

# Value Isobars

## Meeting at Campus Vienna Biocenter, Vienna, Austria December 3 – 4, 2009

### Minutes

#### Participants:

From the coordinator SVT, UiB:	Matthias Kaiser, Torunn Ellefsen, Sigrid Skavlid
From dialog<>genteknik:	Stefan Grünert, Brigitte Gschmeidler
From LSE:	Nicole Kronberger
From DINAMIA:	Maria Eduarda Goncalves, Ines Gameiro
From EKUT-IZEW:	Thomas Potthast, Simon Meisch
From UNIMAAS:	Laurens Landeweerd
From the European Commission:	Lino Paula

#### Excused:

from SVT UiB:	Vibeke Almaas
from LSE	George Gaskell
From UNIMAAS:	David Townend, Rein Vos

\*\*\*\*\*

Minutes were drafted by Torunn Ellefsen, in collaboration with Laurens Landeweerd

- ❖ Welcome by the host of the meeting and introduction to facilities: Stefan Grünert.
- ❖ Presentation: Tour de table.
- ❖ Board meeting:
  - Minutes from kick-off meeting in Asker 16-17 June 2009 were approved.
  - Re Consortium agreement: All partners approved the CA.  
Comment: Publish final grant agreement, grant agreement preparation form, DoW and consortium agreement on a protected website if possible, or make them available for all on the Google group. **(Action point)**
- ❖ WP 8 - Management (Torunn Ellefsen and Matthias Kaiser presented):
  - All partner institutions have received the amount of money (prepayment) as agreed.
  - **(Action point)** All partners were asked to send Torunn the names and e-mail addresses of their institutional financial managers/officers.
  - It was agreed that the next consortium meeting be held in Lisbon in the middle of June. Suggested preferred dates: 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> of June.
  - All partners were asked to note that a Workshop will be held in Hamburg in February or – assumedly – in March in connection with workpackage 6: synthesis. It is expected that each partner is represented with at least one participant.
- ❖ WP 7 – Website (Sigrid Skavlid presented):
  - Presentation of the website [www.value-isobars.no](http://www.value-isobars.no) which is up and running.
  - It was remarked that it is still possible to make a restricted area on the website.

- **(Action point)** Presentations of institutions from kick-off meeting will be published internally, either on the restricted area together with other internal presentations, or through the Google group pages.
- **(Action point)** List of partner institutions should be highly visible on top of the website; consider having the institutions first, and then the individual participants under it, or similar.
- It's up to each partner to decide if they want their professional titles together with their names. Send communication in this regard to Sigrid Skavlid.
- There is a need for an internal discussion group. The EC can offer to help with appropriate internet resources. It is also possible to make under-groups and special pages on our Google-group. All partners agreed that most likely the Google-group meets all our needs regarding internal discussions and protected area. This has to be evaluated further as the project proceeds.
- Regarding the end-users:
 

The idea is to build up an end-user group consisting of minimum 20 and maximum 30 people. The people should basically belong to four rough categories: (i) decision-makers, (ii) research councils / foundations or high level research administration of universities, (iii) experts from the relevant technologies, (iv) NGOs relevant for our field of work. All end-users will at the end of the project be invited to come to a conference in London or Brussels. The coordinator has discussed this with Roger Strand at UiB (leading the "sister" project Technolife), both projects need end-users of a similar kind. They have agreed to share the list of end-users as much as possible. The final conferences will be back to back, thus saving money and largely relying on the same people.

Some of the partners have already suggested some end-users, and the list was further filled up by the coordinator. The coordinator has contacted these prospective end-users, but we are still waiting for answers from most of them. Matthias read out the list of end-users that have been contacted.

It was noted that it is important not to have too many "pure" academics. Lino Paula offered his help by providing names from the industry or other relevant bodies, e.g. from STOA.

  - **(Action point)** All new suggestions for the end user list should be sent to Torunn. ([torunn.ellefsen@svt.uib.no](mailto:torunn.ellefsen@svt.uib.no)), preferably by the end of week 51 in 2009 or week 2 in 2010 at the latest.
- ❖ Presentation of the European Commission FP7, and Capacities, Science in Society (presented by the project officer Lino Paula):
  - See ppt presentation (on Google group).
  - New funding scheme, trying to mobilize bigger consortiums.
  - Project management and reporting – see ppt
    - All information on the Cordis website.
    - Reporting guidelines are very important for the partners to have a close look at - -ref. Nov 2007
    - Project period in FP7:
      - 18 month reporting period (this is new in relation to FP6)
      - FORCE – web based tool to edit and submit form C. New website: Quest from early 2010.

