

# WP 1: Project coordination, Standardisation and Methodology

## RRING Self evaluation report of RRI practice

Status: Final

19/08/2021



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 788503.

## About RRING

The overall project aim is to bring Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) into the linked up global world to promote mutual learning and collaboration in RRI. This will be achieved by the formation of the global RRING community network and by the development and mobilization of a global Open Access RRI knowledge base. RRING will align RRI to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a global common denominator.

The RRING project acknowledges that each region of the world is advancing its own agenda on RRI. Therefore, RRING will not be producing a Global RRI framework or strategy that is meant to be enforced in a top-down manner. Rather, increased coherence and convergence will be achieved via a bottom-up approach, learning from best practices in RRI globally and from linkages, via the new RRING community, to develop the RRI linked-up world.

### Six Objectives of RRING

**Objective 1:** Promote a linked up global world of RRI by creating the global RRING community network, thereby enabling mutual learning, collaboration, mobilization of RRI concepts.

**Objective 2:** Mobilize, promote and disseminate a global open access knowledge base of RRI based on the State of the Art (SoA) and comparative analysis across the key geographies, all stakeholders and sectors. It will cover key platforms, spaces and players, role and influence of stakeholders, drivers and policies for R&I, regulation in public, private sectors and nation states and international organizations.

**Objective 3:** Align RRI to the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to provide a global common denominator for advancement of RRI and address Grand Challenges globally.

**Objective 4:** Determine the competitive advantages of RRI and also understand how and where RRI is perceived as a barrier and/ or disadvantage.

**Objective 5:** Create high level RRI strategy recommendations for the seven geographic zones, trial RRI best practice learning in 2 EU case studies.

**Objective 6:** Promote inclusive engagement of civil society and researchers.



## Document Information

<b>Title</b>	RRING Self evaluation report of RRI practice	
<b>Distribution</b>	Public	
<b>Document Reference</b>	RRING-[Type the number, e.g. 2.01]	
<b>Deliverable Leader</b>	Gordon Dalton	UCC
<b>Contributing Authors</b>	Erna Karalija	ICORSA
	Chris Foulds	ARU
	Alexander Gerber	HSRW
	Vincent Blok	WU
	April Tash	UNESCO

## Revision History

Rev.	Date	Description	Prepared by (Name & Org.)	Approved By (Work- Package Leader)	Status (Draft/Final)
01	15/05/2021	First draft	Erna Karalija		Draft
02	18/08/2021	Final Draft	Erna Karalija		Final
03					

## Acknowledgement

The work described in this publication has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 788503.

## Contents

<b>WP 1: Project coordination, Standardisation and Methodology</b> .....	1
<b>RRING Self evaluation report of RRI practice</b> .....	1
<b>15/05/2021</b> .....	1
About RRING .....	2
Document Information .....	3
Revision History .....	3
Acknowledgement .....	3
1. Introduction .....	5
2. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP2.....	7
2.1. Open access .....	7
2.2. Gender equality .....	7
2.3. Ethics, research integrity.....	8
2.4. Public engagement .....	8
2.5. Science education .....	8
3. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP3.....	9
3.1. Open access .....	9
3.2. Gender equality .....	10
3.3. Ethics, research integrity.....	11
3.4. Public engagement .....	12
3.5. Science education .....	12

4.	Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP4.....	13
4.1.	Open access .....	13
4.2.	Gender equality .....	13
4.3.	Ethics, research integrity.....	13
4.4.	Public engagement .....	13
4.5.	Science education .....	13
5.	Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP5.....	13
5.1.	Open access .....	14
5.2.	Gender equality .....	15
5.3.	Ethics, research integrity.....	16
5.4.	Public engagement .....	16
5.5.	Science education .....	17
6.	Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP6.....	17
6.1.	Open access .....	17
6.2.	Gender equality .....	18
6.3.	Ethics, research integrity.....	19
6.4.	Public engagement .....	20
6.5.	Science education .....	20
7.	Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP7.....	21
7.1.	Open access .....	21
7.2.	Gender equality .....	21
7.3.	Ethics, research integrity.....	22
7.4.	Public engagement .....	22
7.5.	Science education .....	23
8.	Conclusion.....	23

## 1. Introduction

The Self-Assessment Tool (SAT) for RRING partners has been designed to draw attention to any potential RRI issues in RRING teams and activities, hence encouraging team-lead reflection and action. It is intended to aid reflexivity, to provide support, and to help each team reflect on and plan for the integration of the RRI dimensions into their team and research. It will also assist in documenting some basic data and documenting how partners are approaching the issue of integrating RRI over the course of the project.

