Discussing the output from the group discussion

# G3: Towards a comprehensive access to climate knowledge approach

**Alexis Sancho Reinoso *(facilitator)*, Florrie de Pater, Denis-Didier Rousseau, Candice Howarth, Rainer Stowasser, Stefan Ekman, Jostein Sundet, Rob Swart, Michel Schouppe**

**JPI Climate Workshop "Towards Open Climate Knowledge: Potentials & Weaknesses of the Access to Knowledge Approach on Climate Services"**

***Vienna, 13-14 January 2015***

# Session 1: Brainstorming on Open Knowledge

**On the basis of the Guidelines' chapter 5** (issues no. 2 (Research impact), 3 (Knowledge transfer) & 4 (Active involvement from the civil society)

**Definition:**

What is knowledge? What is open knowledge?

What are "stakeholders"?

**Open question: How make scientific actors' and stakeholders' objectives converge and not diverge?**

They will diverge as long as the research system only awards peer-review publication

**Research impact: open review process:** good practice from the EGU journals' open peer review. Main goal**:** to ensure the quality of review

*(not to engage non-academic stakeholders in the review)*

JPI Climate

# Session 2: Specific suggestions for operational activities as output

**Goal 1**: to brainstorm on measures to be adopted in future JPI Climate calls (e.g. in the context of the ERA-Net on CS

**Goal 2**: to brainstorm on relevant topics for the symposium “Open Climate Knowledge: Designing Comprehensive Access to Knowledge policies to face climate change” (end 2015, Vienna (?))

---

***Field of action 1: Science communication***. To define what science communication is and to foster that this debate will take part in the research project’s budget and funded activities, together with concrete measures to foster communication strategies (e.g. to devote a given % within a consortia budget).

JPI Climate

# Session 2: Specific suggestions for operational activities as output

***Field of action 2: research transfer***. Stimulating young scientific researchers to publish in non-scientific publications, or to ask them to "translate" their output into a non-scientific language through e.g. policy papers.

- Example 1: The Vienna Technical University dedicates funding to translate publications into non-scientific language. Also in Nordic countries: Nordforsk funds this kind of actions.
- Example 2:  Water Framework Directive translated into policy briefs was a quite successful practice.

***Field of action 3: research impact***. Encourage deeper integration within the JPI programs (ex. Between one project's WPs)

- Example 1: In the UK & NL, proposals have to demonstrate their impact (on politics or in society)
- Collaborative outreach strategies between funder and funded (e.g. JPI Climate 1st call)

JPI Climate

# Session 2: Specific suggestions for operational activities as output

To introduce projects' results evaluation in JPI Climate calls ("ex-post evaluation"), including asking whether the results were used or not in the field and bearing in mind the importance of learning also from failed projects.

What question cannot be answered by this data? Why not? Useful to identify gaps

***Field of action 4: (non-academic)stakeholder (active) involvement***. Experience from the JPI Climate 1st call.

To involve the JPI Climate's Transdisciplinary Advisory Board in the symposium.

Young researchers to become collaborators for stakeholders

- Example 1 (NL): PhD students did his project in a Provincial Department

JPI Climate

# Session 2: Specific suggestions for operational activities as output

***Field of action 5: fostering inter-disciplinarity*** To include post-doc and PhD grants being mentored by supervisors from different disciplines.

- Example 1 (DE, University of Konstanz): “PhD Park”

To foster regular meetings between PhD candidates to brainstorm and to produce common output (ex. Summer schools).

JPI Climate