- Objectives of value isobars: all work should lead up to them, and the objectives address the use of the project findings.
  - Expectations of the EC – see ppt
    - Synergy with other EC projects as far as possible.
- The discussions focussed on other projects and possible challenges and synergies.
- ❖ Follow up from minutes – action points from June 2009 (Matthias Kaiser presented):
  - [www.valueisobars.eu](http://www.valueisobars.eu) – the project needs to live in EU, thus the “eu”-address is important. Thomas will register, if registration from outside the EU is impossible.
  - Instead of Project wiki we have decided to use Google groups.
  - Still working on the end-user-list. Will follow up soon.
  - Nicole informed on the Eurobarometer – EC postponed the Eurobarometer. There will be a new version of a combined Eurobarometer. Inputs via Nicole are welcome.
  - Thomas and Nicole seek to clarify the issue around the term “social values”.
  - The rest of the action points are done.
- ❖ WP 1 – Value concepts (Presentation by Simon Meisch)
  - For details see his ppt.
  - Values and validity claims
  - Future research
  - Some terminological questions
    - Moral vs. ethics
    - Norm
  - Comments and reflections on presentation.
    - This is a presentation that will be very important for the upcoming work in Hamburg.
    - How do we account for the fact that values differ from person to person and in different settings?
- ❖ Visit to Vienna Open Lab (Brigitte Gschmeidler and colleagues)
 

All participants enjoyed very much this visit with a hands-on experience on DNA research. During this visit each participant got isolated their own DNA! The work of the Vienna Open Lab was applauded by all participants.
- ❖ WP 2 – Value methods (Presentation by Nicole Kronberger)
  - Work in progress - see her ppt:
    - Values and STS
    - Social values
    - Values as social representations
    - Putting values into practice
    - Cultural and Normative Change
  - Questions, reflections and discussion, in particular in regard to ongoing preparations for a Eurobarometer.
    - Suggestions are welcome.
- ❖ WP 5 – Value technologies (Presented by Laurens Landeweerd)
  - see his ppt:
    - Analyse value dilemmas relating to dual use
    - The proposed work was presented as a first sketch.

- Interactions are foreseen with WP 1 and 4.
- Collection of academic and non-academic texts (e.g. from the media) on both case scenarios is planned. The idea is write two literature reviews on both cases with regard to underlying values.
- David's focus:
  - Study of Norbert Elias on the function of law
  - How values interrelate to legislation
  - Codes of guidance
- Laurens' focus:
  - Identification of explicitly stated values in the literature
  - Suggestion of implicitly hidden value assumptions
  - Philosophical analysis of hidden presumptions
  - Comparison of cases
- Questions, feedback and comments
  - What are the scenarios?
  - Responsibility of publishers, freedom of research writers.
  - First step to do is the review.
  - Give feedback to other WPs.
  - Need an overview of values. (Sort of a value map).
  - The title "technologies" is a bit misleading. Better terminology?
  - Look at what could be the role of the public.
  - Need to clarify what we mean with the "public" or perhaps the "publics".
- ❖ WP 3 – value dialogue (Presented by Brigitte Gschmeidler)
  - See her ppt
  - Two step process
  - First step: value dialogue
    - Ethics and value dialogue with different dialogue groups
    - Ethical matrix as an inspiration source
    - Groups for ethics dialogue – discussed how to make the groups, how to put the groups together. Want to use groups from the public sphere. The danger in these kinds of settings is that one can get only experts.
  - Second step: foresight
    - Focus on governance issues
  - Different challenges.
  - Comments, feedback and questions
    - What is value dialogue?
    - What kind of inputs from other WPs do you need in order to start?  
Need to find out what we want to get out of it. Need to improvise between the WPs.  
Vibeke will be able to assist. Also, people in Maastricht could assist.  
One could make use of short films on you tube etc.  
Format: Ethical matrix, could also use other formats. Public participation is still in its early phase. Value tree is certainly one thing to look at.  
Role play another issue.  
Feel they can start with the first step, however, need to know about the second step in order to start the first step.

