



## **CIVISTI**

### **Collaborative project on Blue Sky Research on Emerging Issues Affecting European S&T**



Grant Agreement no. 225.165

Activity acronym: CIVISTI

Activity full name:

Citizen Visions on Science, Technology and Innovation

Activity type: Collaborative project

Deliverable 3.2

Report on S&T priorities  
from the second meeting  
of the Danish citizen panel

Due date of deliverable:

Actual submission date:

Start date of Activity: 1 September 2008

Duration: 30 months

Author(s): Ida-Elisabeth Andersen

Organisation name of lead beneficiary for this deliverable:

The Danish Board of Technology

## Change Records

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Author</b>
1	05-11-2011	Report	Ida-Elisabeth Andersen

## Partners

**The Danish Board of Technology,**  
Copenhagen, Denmark  
Contact: Lars Klüver  
[LK@Tekno.dk](mailto:LK@Tekno.dk)  
[www.tekno.dk](http://www.tekno.dk)

## TEKNOLOGI-RÅDET

TEKNOLOGI-RÅDET

**The National Consumer Research Centre**  
Helsinki, Finland  
Contact: Mikko Rask  
[Mikko.Rask@ncrc.fi](mailto:Mikko.Rask@ncrc.fi)



[www.kuluttajatutkimuskeskus.fi](http://www.kuluttajatutkimuskeskus.fi)

**Institute Society and Technology**  
Brussels, Belgium  
Contact: Robby Berloznik  
[robby.berloznik@vlaamsparlem.ent.be](mailto:robby.berloznik@vlaamsparlem.ent.be)  
[www.samenlevingentechnologie.be](http://www.samenlevingentechnologie.be)



**Malta Council for Science and Technology**  
Villa Bighi, Kalkara, Malta  
Contact: Giovanni Battista Buttigieg  
[giovanni-battista.buttigieg@gov.mt](mailto:giovanni-battista.buttigieg@gov.mt)  
[www.mcst.gov.mt](http://www.mcst.gov.mt)



**Applied Research and Communication Fund**  
Sofia, Bulgaria  
Contact: Zoya Damianova  
[zoya.damianova@online.bg](mailto:zoya.damianova@online.bg)  
[www.arcfund.net](http://www.arcfund.net)



**Medián Opinion and Market Research Institute**  
Budapest, Hungary  
Contact: Eszter Bakonyi  
[bakonyi@median.hu](mailto:bakonyi@median.hu)  
[www.median.hu](http://www.median.hu)



**Institute of Technology Assessment,**  
Vienna, Austria  
Contact: Walter Peissl  
[wpeissl@oeaw.ac.at](mailto:wpeissl@oeaw.ac.at)  
[www.oeaw.ac.at/ita](http://www.oeaw.ac.at/ita)



**Legal notice:**

The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of the following information.

© CIVISTI 2008. Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>page</b>
Change Records	2
Preface	6
Introduction	7
Validations of recommendations 15 - 20 from the Danish citizen panel	9
Prioritisation	20
Next step in CIVISTI	22

## **Preface**

The CIVISTI project resulted from the idea that citizen consultations are valuable tools to identify new relevant research topics. By listening to citizen's concerns and expectations for future developments in the fields of science, technology and innovation, policy makers are given the opportunity to match the European research agenda to emerging issues among the public.

The CIVISTI project is financed by the European commission and involves seven different European countries (Denmark, Flanders (Belgium), Malta, Hungary, Finland, Bulgaria and Austria).

During the weekend of 16-17 May 2009, the Danish Board of Technology organized the first citizen consultation within the framework of the trans-European CIVISTI project. In each country, the citizen panel was prompted in a structured way to develop their own visions and concerns for the future. A total of 24 Danish citizens volunteered to share their visions and fears with regards to the future.

These visions were put together with corresponding visions from citizen panels in the 6 other countries and evaluated by a group of experts and stakeholders from the perspective of the European research programme. This was done during the expert stakeholder workshop on 14-16 June in Sofia, Bulgaria. Through an interactive and strictly facilitated process, the expert panel identified potential new research areas in science and technology. The basis for this were the citizens visions.