There is a considerable level of RRI expertise within the RRING consortium, especially in the partners participating to RRING and GRRIP projects on RRI, such as UCC and ICoRSA. However, given the variety of consortium members and institutional contexts, and the broad expanse of research interests, not all research teams will have members with RRI expertise or training, and not all working environments will be as conducive to integrating RRI across both people and processes as others. The SAT aims to capture the level of RRI expertise that is present within each research team.

The SAT adopts the AIRR model of Anticipatory, Inclusive, Reflexive, and Responsive approaches to thinking about the integration of RRI into the research process.

### Self-Assessment Process

The SAT is to be completed by each RRING Work Package (WP) Leader and submitted at the end of the project.

A member of the prime contractor at UCC team will provide feedback to each partner on their SAT within an agreed timeframe. The UCC and ICoRSA team will also be available to address any queries by partners on the protocol or SAT. Finally, each SAT is to be retained on file by the Coordinator, UCC.

### Who should complete the SAT?

One SAT should be completed by each RRING Work Package Leader of RRING project in collaboration with the partners in each Work Package.

The SAT and Protocol are designed with the goal of structuring a process of reflection, self-assessment, learning and planning. Therefore, partners will need to allow adequate time to complete it, including time for finding some information, for referring to the Protocol Section below, and related resources, for thinking/reflecting and for the Work Package Leaders to consult with each partner in the Work Package. It may take 20-30 minute to complete it the first time.

What will happen to the information provided by WP Leaders through the SAT?

The SAT information is intended to be used by WP Leaders themselves as a report on how they embedded RRI in their WP activities in the RRING project. Each completed SAT should be retained by the WP Leader and made available to all members of the WP team.

Completed SATs will be circulated to the RRING Steering Committee and will serve as a source of relevant information for monitoring progress across the consortium.

Completed SATs will be retained on file by the RRING Project Coordinator. Anonymised information from the SATs will be used to document the process of implementation of Task 6.4 Internal RRI in RRING evaluation cycle and align RRING impacts with SDGs. This information will be reported on in the Periodic and Final Reports.

Completed SATs will be sent to the ICoRSA and UCC team who will provide feedback to partners.

### RRI Protocol: Implementing RRI in RRING

Implementing Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is a fundamental requirement to realise the ambitions of the RRING project.

RRI consists of five pillars (the sixth pillar of RRI, 'Governance', is not included here as it has small relevance for the research process, and so is beyond the scope of this protocol), namely, Open Access, Gender Equality, Ethics/Research Integrity, Public Engagement, Science Education. Gender Equality is one of the five pillars of RRI, and it is also a standalone Sustainable Development Goal [SDG]. Significantly, RRI is a crosscutting theme that must be integrated and embedded into the development and implementation of the RRING project, as doing so is necessary to fully realising these pillars. Achieving this goal will require comprehensive action on every research front – including staffing, decision- making and the entire research process itself – as well as sustained effort on behalf of the project partners.

This protocol offers a brief guide to RRI as a tool to enhance research processes and outcomes in the RRING project itself, as well as providing a selection of further reading and toolkits to assist in implementation. A Self-Assessment Tool for each RRING Work Package (WP) Leader in RRING project accompanies this protocol.

Positively, integrating RRI into research makes better science.

## 2. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP2

### 2.1. Open access

Work conducted in RRING Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	All the Deliverables are available as open access. All videos, flyers and other dissemination materials are open access
With whom you share the results/data of your WP?	Data is stored on RRING webpage
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? (if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)	In all Deliverables, all contributing authors are listed.

