



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 Bulgarian citizen panel

Due date of deliverable: 05.11.2010

Actual submission date:

Start date of Activity:

1 September 2008

Duration:

30 month

Author(s):

Organisation name of lead beneficiary for this deliverable:

Applied Research and Communications Fund (ARC Fund)

Partners

The Danish Board of Technology,
Copenhagen, Denmark
Contact: Lars Klüver
LK@Tekno.dk
www.tekno.dk

TEKNOLOGI-RÅDET

The National Consumer Research Centre
Helsinki, Finland
Contact: Mikko Rask
Mikko.Rask@ncrc.fi
www.kuluttajatutkimuskeskus.fi



Institute Society and Technology
Brussel, Belgium
Contact: Robby Berloznik
robby.berloznik@vlaamsparlement.be
www.samenlevingentechnologie.be



Malta Council for Science and Technology
Villa Bighi, Kalkara, Malta
Contact: Giovanni Battista Buttigieg
giovanni-battista.buttigieg@gov.mt
www.mcst.gov.mt



Applied Research and Communication Fund
Sofia, Bulgaria
Contact: Zoya Damianova
zoya.damianova@online.bg
www.arcfund.net



Medián Opinion and Market Research Institute
Budapest, Hungary
Contact: Eszter Bakonyi
bakonyi@median.hu
www.median.hu



Institute of Technology Assessment,
Vienna, Austria
Contact: Walter Peissl
wpeissl@oeaw.ac.at
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.

Table of Contents		page
Change Records		2
Preface		6
Chapter 1	Introduction	7
Chapter 2	Validation	11
Chapter 3	Prioritisation	19

Preface

"Short about CIVISTI and the xx citizen panel from CC1 - via expert-stakeholder workshop - to CC2 - to policy workshop in January 2011".

This is just a proposal.

The objective of CIVISTI is to identify new emerging issues for European Science and Technology (S&T) by uncovering European citizens' visions of the future and by transforming these visions into research priorities for FP8. The core idea of CIVISTI is that socially relevant and proactive research agendas could gain from consultations with citizens. For that reason the activities of the project included organisation of national citizen panels, during which citizens formulated and presented their visions for the future. At the first stage of the project, citizen consultations were organised in seven partner countries in the spring of 2009. These events resulted in 69 citizens' visions for the future. At the second stage, an expert-stakeholder workshop was organised in Sofia, Bulgaria, on June 15-16, to discuss these visions and determine how to best turn them into actionable research priorities. The workshop resulted in 30 recommendations for future research programmes. The next activity of CIVISTI was the organisation of a second round of citizen consultation meetings (CC2). The objective of the CC2 meetings in October 2010 was to once again consult the citizen panels in order for them to validate and prioritise the 30 recommendations from the expert-stakeholder workshop. The result was a set of S&T issues and recommendations, which citizens find most important for their future. Results from all national panels will be put together and later be presented during a policy workshop in Brussels in January 2011.

Chapter 1 Introduction

The national CC2 report will have an **introductory part** summarizing facts on CC2 like the date and place of, the list of participants, the programme etc. and a short description of the course of the day. - In this there will be a comment on the participants: the number of participants – those who were not there: did the fact that not everybody could participate change the profile of the citizen panel: older – younger – more men/women etc.?

The second citizen consultation meeting (CC2) was organised in Sofia, Bulgaria on Saturday, 23.10.2010 as an activity of the CIVISTI project. The venue of the event was *Paragraph Restaurant*, situated in the city center of Sofia. The venue was chosen due to several reasons like its location (easy access from all parts of the city), informal and friendly atmosphere, appropriate settings, suitable arrangement of the working tables and the plenary space on the second floor as well as the availability of another hall on the first floor where coffee breaks were organised and lunch was served.

The names of the 18 citizens who participated in the CC2 meeting in Sofia are listed below. All participants took part in CC1. 18 out of 25 in CC1 attended CC2, which represents :

1. Alexander Marinov
2. Ivaylo Velinov
3. Tsvetana Velinova
4. Nayden Naydenov
5. Alyona Deniakina
6. Emil Mihaylov
7. Valentin Pashov
8. Miroslav Gerginov
9. Evelina Parapanova
10. Maria Georgieva
11. Borislav Filipov
12. Madlen Tsekova
13. Magdena Ivanova
14. Boyan Krovoshiev
15. Emilia Kolushki
16. Anka Bojilova-Bazdarski
17. Vesela Genkova
18. Martin Ivanov