On the 9<sup>nd</sup> of October 2010, the Danish citizen panel reassembled to formulate their opinion on the experts recommendations. The goal of this meeting was twofold: A validation of the recommendations based on the Danish visions, and a prioritisation of the recommendations. The output of this meeting is that most recommendations are seen as desirable and relatively effective in realising the vision. The Danish panel chose a clear top 3 for the recommendations and it is also possible to identify a top 10.

We would like to thank the participants, whose input is of great importance for the success of the CIVISTI project, for their enthusiasm and cooperation.

## Introduction

The second Danish CIVISTI citizen consultation (CC2) took place on Saturday the 9<sup>nd</sup> of October 2010. All citizens that participated in the first CIVISTI citizen participation had been invited by mail and by telephone. 15 citizens out of 25 agreed beforehand to attend CC2. Of the ten persons, who excused themselves, some were working far away (one in China), others had important family matters or other arrangements which they had to attend. In the morning of the meeting two citizens cancelled their attendance for health reasons. 3 participants did not notify us about their absence.

The participants all received two information packages with reading material so that they could prepare themselves for CC2.



The participants were 5 men and 5 women. Four out of the ten participants were older than 50. The educational level maybe was slightly higher than in the panel as a whole. The participants were:

Dorte Nygaard Kristensen	Frederiksberg	Student
Mathias Lang	Vallensbæk Strand	Student
Sabrina J. R. Rasmussen	København Ø	Student
Morten Klamer	Hillerød	Consultant
Katrine Gerlach Skibild	Frederikssund	Practice nurse
Lisbeth Brandt	København S	Coordinator
Bo Ørting	Albertslund	Quality controller in Coop/DK
Rene L. Christensen	København NV	Media producer, Copenhagen University
Anne Bente Nielsen	Smørum	Journeyman painter
Henrik Wulff Ljungberg	Birkerød	Upper secondary school teacher

The Danish Board of Technology staff:

Tormod Olsen  
Ida-Elisabeth Andersen

Facilitator:

Mette Seier Helms

### ***Course of the day.***

All participants, except one who came later, arrived between 9.30 and 10 am and appeared happy to see each other again. The project leader gave a short introduction to the CIVISTI project reminding the citizens about their work with the visions and the different steps of the project. She also told the citizens about the expert stakeholder workshop: its workshop method, participants and resulting recommendations. And the facilitator presented the programme of CC2 and how to work with validation and validation criteria in the first part of the day – and how to work with prioritisation of the rest of the recommendations (not derived from Danish citizen visions) in the second part of the day.

The members of the panel asked some questions about how results would be received at the policy workshop. Two persons would like to attend the workshop and were invited to do this on their own costs.

During the validation session the participants were divided in three groups with three participants and a moderator/facilitator in each group. There were six recommendations to validate, which had been inspired by visions from the Danish panel. Each group therefore has to validate two recommendations using the three criteria: faithfulness (in relation to the related vision) – effectiveness and desirability. When all six recommendations were validated there was a short presentation and discussion of the results. The citizens appeared to be satisfied with both results and process.

In the afternoon, the 24 recommendations that were not inspired by Danish visions were presented by the facilitator. Next, an open market space was made by hanging the short version of the recommendations on the wall and the citizens were invited to walk around and read all the recommendations and try to get overview and impression of them. They had a personal scoring form on which they could indicate questions and comments. This individual form helped them later on to remember what recommendations they liked most and deserved a vote. Afterwards, they got seven stickers to vote for the recommendations that they found most important. And after the voting there was a discussion on the results: why did the ranking look the way it did? This discussion became also an evaluation of the day, where it became clear that the panel members found the validation process more meaningful than the prioritisation process.

Finally, the questionnaire was filled in and the participants were rewarded for their good work with a reception.

In general the citizens worked in a very engaged and constructive way and the second citizen consultation of the Danish panel was a good experience to both citizens and organisers.



## **Validations of recommendations 15 - 20 from the Danish citizen panel**

The chapter contains validations from the Danish citizen panel. In the top of each validation the short versions of both the recommendation and the vision behind it are quoted. The participating 9 members of the Danish CIVISTI panel were working in 3 groups with 3 people in each group. The validations are only made by one of the groups. For this panel there was not time enough for everybody to validate each of the recommendations.

### ***Recommendation 15. Agreements with farmers organizations on avoiding antibiotics and hormones.***

Implement research on ethical, legal and philosophical status of animals in FP8\*. Develop agreements on avoiding antibiotics and hormones to be implemented at the local or regional level but that are harmonized at the European level.

