

b. Implementing team

This subsection dwells upon the establishment of the team in charge of implementing the GAs and developing the Roadmap. In this subsection a distinction is made between core team (which only includes people directly involved with GRACE) and extended team (a team which may also include other people, sometimes only occasionally involved with GRACE, who anyhow can facilitate the implementation of GAs and of the Roadmap).

b.1. COMPOSITION OF THE CORE TEAM. The composition of the core team is a pivotal element for developing actions aimed at producing institutional change. In the case of GRACE, GAs are few and the core team should be small. Moreover, budget constraints make it difficult to allocate permanent human resources. However, ensuring a certain continuity in the development of GAs, should be also necessary. Considering the diagnosis made so far and the RRI profile defined above, which could be the composition of the core team? How many people could or should be involved? Is the composition of the team compatible with the available budget? Could someone include in the core team engaged on a voluntary basis? Is the team authoritative enough for mobilising other actors (for example, a team leader who is not part of the permanent staff of the organisation may be not taken seriously by permanent staff member or leaders)?

b.2. SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES OF THE CORE TEAM. GRACE teams will be supported by the “experienced partners”. However, also in view of developing the Roadmap, it is important to see if the core team has or can access the necessary skills and competencies necessary to design and implement the GAs and, in the future, the Roadmap towards RRI. Which are, according to your opinion, the main skills and competencies the team should have? Are they already available within the core team? If not, are there other members of the organisation who could be involved in the GRACE project?



WHICH SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES AND HOW TO FIND THEM

Which skills and competencies could be needed?

Some of the so-called “**soft skills**” will be necessary. They could be those related to, e.g., basic communication, problem-solving and negotiation, interpersonal relationships or time management. They are probably already available in the core team or in the extended team (see next point).

Specialised skills and competencies related to the RRI keys are obviously also needed. For example, to develop GAs in gender equality it could necessary a knowledge and, as far as possible, a direct experience of, e.g., the basic mechanisms producing and reproducing inequality (related to, e.g., gender bias, behavioural patterns, languages, etc.) or problems and solutions connected to work-life balance policies. Similarly, approaching ethical issues could make it necessary a knowledge of the main ethical questions pertaining to the research and innovation process and products as well as a competence on the main solutions adopted (e.g., ethical committees, guidelines and protocols, etc.).

Finally, there are **specialised skills and competencies related to the type of actions** implemented such as skills and competencies on how to organise conferences or events, how to set-up a website or a webpage, how to make guidelines, reports, or press releases, how to organise a public consultation or a survey, or how to define a norm or a new regulation.

In order to **access the skills and competences which are lacking**, different sources of expertise can be identified, e.g.:

- **Guidelines, manuals, on-line courses and guidance-like publications**, available on internet, which can help acquire skills and competences pertaining to the RRI keys or those connected to the different types of actions to be carried out
- **Officers or units** within the organisation already institutionally in charge of RRI keys or having the necessary skills and competences for supporting the GRACE team in making the different types of action
- **Single researchers or individuals** who already gained an experience on RRI keys or in developing some kinds of actions
- **Internal or external groups, associations, or networks** which have an experience in the RRI keys or in other relevant areas.



The implementation of GRACE will surely require only a few of these skills and competences. Anyhow, making a balance of those already available and developing a strategy to access those that are lacking could be helpful.

b.3. **STRUCTURE OF THE EXTENDED TEAM.** The core team can be not capable alone to activate the concerned actors on institutional change. It could be therefore necessary to enlarge the team including people sometimes only occasionally involved with GAs implementation, who can anyhow facilitate their success and long-term sustainability. Some examples are given in the box below. Is the core team able to develop the GAs and the Roadmap without involving other people? In other words, is it necessary to establish an extended team? If so, which kind of extended team can be established?

THE EXTENDED TEAM: EXAMPLES

Different kinds of extended team can be found. Some examples are provided below.

A TEAM INCLUDING REFERENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS. At the Paris Diderot University, in order to develop a Gender Equality Plan, a network of referents (i.e. voluntary members) in all the departments and services (including scientific and administrative personnel) concerned with the project was established and progressively incorporated in the extended team so as to favour the embedment of the project in the organisation. This decision initially was difficult to implement due to the difficulties met in coordinating them. However, afterwards this network revealed to be particularly effective for mobilising the different components of the university, getting information on the actual needs of each department, sharing information on the project, linking with the top and middle leadership and favouring the long-term sustainability of the actions initiated under the project.

A TEAM INVOLVING KEY ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS. At the Research Center for Molecular Medicine of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (CeMM), to make a gender equality programme, a core team and an extended team were created. The extended team includes the Administrative Director, the Director of Medical Affairs, the Head of Scientific Support, the Head of IT Services, the Media Relations Managers and the Head of Public Relations. Afterwards, two group leaders and an executive assistant joined the team voluntarily. Even though coordination was difficult at the beginning, teamwork improved quite rapidly overall, thanks to the adoption of a more participative approach, leading to increasing opportunities for discussion and information exchange. The involvement of high-level leaders from the administration, scientific support staff and senior researchers made the action plan institutionally stronger and more impactful.