### 2.2. Gender equality

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	WP2 had a dissemination board with >50 female participation
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the Task/WP that you lead. In particular how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	Journal publication feature female authors as leading as well as contributing authors WP2 integrated gender equality board, with integrated gender training for the consortium members during project duration
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the team of your WP?	There was no issue in Gender balance in WP2 decision making.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	NA
In relation to any analysis or research-reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, discussion, findings and recommendations.	NA

## 2.3. Ethics, research integrity

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	WP2 considerations are incorporated into publication protocols.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	N/A
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	WP2 had almost of of the 21 partner organisation participating throughout most of the duration of the workpackage. Therefore, the workpackage had a multitude of contribution of ideas, provide a divers range of perspectives and ideas.
How may your WP benefit from incorporating ethics? (- avoiding possible research misconduct or market failure -gaining credibility -improving quality -winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent)	All WP2 activities was reviewed by all partners in the workpackage to improve quality (D&C board). The data was reviewed by the WP1 Open Access Data Management committee

## 2.4. Public engagement

Work conducted in RRING Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	All public activities (Such as workshops) were open for all types of stakeholders
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities? (values, needs and perceptions important to stakeholders, R&I methodologies, role responsibilities, are examples of dimensions)	
What does Public Engagement in the decision-making process means in your WP?	
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	

## 2.5. Science education

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	Society is the public, and public are invited to be part of RRING Community
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Training workshops form one of the main value services that RRING Network will provide to its members

### 3. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP3

#### 3.1. Open access

	<b>Work conducted in RRING Project</b>
<b>Which elements of your WP are Open Access?</b>	As many of the interview transcripts (that consent allows) have been made open access. All of the survey results have also been anonymised and many open access in an MS Excel file.
<b>With whom you share the results/data of your WP?</b>	All interview participants were given the possibility of looking at the anonymised transcripts prior to them being made open access, which some took advantage of. Otherwise, sharing of results/data have been via Zenodo, in anonymised form.
<b>How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? ( if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)</b>	Each data file has an author(s) assigned to it, to be clear who the lead was in generating each data file. The WP deliverable similarly made authorship clear via stated authorships for each component of the set of deliverables, i.e. authors made clear for each of the interviews/survey/literature review/project reviews, etc. Additional thanks and roles were also noted in the acknowledgements, when authorship status was not warranted.

### 3.2. Gender equality

<b>Work conducted in RRING Project</b>	
<b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?</b>	Key staff involved in this WP did have experience of doing research on gender. The gender committee of RRING was also called upon for additional support and reviews, where appropriate and needed.
<b>Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the Task/WP that you lead. In particular how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?</b>	Gender was explicitly considered in the design of the study in, for example: in guidance given to interviewers; in the questions formulated; the sampling target and monitoring procedures set for the interviewers.
<b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the team of your WP?</b>	Key roles and decision-making responsibilities in the WP were held by males.
<b>In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.</b>	Given that gender and diversity represented a clear part of the interview protocol (and the survey questions), it is unsurprising that gender-related data were generated as a result. This was something that was focused on through both qualitative and quantitative investigations.
<b>In relation to any analysis or research-reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, discussion, findings and recommendations.</b>	The analysis of the data produced themes that explicitly focused on gender and diversity issues. We also made sure that gender was considered and conceptualised within a wider picture of intersectionality and diversity considerations.

### 3.3. Ethics, research integrity

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<p><b>What are possible ethical considerations for your R&amp;I practices in your WP?</b></p>	<p>Informed consent regarding issues of e.g. anonymity, confidentiality and general data management issues.</p>
<p><b>Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&amp;I practices, and how?</b></p>	<p>WP lead, task leads, and associated partner staff as required.</p>
<p><b>How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?</b></p>	<p>Before locking down a particular decision (e.g. our discussion on amendments to informed consent procedures), all partners were invited for comment through the Steering Committee.</p>
<p><b>How may your WP benefit from incorporating ethics? (- avoiding possible research misconduct or market failure -gaining credibility -improving quality -winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent)</b></p>	<p>All.</p>