The agenda of the event was the following:

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 9.30 – 10.00 | Arrival and registration of participants |
| 10.00 – 10.20 | Overview of activities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- CIVISTI project- What have happened since our last meeting?- Presentation of the objectives of the second citizens' consultation meeting- Presentation of the expert-stakeholder workshop: the participants and the work process. |

Zoya Damianova, Denitsa Marinova

10.20 – 11.00

Introduction

- Overview of the Bulgarian visions and the participants who developed them
- Introduction to CC2: short introduction by the participants and presentation of the work process
- Presentation of the agenda of CC2
- Questions

Todor Galev

11.00 – 11.30

- Presentation of the six recommendations, related to the visions which came from the Bulgarian national citizen panel
- Explanation of the criteria for the validation of these recommendations by panel members
- Break down in 3 working groups with moderators Denitsa Marinova, Todor Galev and Teodora Georgieva

Denitsa Marinova, Todor Galev

11.30 – 13.30

Validation of the recommendations related to the Bulgarian visions

- Validation of the recommendations by participants according to the methodology

13.30 – 14.30

Lunch

14.30 – 16.00

Plenary session

- Presentation of the validated recommendations by the group facilitators

Denitsa Marinova, Todor Galev, Teodora Georgieva

- Presentation of the recommendations, based on the visions of the other CIVISTI partner countries and their corresponding visions

Milanka Slavova

- Prioritisation of the 24 recommendations of the CIVISTI project: which recommendations do citizens find most important for their future?

- Participants in CC2 voted for the recommendations they consider most important for the future. Each participant received 7 votes, but s/he can vote only once for a given recommendation

16.30

Coffee break

16.45 – 17.30

Presentation of the results

- Presentation of the results
- Argumentation for the top 5 recommendations – short discussion about the reasons for the ranking of the recommendations by the participants
- Information about forthcoming steps in the validation of the recommendations and their corresponding visions
- Closure of the meeting

Milanka Slavova, Zoya Damianova

17.30

Celebrating the results of CC2

As indicated in the agenda, the second citizens' consultation workshop began with a short welcome from Ms Zoya Damianova from ARC Fund, which is the Bulgarian partner in the project. Ms Damianova briefly presented the objectives of CIVISTI and provided an overview of the project activities that have been executed between the last meeting with the citizens and the current one. After that, Ms Denitsa Marinova from ARC Fund briefly presented the expert-stakeholders workshop, organised in Sofia in June 2010, as well as the outcomes of the workshop. Then, Mr Todor Galev presented the agenda of the CC2 meeting and each participant introduced himself/herself and shared with the others whether anything relevant that reminded him/her of CIVISTI has happened since the last meeting of the group. During this introductory part some participants expressed their positive attitude towards the project. The enthusiasm of the student Madlen Tsekova, for example, was related to the unexpected benefit, stemming from the fact that she found her name in Google (on the project website). Some of the older participants, however, expressed their pessimism that the project could lead to real results. Their pessimism was not directly related to the project, but rather it was based on their negative experience with problems they had encountered during their daily round. Mr Alexander Marinov told that according to him, during citizen consultation meetings "we dream and work." Some participants proposed to develop the recommendations not only on European, but on national level as well and to implement them into real national policies in all partner countries of CIVISTI.

The next point in the agenda was the presentation of the six Bulgarian visions and their respective recommendations, made by Ms Marinova. After that Mr Galev explained the criteria according to which the participants were about to validate the recommendations, based on the six Bulgarian visions. Mr Galev's presentation was followed by the division of the participants into three working groups. Each group had a facilitator who guided the work. Participants had around two hours in order to validate the six recommendations.

There was a slight adjustment to the timing of the agenda and the second part of the day after the lunch break continued with a presentation of the other 24 expert recommendations, made by Ms Milanka Slavova.

During that time, the facilitators of the three groups were summarising the results of the morning session. After the participants got acquainted with the 24 recommendations, each of them received 7 points and had to vote for the 7 recommendations that s/he considered most important for the future. While Mr Galev was counting the results after the citizen's vote, Ms Adriana Dimova from ARC Fund presented the summary results of the validation from the morning session. After that, the results of the voting were presented by Mr. Galev, followed by a short discussion, facilitated by him, about the reasons for them. The meeting ended with several concluding points regarding the next phases of CIVISTI, made by Ms Zoya Damianova. At the end, each participant filled in a questionnaire, which aim was to assess the CC2 meeting.