Corresponding vision: 31. Responsible animal production in the EU.

### **Vision 31: Responsible animal production in the EU**

Animals are kept under conditions respecting their natural behaviour. Live animals are not transported unnecessarily and are always butchered locally. Infectious diseases transmitted from animals to humans are eradicated through improved animal welfare and responsible handling of the animals.

### ***Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 15***

#### **Faithfulness**

	Bull's eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	1	0	1	1	0

The recommendation is loyal to the vision, because the experts have weighted ethical considerations to animal welfare as very important, and because they recommend a cross disciplinary research programme in this field. They also want to have public debate on animal welfare. On the other hand the recommendation is not absolutely faithful to the vision, because there is no focus on the quality of animal products, and several concrete proposals from the vision are not included, e.g. illness and health of animals and humans.

## Effectiveness

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number of votes	0	3	0	0	0

The recommendation is seen as effective, because the experts recommend to start these activities as soon as possible. On the other hand it is not validated as absolutely effective, because it recommends voluntary agreements and private control. Efficient control, according to the panel, must walk on two legs: both private and public – both voluntary and prescribed.

## Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	2	1	0	0	0

The recommendation is highly desirable, because there is too much poor animal welfare and too many animal products of poor quality. – One argument against desirability, however, is this doubt of the panel members: will it be possible to cope with the demand for food products, if the products shall comply with strong demands on animal ethics and animal welfare?

### ***Recommendation 16. Innovative participatory structures.***

Implement innovative experiments with citizens participation. Large scale explorative action research\* based on trying new methodologies and including new communication technologies for citizens political communication debates.

Corresponding vision: 32: EU for the people.

The recommendation is also related to:

- vision 36: Mass communication replaced by masses communicating (by providing communication technologies to facilitate the participatory structures)
- vision 42: Europe TV (by providing a medium for these methods)

### **Vision 32: EU for the people**

Through close dialogue, in which citizens get a sense of being listened to and having a say in democratic processes and development of visions, the EU now feels like an institution close to the people. Citizens feel this closeness through a shared identity and through a vision, also shared, by citizens and institutions.

## ***Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 16***

### **Faithfulness**

	Bull's eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	1	2	0	0	0

This recommendation is seen as quite faithful to the original vision, because it keeps focusing on the core of the vision and even develops it into a better idea.. It is also positive that the principle of subsidiarity is central in the recommendation, which is based on local relationships and especially on linking local identity with European identity. The recommendation understands citizen participation as a necessary and continuous process and its headline is good and precise.

### **Effectiveness**

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number of votes	2	1	0	0	0

The recommendation is seen as very effective, if importance is attached to the following elements when realizing the vision:

- use information technologies and virtual tools of communication
- realising must include democratic decision making and voting in EU
- the principle of subsidiarity must be maintained in order to support local and decentralized developments and at the same time
- the idea of a common “EU culture” must be supported and developed

The panel did not mention any negative arguments against this positive validation of the two criteria.

## Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	3	0	0	0	0

The panel's finds the recommendation highly desirable because of the local anchoring, because more people will engage and take part in democracy, and because citizens will be heard. This recommendation can contribute to the development of EU as a political actor with a holistic approach, opposite to the current situation where every national state takes care of their own interests, according to the panel. The vision about citizen participation should be seen as a "mother vision", e.g. a precondition for realising other visions for EU. Action research, living labs and use and development of other methods for citizen participation are therefore also preconditions to realising this vision.

But if citizens don't engage and if policy makers don't listen to the results of citizen participation, then the panel **does not desire** the realization of this recommendation.

### ***Recommendation 17. Social innovations for aging societies are needed.***

Research should be done to investigate the effect that a transition period between full-employment and full-retirement would have on the labour market. The aim of this would be to re-evaluate the rigid retirement age/pension system that currently characterizes pension policy.

Corresponding vision: 33. The ageing man/woman is a resource.

The recommendation is also related to:

- vision 17: Where there is a will, there is work.
- vision 50: Support for starting and maintaining a family - and the EU.

### **Vision 33: The ageing man/woman is a resource**

Europe's share of elderly people has increased. Now elderly people have become a resource rather than a "burden", which was a concept generally used in years around 2000. Society is gaining economically, socially and culturally from this new role of elderly people. It benefits the younger generation and improves the quality of life for elderly people.

**Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 17**



**Faithfulness**

	Bull's eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	0	0	1	2	0

The recommendation is seen as faithful, because both recommendation and vision view the idea of a period of transition between work and pension as necessary and important. And because the recommendation is stressing the access to leisure activities for the senior group as important.

But the recommendation is not seen as faithful to the vision's conception of man. The vision is a society with a new conception of man, where everybody, also elderly persons, are seen as a resource to society. The recommendation is focusing too narrowly on the labour market, and sees alone a possible longer connection with the labour market as the element, which can turn the ageing population into a resource for society. Furthermore the recommendation does not mention progress in medical research and living arrangements, which are important preconditions for realising the vision.

## Effectiveness

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number	0	0	1	1	1

It is validated as effective because the conception of ageing is understood as a concept about transitions of life - and periods of transition are seen as something we (society) must deal with in order to open for a variety of possibilities of life. – On the other hand the recommendation may become an obstacle to realising the vision, because focus has been changed from the ageing person as a resource to society to the ageing person as a problem to society. The view of the recommendation is that the ageing person is a problem for society, which we must try to solve by implementing new initiatives in the labourmarket. According to the panel this will not contribute to realizing the vision.

## Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	0	2	0	1	0

The panel finds the recommendation desirable because it can give better possibilities for transition from work to pension in some countries and can contribute to a broader and more positive conception of the resources, which can be found in the ageing population. But it is not desirable as it is presented now, because of a too narrow focus on labour market and economy, and because it will not contribute to necessary changes in current negative attitudes to the ageing population and therefore will not stop age discrimination.

### ***Recommendation 18. Promote technical and social innovations that can enhance people’s access to and use of public transportation.***

Promote technical and social innovations to improve people’s access to transportation schemes, through an intelligent and interactive network\*. This network should cover and integrate both local and trans-national travel in a flexible, user friendly and environmentally sound way.

Corresponding vision: 35. Environmentally sound transportation throughout Europe.

### **Vision 35: Environmentally sound transportation throughout Europe**

In 2040 all transportation in Europe will be environmentally sound and there will be many environment friendly means of transportation for both countryside and city: bicycles, electric cars,

electric buses, trams and metro. Public transportation is the most attractive choice and the most used transport method. Public transportation is fast and easy to use day and night.

## Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 18

### Faithfulness

	Bull's eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	1	2	0	0	0

The panel finds the recommendation very faithful to the vision. The recommendation even goes beyond the vision and makes it better. But faithfulness is reduced by the fact that this recommendation does not adapt well to a society, which already has ideas of sustainable transportation. For such countries it is not sufficiently innovative. The original vision was more naïve (or visionary) than the very realistic focus of this recommendation.

### Effectiveness

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number of votes	0	2	1	0	0

The logic of the recommendation is very effective and will realize the vision in a positive way. Furthermore the recommendation calls for research in the field of sustainable transportation. But it is not efficient enough for societies, which are already thinking in sustainable transportation. For such societies it is not ambitious enough. It deals with problems, which we have to solve, no matter what, and with initiatives, which currently are going on. The recommendation does not deal with solving the whole problem of sustainable transportation. Especially the panel is missing recommendations about how to change people's attitudes to transportation, and a discussion about how transportation can be better adapted to human needs and to a new relationship between leisure time and work.

## Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	3	0	0	0	0

The panel finds the recommendation very desirable, because it is useful for the climate and can contribute to solving of congestion problems. As transportation influences many fields of life realizing of the recommendation can be useful to many of such fields ( leisuretime/work, animal welfare, environment in its broadest sense etc. ) Therefore the recommendation is necessary. A couple of critical comments mention that the recommendation does not focus on a necessary adaptation of transportation to human needs. And it also does not mention necessary of changes of attitudes. Therefore the panel would have liked the recommendation to be broader.

### ***Recommendation 19. Develop avatars that are able to act as a remote physical representation of myself.***

Start research on the many aspects of creating avatars, including research in brain-machine interface, technical research, research in legal and insurance issues and research in social consequences.

Corresponding vision: 36. Mass communication by masses communicating.

### **Vision 36: Mass communication replaced by masses communicating**

The multimedia environment is so developed that no economic, political or other interest are controlling it. Everybody can use it freely and seamlessly in the interest of him-/herself and the recipients. Physically remote – yet close. Dialogue is seamless although there are still numerous languages. Intercultural bridge building – everyone is stranger, no one is stranger. – Private and public “communication drones” are reality.