### 3.4. Public engagement

Work conducted in RRING Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	Interviews and survey were focused on professionals, and thus the questions that were posed to them were as R&I stakeholders. The normal idea of 'the public' (e.g. 'citizens') played much less of a role.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities? (values, needs and perceptions important to stakeholders, R&I methodologies, role responsibilities, are examples of dimensions)	No engagement activities in this WP, other than via data collection activities.
What does Public Engagement in the decision-making process means in your WP?	Public engagement did explicitly feature in the design of the interview protocol and survey design, as we were keen to explore how it was feature in the professional R&I of our peers.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	The work of others in this area was a central object of enquiry for us.

### 3.5. Science education

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	This WP explores the state-of-the-art of RRI. RRI is fundamentally connected to the desires, needs, interests of and in society, and so it was essential that research-and-society issues were considered.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	N/A

## 4. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP4

### 4.1. Open access

<b>Work conducted in RRING Project</b>	
<b>Which elements of your WP are Open Access?</b>	All WP deliverables have been or will be made fully accessible (open access) through the Participant Portal, as soon as they are approved by the European Commission. In compliance with EC funding regulations, scholarly publications resulting from WP4 have also mostly been or will also be open access ('green' at least). Considering that several deliverables comprise numerous contributors and thus potential co-authors of publications, it is difficult to say at this point (April 2021) with precision which authors will publish about which elements through which publication venues.
<b>With whom you share the results/data of your WP?</b>	WP4 adheres to the EC Open Data Pilot, making as much of its data available under the FAIR principles. As part of both deliverables D4.1 and D4.2, the respective tasks also conducted secondary analysis on data that had already been published (open access) from upstream workpackages.
<b>How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? (if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)</b>	Each deliverable and milestone document clearly indicates the respective task leaders and contributing authors.

### 4.2. Gender equality

### 4.3. Ethics, research integrity

### 4.4. Public engagement

### 4.5. Science education

## 5. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP5

5.1. Open access

	<b>Work conducted in RRING Project</b>
<b>Which elements of your WP are Open Access?</b>	Results and database of the quantitative exercise
<b>With whom you share the results/data of your WP?</b>	The results and methods are shared openly through the technical report. The data from the quantitative study is also anonymised and aggregated and shared.
<b>How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? (if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)</b>	Ownership of data sources, particularly interview sources, is traceable for certain people only to protect the identity of the interviewees.

## 5.2. Gender equality

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<p><b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?</b></p>	<p>The main issue was to integrate gender equality as CONTENT of the research, since gender expertise was built in the teams, and issues were addressed through the SATs.</p>
<p><b>Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the Task/WP that you lead. In particular how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?</b></p>	<p>Gender has been integrated throughout the methodology and parameters in the following ways. First in terms of sampling, there has been an aim for inclusion of diverse perspectives (although this has not always been possible because of limitations related to the fact that the sampling in this work package related to organisations, not individuals, hence leaving the decision on the participant to the organisation itself). Second, gender disaggregated data has been collected. Third, in terms of the guidelines for data collection, whenever possible females have conducted the interviews to other females, and males have conducted the interviews to other males. Also, whenever possible, attention to the cultural framework has been paid by choosing an interviewer that was familiar with the culture of the interviewee. In addition, the management of gender and diversity in research and innovation work has been studied as a transversal issue in the case studies in the work package (please refer to the SATs for further detail)</p>
<p><b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the team of your WP?</b></p>	<p>We did not identify any major concerns, small issues were identified in the SAT.</p>
<p><b>In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.</b></p>	<p>The research activities included interviews and a survey. For the latter, a mass emailing approach was followed; therefore, there was not a defined strategy in terms of achieving gender balance in the data collection. In addition, this survey (T5.4.), we collected data on organizations, not individuals, and therefore, although we would have liked to purposefully send the invitation to participate in a purposeful manner, aiming for parity in responses, (only 37.10% of respondents were female), but the survey was addressed to organizations, not individuals (therefore, the respondent was selected by the organization). Same issues apply to wider diversity, beyond gender.</p> <p>When it comes to selecting participants for the case studies, based on theoretical sampling, we could gain more room to include diversity as a selection criterion. Still, organizations were chosen for the sample (e.g., a company in particular, an NGO in particular), but, within the organization, when several relevant interviewees were available, we included diversity criteria. We also included this as criteria when approaching individuals (civil society and researchers). In terms of timing of interviews, we always adapted to the availability of the interviewee. All interviews were conducted remotely with no costs for the participants (except two interviews, which conducted in the workplace of the interviewee, at convenient times within the work hours).</p>
<p><b>In relation to any analysis or research-reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, discussion, findings and recommendations.</b></p>	<p>Several strategies have been carried out to embed gender equality and diversity into the research content. First, when it comes to research design we have aimed for diversity in the sampling (accounting for the limitations identified in the previous section) and collected gender disaggregated data in the survey in Task 5.4. Bias has been addressed indirectly by having a diverse team in the tasks and work package, which has helped to identify possible biases in the research and also identified relevant research topics related to gender and diversity. Moreover, the research instruments have undergone revision by the gender experts within the work package. We have also taken gender and diversity as one of the main topics to be investigated in the case studies in Task 5.4. In these studies, we have addressed how the management of these issues leads to competitive advantage in two different domains. In addition, we have taken care of having an inclusive language in the reporting in the deliverable.</p>