The fact that 18 of the original 25 people (72% of the initial number of participants) who participated in the first citizen consultation meeting in 2009 came to CC2 is a positive result, indicating that participants are interested in CIVISTI and they consider that such kind of panels are an important instrument and should be used in order to guide decisions in research planning. Three of these eight people who participated in CC1, but did not participate in CC2, have changed their telephones and addresses and could not be contacted at all by the organisers and the other five expressed their willingness to come, but had other personal or business engagements on the day of the meeting.

The different number of participants in CC2 did not affect the profile of the citizen panel in a negative way. A total of seven participants who participated in CC1 did not participate in CC2 – five of these seven were men and two of them were women. However, this fact did not change the profile of the citizen panel negatively, but just the opposite - the 18 participants in CC2 were equal number according to their gender – nine men and nine women. In addition, they were representatives of different age groups and had different educational background. Moreover, they represented a good mixture of representatives of all societal strata – people with university degrees and people with secondary education only, employed and unemployed people, pensioners, students. Hence, the group was heterogeneous and it represented a real sample of the different groups of the society.

Chapter 2 Validation

The report needs to contain a chapter on the **validation** of the recommendations related to the national visions.

When **reporting the national results of these validations** we strive to give a fair picture of citizen's validations of these 3-6 recommendations. We report how citizens have validated each of the 3 criteria and try to summarise this into a more qualitative description of the validation of each recommendation thereby using the scores and the related arguments as a background for the picture. We don't let scores play an explicit part in this description.

Describe the validation for each recommendation – ½ – 1 page for each. Structure the descriptions after the criteria and bring arguments for and against loyalty – effectiveness – desicreability. Sum up with your general experience of the positive/negative validation of each recommendation.

After the introductory part, the 18 participants in CC2 were divided into three groups. Each group had a facilitator and validated all six recommendations, based on the six Bulgarian visions. The division of the citizens into the groups was the following:

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Alexander Marinov	Miroslav Gerginov	Magdena Ivanova
Ivaylo Velinov	Evelina Parapanova	Boyan Krovoshiev
Tsvetana Velinova	Maria Georgieva	Emilia Kolushki
Alyona Deniakina	Borislav Filipov	Anka Bojilova-Bazdarski
Emil Mihaylov	Madlen Tsekova	Vesela Genkova
Valentin Pashov	Martin Ivanov	Nayden Naydenov
Facilitator: Todor Galev	Facilitator: Teodora Georgieva	Facilitator: Denitsa Marinova

General remarks on the validation process:

- Younger people were usually working faster, because they were more focused;
- Older participants (already retired from active work) were slower and started discussions which continued beyond the allocated time for the validation of a certain recommendation;
- Marks from all groups and participants were similar, which is an evidence that there were no major discrepancies among the opinions of older and younger participants and there was no impact on the quality of work, either positive or negative, as a result of the different ages of group members;
- Some participants (some of the elderly ones and the ones with lower education) had difficulties to understand the link between the visions and the recommendations as well as the recommendations themselves due to the specific terminology;

- The link vision-recommendation was questioned by other participants as well. During the discussion, it turned out that citizens expected the recommendations to be very practical in order to be able to execute them, but they did not understand that the recommendations were aimed at formulating the research priorities of FP8;
- Citizens were not acquainted with the research framework programmes of the EU and their objectives as well as the mechanisms of the European institutions and programmes;
- The fact that some participants were optimists and others were pessimists reflected in the opposing marks which some recommendations received; Generally, optimists were giving higher marks than pessimists;
- **According to the citizens, some recommendations were paraphrased versions of the visions and did not contain new elements or suggestions how to reach the objective of the vision in question;**
- Participants had some difficulties in differentiating between the three criteria (faithfulness, effectiveness and desirability);
- The criteria for choosing the mark from the 1-5 scale were not crystal clear and as a result of that most participants were marking '4' when they were not sure which mark to give;
- Overall, the recommendations were validated as relevant in terms of support and proposed measures for the realisation of the visions; Only recommendation №12. *Increase direct democracy through e-voting* received low grades, because almost all participants in the panel agreed that it was very limited and covered only one small aspect of the vision;
- All facilitators said that participants were very enthusiastic and committed, because they were really interested in the topics discussed; This fact is extremely delightful and important to be noted since the youth and the people in their active years will be the ones to participate in the process of turning these visions into reality;

The recommendations and their respective visions which were validated on the 23.10.2010 in Sofia were the following:

Recommendation	Vision
№9. Optimization of urban space: towards dense European eco-cities	A contemporary European city in the year 2050
№10. From CAP to European Agricultural policy: Back to a gardening tradition	Bulgaria – the garden of Europe
№11. Research to overcome the tension between the use of highly complex materials in products and their recyclability	Eco-techno future
№12. Increase direct democracy through e-voting	Link among the generations, space and time
№13. Recognition policy	One Bulgaria, One Europe, One World – one whole!
№14. Develop Sofia into an eco-model for European capitals	Sofia – the green capital

After the validation of the recommendations by the citizens, the facilitators of the three groups gathered and discussed the results during the lunch break. The information on each recommendation

that is presented below is a summary of the work, executed in the groups, as well as the discussions that the participants had during the process of validation. The mark given for each criterion is the average mark, calculated by the facilitators for the given criterion by each of the three groups and then by calculating the average mark for the whole panel.

№9. Optimization of urban space: towards dense European eco-cities

Average mark for faithfulness: 4.4

Overall, the ideas of the vision had been properly understood by the experts, however, there was no common opinion regarding the citizens participation in the creation of eco-cities. On one hand, citizens' participation ensures the democratic decision-making and reflects the visions of the people in terms of their dream eco-city, but on the other hand it allows non-experts to participate into the decision-making process, which is considered a negative aspect, since the 'eco' field needs specific expertise.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criterion:

- City culture will be ameliorated;
- The main idea of the vision is understood properly;

Arguments against the faithfulness criterion:

- Common use of the term 'sustainable development,' but there is no clear definition what it actually means, which leads to confusion;
- More concrete ideas regarding the characteristics of the eco-city should have been provided by the experts;

Average mark for effectiveness: 4

The mark for effectiveness is very high, but in spite of that, most participants expressed the view that the construction and development of an eco-city is such a long-term process that a lot of potential risks might jeopardize the implementation of the idea.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criterion:

- Integrated policy for management of urban spaces and development of new technologies and systems for the construction of eco-cities;
- Recommendations are logic and meaningful and will lead to the implementation of the idea of the vision;

Arguments against the effectiveness criterion:

- No such eco-city exists;
- Not possible to construct an eco-city at the moment;
- The expert recommendations are not that innovative;

Average mark for desirability: 4

The overall view is that the idea for an eco-city could be implemented successfully in old EU member states, but it is not feasible in Bulgaria at the moment.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- Contemporary way of life needs constant optimisation of life in the cities;
- Concrete and feasible activities are presented;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- Too much time is necessary in order to implement such an idea;

- The idea is too innovative and hard to implement;
- Old historical cities will be destroyed;

№10. From CAP to European Agricultural policy: Back to a gardening tradition

Average mark for faithfulness: 3.7

Part of the participants thought that the recommendation was in compliance with the vision and part of them believed that it could lead to some negative results like GMOs.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criterion:

- The positive aspect of the recommendation is the identification of the necessity for concrete state policy;
- The measures proposed in the recommendation will lead to the realisation of the vision;

Arguments against the faithfulness criterion:

- Regional development could have a negative impact on poorer regions;
- R&D activities in the area of agriculture usually lead to creation of GMOs, industrialised agriculture etc;
- The vision focuses on the local level, while the recommendation suggests the development of a common European policy;

Average mark for effectiveness: 3.5

The common view was that the recommendation would not lead to the realisation of the vision.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criterion:

- The ideas of the recommendation are applicable;
- The image of the farmers and agricultural producers will be ameliorated;

Arguments against the effectiveness criterion:

- The vision is related to Bulgaria only, because of its unique climate, while the recommendation is too general;
- The measures proposed might not be effective;

Average mark for desirability: 4

The recommendation is partly applicable in the long-term, because state policy might differ from European policy.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- The proposed measures are applicable despite the discrepancies between the vision and the recommendation;
- Quality of life in Bulgaria will increase;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- The long-term effect of the approach might be negative, because it is possible to result in industrialisation;
- A lot of financial resources are needed in order to implement the recommendation;

№11. Research to overcome the tension between the use of highly complex materials in products and their recyclability

Average mark for faithfulness: 4.4

The recommendation reflects only one element of the vision - the element of recycling.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criterion:

- The idea of the vision is understood properly and is reflected into the recommendation;
- The recommendation is considered to be equally attractive to both customers and producers;

Arguments against the faithfulness criterion:

- Only one criterion of the vision is reflected in the recommendation;

Average mark for effectiveness: 4

Potential conflict of interest might arise between producers of goods and supporters of recycling.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criteria:

- All aspects of the vision are taken into consideration and necessary actions are pointed out;
- Some of the proposed measures have already been implemented in some parts of the world;

Arguments against the effectiveness criteria:

- The recommendation is not full, it needs further development;
- Financial stimulus is needed;
- Lack of will from manufacturers might jeopardize the implementation of the idea;

Average mark for desirability: 3.8

Potential conflict of interest might arise between producers and supporters of recycling.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- Concrete measures are pointed out;
- The environmental aspect is extremely important – production of environmentally friendly products must be stimulated;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- Contradictory measures are proposed in the recommendation: on one hand, the profit of the business will decline if the recommendation is implemented, on the other hand it is expected that the business will be the generator of the implementation of such measures;
- Applicability is too low, because of the complexity of the described processes;

№12. Increase direct democracy through e-voting

Average mark for faithfulness: 2.5

This is the recommendation with the lowest scores. The main reason for the low results is the fact that only one unimportant element of the vision (e-voting) was taken into consideration by the experts and was developed in the recommendation. Other elements, for example high speed transport, are not considered at all.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criteria:

- Reflects the realisation of one part of the vision;

Arguments against the faithfulness criteria:

- It is not a recommendation, but a comment without clear idea;

- Only the e-voting element is considered, but it is only a small part of the overall idea of the vision;

Average mark for effectiveness: 3.2

Expert decisions must be made by experts, not by ordinary people through universal suffrage.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criteria:

- The recommendation is effective only with regard to the e-voting;

Arguments against the effectiveness criteria:

- Populism is dangerous and because of that it is important to focus on the fact that not all decisions should be made through universal suffrage;
- Much more actions in different areas must be taken in order to realise the vision (international treaties, development of transport, healthcare, business relations, education, culture);

Average mark for desirability: 3.6

The measure is applicable, but it has some dangerous aspects if used in undemocratic societies, because the vote could be easily manipulated.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- The realisation of e-voting is easily applicable;
- Faster and easier way to vote;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- E-voting has a lot of aspects that need to be considered before introducing it;
- E-voting could be manipulated very easily;
- Some people are not able to work with computers;

№13. Recognition policy

Average mark for faithfulness: 3.8

Some participants in the consultation panel thought that the recommendation was partial, while others considered that it complemented the vision.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criterion:

- The recommendation reflects the vision completely;
- It is a very positive aspect that both the EU and national level are considered;

Arguments against the faithfulness criterion:

- The recommendation is very abstract and contradictory;
- Some of the main topics like incurable diseases and ecology are omitted;

Average mark for effectiveness: 3.5

Totally different opinions were expressed regarding the effectiveness of the recommendation. Part of the citizens considers that it is very concrete, while others say it is not concrete at all. The opposing views are due to the fact that recognition policy is a new area and it is hard to assess its contribution towards the realisation of the vision.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criterion:

- Concrete measures are proposed, for example, the proposition for “branding;”
- The recommendation could result in better communication and understanding among the ethnicities;

Arguments against the effectiveness criterion:

- The vision is for “unification,” while the recommendation focuses mainly on differences/differentiation;
- Since some of the topics like health and ecology are not taken into consideration by the experts, the recommendation will not be effective in covering all aspects of the vision;

Average mark for desirability: 4

There are moral arguments related to the usage of scientific methods for solving social problems.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- The recommendation encompasses all aspects of the vision and makes it more clear;
- Innovative area that needs to be developed;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- Abstract and contradictory ideas;
- The implementation of the recommendation would hardly lead to considerable results within the EU;

№14. Develop Sofia into an eco-model for European capitals

Average mark for faithfulness: 4.2

Clearly presented aims and ideas.

Arguments, supporting the faithfulness criteria:

- The experts just agree with the vision;
- The recommendation reflects the main idea of the vision;

Arguments against the faithfulness criteria:

- The question regarding the funding is extremely relevant;

Average mark for effectiveness: 4

The realisation of the vision is possible only in case concrete measures for its implementation are taken, however, most citizens were pessimistic that this is going to happen in the near future.

Arguments, supporting the effectiveness criteria:

- Concrete and practical steps are proposed;

Arguments against the effectiveness criteria:

- The realisation of the idea is possible only with EU funding, but most citizens consider it highly unlikely that the EU will allocate funds for such an activity;
- Local institutions have to be involved and work hard for reaching the aim;

Average mark for desirability: 4

The vision is feasible, but hard to implement.