### ***Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 19***

## Faithfulness

	Bull’s eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	0	0	1	2	0

There is a certain relationship and therefore a little faithfulness to the vision, because the recommendation is working with an aspect of artificial intelligence, which can help to overcome



obstacles to communication. - But it is not faithful to introduce the avatar, which is not at all a part of the vision. The idea of an avatar produces a basically different image of man, and it binds thoughts from the vision in a false direction. The ideas on communication from the vision are not included. Therefore the part on mutual learning and the democracy aspect has been lost.

The panel is very disappointed with the avatar and finds that the experts have been focused too much on the idea of presence, independent of time and place. Furthermore the panel is afraid that the avatar will make people think of a society, where man is physically isolated. Therefore the recommendation is seen as very much in the periphery of the vision.

### Effectiveness

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number of votes	0	0	1	1	1

The recommendation can be seen as an effective tool for realizing the vision, because it implies an idea of closeness, which has not been known before. But still, it does not include the most important ideas from the vision and therefore it is not going to realize the vision effectively. The recommendation is ambiguous. There is too much focus on one sentence about a farmer taking care of the sheep of another - far away - farmer – too much focus on time traveling – and on presence, which is independent of time and location. Especially the group finds the paragraph on timing of bad quality, because it gives rise to wrong associations.

### Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	0	1	1	1	0

The recommendation is desirable because the development in the field of artificial intelligence may lead to many good things in society. And it is positive that ethical aspects are dealt with. But it is not desirable because the headline and the paragraph on timing give rise to misleading associations. The focus on time traveling – the possibility of presence everywhere – are problematic. Realizing of the avatar is not desirable to this panel, as it includes a negative conception of man.

## Comment to the validation

In this case the group had problems to decide how to choose between “to a certain degree desirable” from “to a certain degree undesirable”, because there was such a big difference between recommendation and vision. The vision can be misunderstood if one looks at it from the point of view of the recommendation. The authors of the vision knew that this was a possible misunderstanding and regretted that they did not formulate the vision in a more narrow and concrete way.

### ***Recommendation 20. Select or develop plants and techniques for areas with extreme climate conditions.***

Increased research, development and use of plants adapted to extreme wet and dry areas and capable of resisting extreme climate conditions.

Corresponding vision: 39. Food production in the EU is sustainable.

### **Vision 39: Food production in the EU is sustainable**

Europe’s agricultural production takes place in a closed circuit, supplying exactly as many nutrients as are lost in production. Agricultures do not pollute, pesticides are not used and there is no leaching of nutrients. The yield from agriculture is at optimum level.

### ***Validation by the Danish citizen panel of recommendation 20***

#### **Faithfulness**

	Bull’s eye	Reflects strongly	Partly yes, partly no	Reflects weakly	Does not reflect at all
Number of votes	0	1	2	0	0

The recommendation is faithful to the vision because it includes many elements from the vision and the attitude to these elements is the same as in the vision. But faithfulness is reduced by the fact that these single elements are taken out of context and developed into technical tools, which are supposed to accomplish specific tasks. It does not appear that the vision is a mutually dependent whole, and the recommendation does not deal with the core of the vision which is: change of citizens’ behavior, economic sustainability in agriculture and preservation of nature.

## Effectiveness

	Most important instrument	One of the important instruments	May or may not be important	Does not contribute to make the vision come true	Contraproductive
Number of votes	0	2	1	0	0

The recommendation can be validated as an effective tool to realize the vision, because it includes elements from the vision, which are important to realizing it. But it is not effective because it does not include change of citizens' behavior, revolutionizing of agriculture and preservation of wild nature. Without holistic conceptualization of the vision the recommendation is running the risk to end in something quite contrary to the vision.

## Desirability

	Highly desirable	Partly desirable	Neutral	Partly undesirable	Undesirable
Number of votes	0	1	2	0	0

The recommendation is desirable because it is positive to do something in this field: use of pesticides has to be reduced – GMO is necessary to avoid pesticides and to allow agriculture in less useable areas . And it is also desirable, because it has a focus on adapting cultivation to a variety of climatic conditions.

