the European Research Area to future challenges requires developing synergies with the European Higher Education Area in a complex landscape of universities and research* *organisations with a view to underpinning* ***open science****,* [...] *and* ***breaking down disciplinary and inter-sectoral research barriers to match emerging business and societal needs.***

*What is however, according to my reading of the orientations document, not sufficiently addressed is the integration of the European citizens and their values, needs and expectations into the production of knowledge, technology and impact. This is expressed in the Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) approach, which has been embraced by numerous European and global stakeholders during the last 10 years. Public engagement is to my understanding essential to the publics’ further support of future framework programs and trust and appreciation of science, research and innovation..*

*These issues are of course not new. They have been so far pursued by the ‘Science in Society’ program (FP7) and the ‘Science with and for Society’ program (H2020). While I understand that according to the orientations document there are no explicit barriers to achieving the ambition pursued by SwafS, this ambition is also not encouraged as a policy objective in the clusters (pages 12-19) or in the scope of the supporting policy objectives (pages 20-25).*

*It is my understanding that the ambition that was envisioned and pursued by SiS and SwafS has not yet been realized. Mostly, because it calls for a more significant change in the way that science, research and innovation are orchestrated and performed than was originally expected.*

*I am convinced that a continuation of the SwafS program and the RRI approach would be overall highly beneficial for reaching the impacts outlined in the orientation document. However, responding to the proposed structure of Horizon Europe, I am proposing here to embed engaged research as a cross-cutting issue for the whole program of Horizon Europe and to support this cross-cutting issue with a dedicated budget and a couple of measures within the all the clusters as well as within the missions.*

*How to integrate these amendments into the structure of Horizon Europe (building on ideas put forward in the Pathways Declaration at* [*http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/*](http://pathways2019.eu/declaration/) *:*

*Funding for engaged research should be provided by*

*(1) dedicated calls within the cluster programmes (and missions alike) supporting RRI and fostering SSH research and addressing topics of societal relevance, non-technological or social innovation, by*

*(2) integrating RRI/ engaged research as a requirement in calls for technological projects and supporting this requirement by a couple of instruments (projects can dedicate certain budgets to such instruments, these elements are considered as key in the evaluations and project reviews, applicants receive dedicated support in the application phase, these elements are not regarded as dissemination but as research etc. see the Pathways declaration).*

*(3) implemented in form of a subprogram to ‘Reforming and Enhancing the European R&I system’ to nurture the knowledge base for example to particularly address the challenge of addressing engaged research in a holistic perspective within R&I projects.*

*Total funding of these streams aiming at 1 % of Horizon Europe budget could be a reasonable target and would be comparable to funding under H2020.*

Submit your input to the public consultations on Horizon Europe

Now klick on ‘Submit’.

Data for statistical purposes

For statistical purposes it would be great if you could provide the following information:

* your country of work,
* your role (organization or individual),
* your societal sphere (i.e. stakeholder type).

Please open the following link to provide us with this data: <http://deep-agency.eu/counter/>

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT!**