Arguments, supporting the desirability criterion:

- Better quality of life for citizens;

Arguments against the desirability criterion:

- N/A

Chapter 3 Prioritisation

The **prioritisation** of all recommendations.

When reporting the national results of the **prioritisation of all recommendations which were not inspired by visions from this national panel**, we list all these recommendations in accordance with the score/number of dots they got in the prioritisation process. We show the top 5 list as the first five in the whole list of the 24-27 recommendations.

We use impressions and documentation, such as minutes from the discussions to analyse the prioritisation, to give the reader some background to understand how the prioritisation resulted in this particular list of recommendations.

The afternoon session of CC2 began with a presentation of the 24 recommendations which were not inspired by visions from the Bulgarian panel. After that each participant received seven votes with which s/he had to vote for the recommendation s/he considers most important for the future. Each participant had to vote only once for a given recommendation. Each participant was asked to use all 7 votes. The total number of votes equals the number of participants multiplied by 7. The five recommendations that gathered the highest numbers of votes were the following:

1. № 24. Go and re-appropriate countryside! – 13 votes
2. № 26. Develop effective urban infrastructures supporting a multigenerational lifestyle. – 13 votes
3. № 2. Tools for disabled people. – 12 votes
4. № 18. Promote technical and social innovations that can enhance people's access to and use of public transportation. – 12 votes
5. № 21. Policies towards immigrants and refugees appreciation. – 10 votes

The voting was followed by a discussion whose aim was to analyse the reasons for the results. The first point of the discussion was the fact that the first two recommendations with 13 votes are actually opposite in their meaning, because they reflect life in the city and life in the village, but participants who voted for both of them said that **no opposition existed since life in both cases should be pleasant and comfortable**.

Ms Emilia Kolushki said that she hadn't voted for recommendation *№ 21 Policies towards immigrants and refugees appreciation*, because the problem of immigrants and refugees is not relevant in Bulgaria. Moreover, Bulgarians are tolerant enough towards people of different ethnical origin. No other comments regarding the top five ranking were made.

Some participants said that they expected and wanted to see the following recommendation among the top five, because they consider them issues of great importance:

- № 3. European TV – unity in diversity. A permanent lab for experimentation on building and expressing identity (IdenTVLab).
- № 5. Foresight and research to explore sustainable options of decentralized energy production systems and the resolution of energy related conflicts.
- № 15. Agreements with farmers' organisations on avoiding antibiotics and hormones.
- № 17. Social innovations for aging societies are needed.
- № 27. Encourage alumni work in corporate governance.
- № 28. Worldwide collaboration on space technology.

The recommendation which provoked a real discussion was № 1. *Humanistic research to explore what dignity during the dying process means to contemporary Europeans*. It received 6 votes and was placed on position 7 in the ranking, just after № 17. *Social innovations for aging societies are needed* which gathered 7 votes.

Mr Martin Ivanov expressed the view that recommendation № 1 should not be in the list at all, since euthanasia is contradictory to human nature. Mr Todor Galev explained that the logic of the recommendation is not to defend euthanasia as a method, but rather the idea is to create places, like clubs, where people could share their opinion and discuss their concerns about such sensitive issues. Such a need arises as a result of the declining influence of religion and family as a unit of society. According to Mr Boyan Krivoshiev euthanasia is not a natural way to end a life and there are moral questions, attributed to such an act. Mr Galev recalled that the idea of the recommendation is to have exactly such kind of discussions.

Another conclusion of the discussion was that the recommendations that received the least number of votes are more 'expert' and hard to understand. Examples of such recommendations are № 19. *Develop avatars that are able to act as a remote physical representation of myself*, № 4. *Plug and play communication: development of standards for smart gadgets* and № 30. *Stimulate research on human-machine interfaces*.

All participants said that when prioritising the recommendations they voted according to their own judgment and their own personal view about the common good and did not follow the approach, reflecting the point of view of European policy makers.

The discussion ended with the proposition of Mr Boyan Krivoshiev to create CIVISTI Club in Bulgaria so that participants in CC2 continue meeting with each other in order to discuss issues of public importance. All participants welcomed the idea and the representatives of ARC Fund took the responsibility to organise the first informal meeting of the club shortly after the end of CIVISTI Project.

The idea of CIVISTI Club as an approach was discussed among the ARC Fund's staff after the end of CC2. The opinion of the team was that provided this idea proves to be a feasible one, the concept could be expanded to address other issues sensitive to the Bulgarian society, and could be also upgraded to the social networks like Facebook.