The recommendation is not desirable because it does not see agriculture holistically in a broad perspective . It is focusing too specifically on some of the tools (the plants, the technical stuff, the instruments). It is difficult to see if the objective is profit or sustainability. GMO is not the solution, but only a step on the road to economic sustainability.

## Prioritisation



Below is the prioritisation of the 24 recommendations that were not derived from Danish visions. Each citizen had 7 votes. We ended up with a **top 3**, 3 recommendations scoring 7 and 5 votes – and with a **top 10** – the top 3 plus seven recommendations scoring 4 votes.

	<b>Number of votes</b>
<b>5. Foresight and research to explore sustainable options of decentralized energy production systems</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Humanistic research to explore what dignity during the dying process means to contemporary Europeans..</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>22. Foster the use of bio-refineries.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Tools for disabled people</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Plug and play communication: development of standards for smart gadgets.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>6. A platform for the future of work at a local, regional and global level should be considered within upcoming calls of the SSH programme.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>9. Optimization of urban space: towards dense European eco-cities</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>11. Research to overcome the tension between the use of highly complex materials in products and their recyclability</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>21. Policies towards immigrants and refugees appreciation.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>26. Develop effective urban infrastructures supporting a multigenerational lifestyle.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>8. Enhance the ethical reflection on science based organic and “bionic” production</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>10. From CAP to European Agricultural policy: back to a gardening tradition.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>13. Recognition policy.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>24. Go and re-appropriate countryside</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>25. European integrated policies on sharing work.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>27. Encourage alumni work in corporate governance</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>28. Worldwide collaboration on space technology</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>30. Stimulate research on human-machine interfaces.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. European TV – unity in diversity. A permanent lab for experimentation on building and expressing identity</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>7. Stimulate research to expand/augment the human sensory capabilities</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>12. Increase direct democracy through e-voting.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>23. Project for Finnish best practices to be disseminated and used in other countries.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>29. Project to explore global governance.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>14. Develop Sofia into an eco-model for European capitals.</b>	<b>0</b>

The ranking from the Danish panel ended with all recommendations except one came on the list with from 1 to 7 votes, only one recommendation got all 7 votes, only one got 0 votes.

The top 10 list consists of very different recommendations, but there seem to be an overweight of recommendations on environment and energy – but also recommendations with ethical concerns and recommendations about the future of work.

### ***Reflections on results of the prioritisation process from members of the Danish panel***

After the presentation of the results the panel discussed, why the ranking list looks the way it does. Somebody mentioned that the prioritisation process had been a difficult process, it had gone too quickly and been too superficial, they thought, because they had been told that they did not need really to read the long version of all the recommendations. Some of the citizens wished that we as organisers had asked them to use more energy beforehand to read and know all the material.

Some citizens had voted for recommendations, which they regarded as visionary, in stead of recommendations, which they thought would be realised under all circumstances. Opposite others, who had prioritised recommendations, which they thought were going to be realised.

Some citizens thought that seven votes for each person were too many. They would have preferred to have three votes.

Some citizens found that prioritisation had been difficult, because the recommendations were much too much alike – maybe they should have been put into categories. Some citizens thought that some of the recommendations were too thin and airy and should have been more worked out. Others pointed to examples which, according to them, were not visionary at all.

And YES, everybody agreed that they would have liked a direct dialogue with the experts and stakeholders on visions and recommendations.

They pointed to an additional criterion for validation, which could be formulated: “I would like to send this message to politicians and other decision makers”. – It also turned out that many panel members are worried that the results from CIVISTI shall dissapear in the “EU machinery” – or that the inspiration to the recommendations from the citizens (the visions) shall disappear in the next steps of the work. Therefore some of the citizens will like to join the policy workshop in Bruxelles in January 2011.

## **Next step in CIVISTI**

This report on validations and prioritisations of expert recommendatons by the Danish CIVISTI panel will be put together with the the corresponding reports from the other six CIVISTI panels.

At a final policy workshop in Bruxelles in January 2011 the final report on validation and prioritisation will be handed over to the EU Commission together with other project results.

In February 2011 the Danish CIVISTI panel will have an informal meeting and a dinner to inform the panel members about how their visions and ideas have been received by politicians and other decision makers.

Many thanks to everybody who have contributed to make CIVISTI an interesting and challenging project. Many hopes that the results from CIVISTI will be used and that CIVISTI will be an inspiration to other such projects in the future.