### 5.3. Ethics, research integrity

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Vulnerability of certain interviewees, possibility of disclosure of competitive business details
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	WP leaders (who are also task leaders); members of the gender committee and all researchers involved in the task. If an ethical issues is identified, it is discussed in a dedicated meeting /part of a meeting.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	Through the cocreation of the task design with the different researchers, who had diverse backgrounds.
How may your WP benefit from incorporating ethics? (- avoiding possible research misconduct or market failure -gaining credibility -improving quality -winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent)	Winning greater support for actors, gaining credibility, licence to operate

### 5.4. Public engagement

Work conducted in RRING Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	The interviewees included several types of stakeholders, and there have been some dissemination events that have involved mostly policy-makers and business, the most affected stakeholders by the WP.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities? (values, needs and perceptions important to stakeholders, R&I methodologies, role responsibilities, are examples of dimensions)	Mostly values and motivations and tools to introduce RRI in their R&I activities.
What does Public Engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	Mostly in the design and sample selection, and of course in the dissemination activities
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	See above

## 5.5. Science education

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	The fact that they need to be developed in all areas of R&I for inclusive and sustainable societal transitions
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	It does not envisage educational activities as such, but dissemination activities for businesses to include RRI in the R&I activities.

## 6. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP6

### 6.1. Open access

Work conducted in RRING Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	reports, including methods data (from other Work Packages)
With whom you share the results/data of your WP?	governments, institutions of science, academies unions, in multiple countries as part of promotion of the RRI standards globally; researcher communities, online, as part of the expansion of the RRING network
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? ( if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)	Deliverables are traceable to specific authors and institutions for the analysis or the summary reporting they contributed.

## 6.2. Gender equality

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<p><b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?</b></p>	<p>WP 6 had task leaders chosen in ways that built on expertise and attained gender balance. It became clear that the leadership roles given to women were not conducted in the same way as those given to men, and in two instances I observed that this differentiation required time for the partners in teams to adjust and give their best work. The slow start may otherwise have due to Covid conditions and other stresses, it is hard to say.</p>
<p><b>Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the Task/WP that you lead. In particular how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?</b></p>	<p>1- integrated in the concept and process: For works that will later be published, there were three-level independent reviewers who considered the proposed publications from the perspective of how well they may promote gender equality. For each, women and men worked collaboratively (with high representation of women) for producing the material. 2-integrated in the outputs: speaking generally the reports and guidance materials always include a section dedicated to the matter of achieving gender equality, so there is a large amount of material that is directed toward achieving this aspect of RRI.</p>
<p><b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the team of your WP?</b></p>	<p>Awareness of promotion of gender equality goes beyond the choice of a man or woman for a particular leadership position; representation is not the only issue. I see the main issue of inclusiveness and gender balance to be that everyone is vigilant and keeps focused, and that the habit of equality be given time for the practice and habit of genuinely inclusive collaborations to be normalized. Decision-making has to be rooted in an awareness that our teams are not yet functioning perfectly as inclusive teams, so even when a decision is taken there may be voices that were not heard or were smothered. To ease the transition each person in the hierarchy of decision making must keep checking back down the levels of the hierarchy, trying to see if voices are included, over and over and over, and by this routine of learning and listening, gathering the insights that can better inform decisions and make inclusion better by small adjustments.</p>
<p><b>In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.</b></p>	
<p><b>In relation to any analysis or research-reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, discussion, findings and recommendations.</b></p>	<p>As mentioned above at 2-Gender Equality Promotion is integrated in the outputs: speaking generally the reports and guidance materials always include a section dedicated to the matter of achieving gender equality, so there is a large amount of material that is directed toward achieving this aspect of RRI. Gender analysis is less used when reporting on research of WP6.</p>