- ❖ WP 4 - Value and regulations (presentation by Iñes Goncalves)
  - A draft report, and later a revised draft report was prepared and sent around. Presentation of the report.
  - Searching for a working definition for legal principles and rights: legally binding bridges between values and rules.
  - Conflicting principles and rights need to be balanced. What to balance? How to balance (though proportionality)?
  - Law/regulation: the latter is a matter of public agency.
  - What may count as values in law or regulation as shaped by Science and Technology? Charter of fundamental rights: explicit/implicit rights. They made a text analysis of the EU-charter of fundamental rights, singling out individual values, societal values, market values, specific group's values (patients for example): some preliminary conclusions of what values occur more.
  - Conflicting principles: we should also look at this issue with regard to the practical implementation of normative instruments.
  - Discussion on the issues in the document sent last Monday:
    - Excerpts from discussion:
      - The same terms are used differently by each partner (for example, conflicting values, balancing values).
        - Is a word count of how many times a value occurs in the fundamental rights charter relevant for how important they are?
        - One needs a specific method. But indeed...
        - Legal experts decide more easily on what a value is, and then cascade to regulation.
        - Two ways in which a subject becomes embedded in law: starting from law itself or starting from society. But one cannot actively bring values into the law. We use a working definition of value, otherwise we have nothing to base the work on.
        - Don't we need more hard law, if we take these values more seriously? Otherwise doesn't it just remain lip service? Or is soft law sufficient?
  - Maria Eduarda talked about the status of principles, about instrumental principles, that guide the workings of institutions of the legal systems (like the principle of proportionality). Also social values penetrate the legal system through institutions. In Europe in the Middle Ages the church decided upon what values were relevant. Now civil institutions are the vehicles that carry social values into the law.
  - Distinction between enterprises and individuals. Who defines the values? The parliament? Judges? Is this transparent enough?
    - European values in the context of a cascade of concepts would seem more like principles. With regard to interpretation, social values enter in the matter of the interpretation of uncontested principles. Could be a good model for an approach.
    - Reference was made to an author claiming that even on the level of courts, society should enter the process of interpretation through social values.
    - Certain principles such as the new principle of environmental protection also enter through individual social values a judge might have.
    - Legal positivists stating they're only interested in the explicit principle not it's 'value history' are wrong, since values enter again in the process of

interpretation.

- Legal cascade - from constitution to lesser rules, from principles to norms to regulations etc.
- Legal principles are rather free-floating, specifically in international law, with regard to how they are adopted. The adoption of regulation works easier.
- Also the question arises why in some cases the law just dies.
- Like the stem cell legislation, that in Germany has to be changed.
- This amounts to legal impact assessment.
- Any scientist could have told in advance that the half-way solution on stem cells would not work.

**(Action point):** We need a more principled discussion about the relation between law and the value map, and should perhaps return to this during the Hamburg workshop.

- ❖ WP 6 -synthesis work (presented by Matthias Kaiser)
  - See his ppt.
  - 3 documents to inform the three consultation rounds with the end-users. These documents should not be longer than 15 or 20 pages (all work packages put together), and shorter would be better. The aim is to end up with a blueprint for governance, the purpose of the project. To this short text: We will send a draft of a working paper 1 week before Hamburg.
- ❖ **Action list:**
  - Matthias' ppt includes a description of what the WP's should contribute to the WP 6 – a list of questions.
  - Agenda – time-line forward:
    - March 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> for the meeting in Hamburg
    - June 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> for Lisbon, with a reserve date for July 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>
    - Deadline for the working papers for the Hamburg meeting, 1<sup>st</sup> of March, for a draft version mid February. (NB: the February drafts need to be condensed (15 to 20 pages), the elaborate versions we keep at the office for a later stage (after June))
    - Final stuff doesn't need to be in till June. These are all working documents / draft versions
  - Place one's literature lists in a folder on the google group, listed by topic.
  - Access to ethics journals for specific articles can be requested amongst partners. Some have more access than others.
  - Thomas will have a phone meeting with George and Nicole on social values, the nature of values, what should be in-/excluded.