A TEAM INVOLVING WHO ALREADY WORKS ON RRI. At the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), in order to pursue RRI-oriented objectives, an extended Team was created connecting with each other all the individuals already working on RRI-related issues across the university (e.g., on gender equality, open access, ethical issues, etc.), thus establishing a coordinated multi-focal network. A light integration approach was developed, i.e., an integration which did not entail the creation of new organisational units or structures but based on the establishment of a common policy and communication framework.

A TEAM THOUGHT TO INCLUDE THE NECESSARY EXPERTISE FOR IMPLEMENTING RRI. At the University of Gdansk, in order to conduct an RRI-oriented action plan, a core team has been established. To get the necessary expertise pertaining to the different RRI keys, an extended team has been also activated, involving, among others, experts on gender equality and on social engagement working at the Department of Social Sciences and the Director of the university Technology Transfer Office, in order to develop initiatives on public engagement. Moreover, a cooperation has been established with members of the team in charge of the university's Summer School to involve them in education-related activities; experts working at the Library unit have been asked to cooperate to develop the actions pertaining to open access.

A TEAM BASED ON AN INTERNAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT. At the Ruhr University in Bochum, the RRI programmes have been developed, in the framework of the NUCLEUS project, by a group based on a cooperation agreement between two university units, i.e., the Corporate Communications Department and the Research School.

A TEAM PROMOTING A VOLUNTARY-BASED ENGAGEMENT. At the Radboud University in Nijmegen, for developing a gender equality action plan, the team in charge of the project promoted the creation of a women's network, involving female researchers, which started over time to manage some of the actions included in the action plan, thus creating a place for people to get involved on a voluntary basis.

c. Mobilisation of the actors

This subsection is aimed at helping implementing organisations to reflect about the actors to be involved in GAs and Roadmap. This issue has been partially dealt with above while speaking of the extended team



c.1. **VISIBILITY OF GAs AND ROADMAP.** In order to create an enabling environment for GAs and Roadmap, specific initiatives can be developed for making the GRACE, the GAs and the Roadmap visible. Are actions of this kind necessary? If so, which actions are more appropriate and effective, considering the elements emerged from the diagnosis? For example, making a survey or making a presentation of data on the condition of women in the organisation, on the use of open access publications and data in the organisation, on how to improve the existing policies in the realm of ethical issues; organising a launching initiatives on GRACE or on specific keys; creating a webpage devoted to GRACE in the institutional website; using already existing events for presenting GRACE; etc.

c.2. **INTERNAL KEY ACTORS.** An important step for designing and implementing the GAs and the Roadmap is that of involving the internal key actors, i.e., the actors within the organisation who are *de facto* already active on RRI or RRI keys. They should have already been identified in the previous section. Some questions could be considered. Is it useful to involve them at least from the beginning (in some cases, conflicts may arise between the GRACE team and key actors for, e.g., jealousy, different views and approaches, etc.)? Who are the key actors to be primarily involved, why and how (for example, including them in the extended team, organising with them a common initiative, establishing an agreement, etc.)? Can be they involved only on GAs or also in a longer perspective for developing the Roadmap?

c.3. **LEADERSHIPS.** A pivotal question is the involvement of leaders. On the one side, involving leaders is necessary for developing sustainable GAs and Roadmap. On the other side, involving leaders could have negative effects (for example, slowing down the actions, developing the GAs and the Roadmap as the leaders want, adopting a top-down approach in developing the GAs). Some questions could be considered. Which leaders are to be necessarily involved? Which kind of involvement can be the most appropriate? Which strategies and activities can be devised in order to favour their involvement?

c.4. **MANAGEMENT.** Another issue is the level of involvement of management. In some cases, this involvement is unavoidable. For example, many gender equality issues (such as recruitment and promotion policies, work-life balance or gender pay gap) concerns the Human Resources Department or other administrative offices. Similarly, citizen engagement or education policies should involve the Communication Department or the units in charge of innovation policies. Again, the key questions are: which management offices are to be necessarily involved? Which kind of involvement can be the most appropriate? Which strategies and activities can be devised in order to favour their involvement?



c.5. **STAFF.** Involvement of staff members (for example, researchers, PhD students, technical assistants) may have an important role in developing RRI-related issues. Usually, institutional change projects which do not involve them is destined to fail. However, mobilising staff members can be a difficult, costly and time-consuming activity, also because, in many cases, they do not want or do not have the time to get involved. Which strategies can be adopted for their involvement? Which tools revealed to be the most effective in the past? How to develop this kind of involvement all along the project duration?

c.6. **EXTERNAL ACTORS.** In many cases, involving external actors (at local, national, or even European level) can be an effective means for making institutional change projects more visible and impactful. For example, inviting well-renowned scholars for speaking of, e.g., the gender dimension in research contents, the future of open access, the increasing role of ethics or about the adoption of forecasting tools in research may be extremely attractive. Similarly, it could be important creating bridge with national or international associations and networks or with other institutions already engaged in RRI policies. Therefore, which actors can be involved, why and when? Which are the expected impacts deriving from their involvement?