### 6.3. Ethics, research integrity

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<b>What are possible ethical considerations for your R&amp;I practices in your WP?</b>	1. inclusiveness of dialogues in each country and between different countries on RRI matters, 2-conflicts of interest of partners 3- redirecting resources
<b>Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&amp;I practices, and how?</b>	1- in T6.3 once established, each national consultation group; and for their doing so, their inclusiveness, and openness was very carefully coordinated and built into their processes; 2- for the internal aspects of Task 6.3 and all other Tasks of WP 6, all partners had some involvement in addressing ethics. For example, we reflected jointly and collaboratively in structured ways about application of resources, best methodologies, applications of methodologies and how to not mislead in reports. We returned regularly to ethics concerns. All were tasked to report conflicts of interest and manage them, and to attend to best practices for their management of the project funds.
<b>How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?</b>	primarily by task leads and the work package lead 1. demonstrating inclusivity in choices of leaders, rotation, the management of meetings, the extra efforts to reach all partners, the making of assignments 2. demonstrating intolerance for intolerance while also taking time to explore and credit contributions presenting alternative values, interests and ideas. The result was better quality in the outputs.
<b>How may your WP benefit from incorporating ethics? (- avoiding possible research misconduct or market failure -gaining credibility -improving quality -winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent) - developing new ideas and creating new R&amp;I opportunities)</b>	The WP did incorporate ethical frameworks (those of the donor are required), and the sense of certainty and reliability and underlying trust helped the WP work against high odds considering that most partners started without knowing one another and had to work across different cultures using exclusively remote work tools. The WP also strongly emphasised inclusion of all within it, which in my view gave credence to the work produced because many minds came together to work on these products.

## 6.4. Public engagement

Work conducted in RRING Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	the incountry tasks involved multiple partner institutions being convened around some central questions and helped to draw their own conclusions.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities? (values, needs and perceptions important to stakeholders, R&I methodologies, role responsibilities, are exmples of dimensions)	perceptions of the stakeholders
What does Public Engagement in the decision-making process means in your WP?	Although stakeholder groups were assembled, the next step -- Public Engagement-- was not featured. In our WP 6 we saw public engagement as the next natural step of processes held in each country. A representative stakeholder group is never sufficiently open to the full range of issues, so the next step is to encourage more public debate. However, this activity lay at the interface of what RRING was developing in its WP7.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	As explained in the question above, truly public engagement did not feature in WP6, although there was a lot of work to engage with stakeholder groups relevant to RRI. Were this to develop further in countries (which in some cases did involve our supporting them to do surveys), this can be seen as the ideal of WP6. All outreach and mobilizing activity core was a learning mechanism in WP 6, so its effect was to inform the conclusions that are found in the analysis and recommedations in deliverables.

## 6.5. Science education

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	RRING adopted for WP 6 an appraoch that is based on a legal instrument agreed at UN level for all states of the world in 2017. In it, science education and access to science and the knowledge it produces are key concerns. WP 6 was focused on developing the final analysis and reporting that could place RRING's bottom up efforts in relation to this new agreement and in relation to a longer term process of transformation. This includes science education, without and science-and-society question.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	The education focused part of the work in WP spilled over to the WP 2 work, and informed the development of debate methodologies to help address schools and young learners, teaching the ideas of RRI.

