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Studying the governance of RRI?
**Assumptions, diagnosis**

- One is that normative prescriptions for RRI will always be contested.

> “Research and Innovation (RRI) is a transparent, interactive process in which societal actors and innovators become mutually responsive to each other with a view on the ethical acceptability, sustainability and societal desirability of the innovation process and its marketable products.” (von Schomberg 2011)
‘Agora’ | Ἀγορά (assembly square)

Concept aiming to “… to embrace the political arena and the market place, and to go beyond both. The ‘agora’ is the problem-generating and problem-solving environment in which the contextualisation of knowledge production takes place. It is populated not only by arrays of competing ‘experts’ (…) but also variously jostling ‘publics’.” (Nowotny 2004)

- Dispute
- Contestation
- Negotiation
Two is that many normative prescriptions for RRI are already subject to manifold governance arrangements
- (self-)regulations, policies, fora, ethics committees, funding schemes, ...
- Governance of RRI characterised by heterarchy

→ challenging the legitimacy and effectiveness of any new framework or arrangement

The Res-AGorA approach: try to constructively build upon ‘RRI in the making’
- Learning from *de facto* governance of RRI
- Constructing an overarching framework in consultation with ‘stakeholders’
How to situate the governance of RRI in the governance of R&I?

• We are interested in governance processes
  o Governance understood as

“The dynamic interrelation of involved (mostly organized) actors within and between organisations, their resources, interests and power, fora for debate and arenas for negotiation between actors, rules of the game, and policy instruments applied helping to achieve legitimate agreements” (Kuhlmann 2001; Benz 2006; Braun 2006)

  o ‘de facto’ governance: what this dynamic interplay adds up to (emerging from interactions)

• → practice based approach

Learning from de facto governance of RRI
Research model

RRI governance arrangements
Actors involved
De facto practices of RRI governance

Building components for a socio-normative governance framework for RRI

Learning from de facto governance of RRI
What to learn?

• Learning:
  o Understanding how the governance of RRI is conditioned
  o Drawing lessons → what for? in which context?

• Articulations and institutionalisations of ‘RRI’: Substantive and strategic motivations
  o A response to past performance (do better)
  o An integrative notion, drawing on
    • ‘care’ and ‘responsiveness’ [forward looking responsibilities]
    • (supposedly) shared orientations
    • Ideas for integration in R&I
    • Acknowledging plurality, belief in inclusiveness and deliberation
  o Thereby mitigating tensions, likely to reappear in practice
A ‘socio-normative’ approach

• Linking our understanding of ‘conditioning’ factors...
  o *de facto* governance: emerging from interactions
  o Qualifying interactions:
    • Constructive
    • Productive  *(Spaapen & Droge 2009)*

• ... to key ‘functions’ in RRI governance:
  o Responsibilisation
  o Contestation

• Learning: assessing how ‘well’ these functions are performed as a consequence of how this is conditioned
### Actors’ view / Analyst’s evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive (qualities)</th>
<th>Productive (transformation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibilisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Actor inclusion</td>
<td>▪ Actors change behavior /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Robustness of the knowledge base</td>
<td>attitude in line with new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Capacities for learning</td>
<td>understandings of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Embedding of responsibility</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contestation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Procedures and ‘rules of the game’</td>
<td>▪ Building of RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Transparency</td>
<td>governance related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Trust in the de facto governance process</td>
<td>improved/new capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(procedures, knowledge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Governance arrangements align</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with or are changed towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>input requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(constructive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proof of the pudding…

• Res-AGorA team currently identifying building blocks (transversal lessons across case studies) for an overarching framework
  o To be put into preliminary frame
  o And further developed in co-constructive workshops

• Thank you for listening!
  o a.m.walhout@utwente.nl