## 7. Self evaluation report of RRI practice in WP7

### 7.1. Open access

	All the Deliverables are available as open access.
<b>Which elements of your WP are Open Access?</b>	D7.2: all survey and interview data have required consents to be open access. Data is stored in Zenodo, and where required is anonymised D7.3: The RRING founding members: members that ticked consent are stored in Zenodo for the moment, and then listed on website when ready D7.3: RRING Trial workshops: Demographics, stored in Zenodo. D7.3 survey data on workshop evaluation data and analysis stored in Zenodo
<b>With whom you share the results/data of your WP?</b>	Data is stored under Zenodo.
<b>How transparent is the ownership of your WP outcomes/Deliverables? (if ownership is traceable to all WP outcomes or is transparent and traceable for certain people only.)</b>	In all Deliverables, all contributing authors are listed.

### 7.2. Gender equality

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?</b>	WP7 had a majority of women partner participants.
<b>Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the Task/WP that you lead. In particular how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?</b>	D7.1: There are 2 sections in the deliverable that explicitly focus on Gender equality, and its relevance to formation and operation of networks D7.2: determined 2 value service offerings to RRING members. In service 1, Gender equality is featured in training workshop 1, see section 1.5.1. In service offering 2, and workshop 2, gender equality is one of the topics, and is described in Appendix 3 D7.3: Gender Equality was aimed for in both membership and workshop registrations. Fortunately excellent gender balance was achieved.
<b>What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the team of your WP?</b>	There was no issue in Gender balance in WP7 decision making.
<b>In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.</b>	D7.1: Not relevant D7.2: Not relevant D7.3: Both RRING trial founding members and workshop participants are gender disaggregated.
<b>In relation to any analysis or research-reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, discussion, findings and recommendations.</b>	D7.3: Gender balance of Founding members and workshop participants is reported in the deliverable

### 7.3. Ethics, research integrity

Work conducted in RRING Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Ethics: WP7 did not engage or cover vulnerable or minority groups.
	Integrity: D7.1: Interview data was anonymised, and consents received. An external subcontractor was employed to do the qualitative analysis. Data stored in Zenodo
	D7.3 survey data on workshop evaluation data and analysis stored in Zenodo, anonymised.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	N/A
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	WP7 had almost of the 21 partner organisation participating throughout most of the duration of the workpackage. Therefore, the workpackage had a multitude of contribution of ideas, provide a divers range of perspectives and ideas.
How may your WP benefit from incorporating ethics? (- avoiding possible research misconduct or market failure -gaining credibility -improving quality -winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent)	D7.3 was reviewed by all partners in the workpackage to improve quality. The data was reviewed by the WP1 Open Access Data Management committee

### 7.4. Public engagement

Work conducted in RRING Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	D7.3 is the only relevant workpackage (D7.1&7.2 were preparatory only); all the QH were invited to be both founding members and participate in the workshops. Public was part of the invited list, and part of the email dissemination list.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities? (values, needs and perceptions important to stakeholders, R&I methodologies, role responsibilities, are examples of dimensions)	D7.3 Workshop 1 had a dedciated session dealin gwith relevance of RRI to the public, and public engagement in research. Workshop 1 has public attendance, although small number.
What does Public Engagement in the decision-making process means in your WP?	In WP7: it was not relevant.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	All 4 QH are critical to the RRING network. RRING network has very limited public as founding members, but has goals to increase this in the next year, through being involved in Green Deal projects where public is involved.

## 7.5. Science education

Work conducted in RRING Project	
<b>What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?</b>	Society is the public, and public are invited to be part of RRING Community
<b>If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?</b>	Training workshops form one of the main value services that RRING Network will provide to its members

## 8. Conclusion

All work packages internally monitored their five pillars of RRI in the operations of their work packages. The self assessment exercise was rewarding for each work package, and assisted in ensuring the work package performance and quality. Itv also ensured that the work package was RRI compatible.