GRRIP

WP 1 Project coordination and common project framework

D1.5 – GRRIP self evaluation report of RRI practice in the project

Contents

Document Information

Title	GRRIP self evaluation report of RRI practice in the project
Distribution	Public
Document Reference	D1.5
Deliverable Leader	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
Main Authors	Jeremy Gault (UCC)
	Graham Lynch (UCC)
	Malcolm Fisk (DMU)
	Hub Zwart (EUR)
	Xiaoyue Tan (EUR)
	Patrizia Grifoni (CNR)
	Indrani Mahapatra (UCC)
Contributing Authors	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
	Eric Jensen (ICoRSA)
	Gordon Dalton (PLOCAN)
Acknowledgement	Final proofreading by Cathal O'Mahony (UCC)

Revision History

Rev.	Description	Prepared by (Name & Org.)
0.1	Initial Draft	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
0.2	Updated Draft	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
0.3	Review	Eric Jensen (ICoRSA)
0.4	Updated Draft	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
0.5	Review	Indrani Mahapatra (UCC)
1.0	Pre-final version	Lars Lorenz (ICoRSA)
2.0	Final Version	Indrani Mahapatra (UCC)

1   Introduction

This Self-Assessment Tool (SAT) was initially developed as part of the Horizon 2020 funded RRING project (rring.eu) and is being reused for GRRIP. As well as making value of the evaluation approaches developed by RRING, the use of the SAT saves time and resources, as questions have been validated as part of the RRING work. The SAT was shared with GRRIP work package leaders to identify any potential RRI issues in the management of GRRIP's work packages and activities therein.

Work package leaders are encouraged to reflect on their priorities and actions over the course of the project, focusing on key Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) dimensions. The SAT also captures data on the process used by work package leaders to integrate RRI over the course of the project. While not all research teams will have members with RRI expertise or training, and not all working environments will be as conducive to integrating RRI across both people and processes as others, the SAT aims to capture the level of RRI expertise that is present within each team.

The SAT adopts the AIRR model of Anticipatory, Inclusive, Reflexive, and Responsive approaches to thinking about the integration of RRI into the research process.

Self-Assessment Process

The SAT has been completed by respective GRRIP work package leader and submitted at the end of the project. The work packages in GRRIP are:

WP1: Project Coordination, Standardisation and Methodology

WP2: Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication

WP3: Statement of the Art on RRI Action Plans and QH dialogue platforms

WP4: Quadruple Helix engagement

WP5: RPO&RFO Working Groups setup, and audit and impact assessment of RRI maturity

WP6: RRI Action Plan creation

WP7: RRI AP Implementation & RPO/RFO case study

WP8: RRI Mutual Learning- Monitoring, Reflection and Evaluation

WP9: Marine and Maritime Legacy outputs

Who should complete the SAT?

One SAT has been completed by each GRRIP work package leader in collaboration with the partners in each work package. Due to the management structure of the project, one person may have completed multiple SATs, if they are leading multiple work packages.

The SAT was designed to aid a process of reflection, self-assessment, learning and planning. Therefore, each assessment requires adequate time for full completion, including time for finding some information, and related resources, for thinking/reflecting on the questions, and for the work package leaders to consult with each partner in the work package. The estimated average completion time is between 20 and 30 minutes, if all prior work is ready or all details known.

What will happen to the information provided by WP leaders through the SAT?

The questions of the SAT can be picked up by other projects to conduct SATs. They will also be retained on file by the GRRIP Project Coordinator. This deliverable will also be made publicly available.

RRI Protocol: Implementing RRI in GRRIP

Implementing RRI is a fundamental requirement to realise the ambitions of the GRRIP project. Initially, RRI consisted of six "pillars",[1] namely, Open Access (OA), Gender Equality (GE), Ethics/Research Integrity, Public Engagement, Science Education, and Governance (later governance was removed and the policy conceptualisation of RRI consisted of five pillars). For each of the WPs, governance aspect in integrated in the questions under each pillar. Furthermore, at overall GRRIP project level, governance is part of WP1 and the RRI principles are either part of deliverables (e.g. D1.4 – Data management), follow institutional ethical rules or were part of the grant agreement commitments , viz., Science Education as a KPI, making all GRRIP deliverables public (i.e. Open Access), hence WP1 is not included here. Gender Equality is one of the five pillars of RRI, and it is also a standalone Sustainable Development Goal [SDG5]. It is the intention of the GRRIP consortium that RRI is integrated and practiced into the implementation of the project. To achieve this goal requires comprehensive action at different levels – including staffing, decision- making and the entire research process itself.

This report documents how the RRI pillars have been integrated over the course of the project to enhance research processes and outcomes in the GRRIP project itself. The following sections include the completed SAT by each GRRIP work package leader.

---

[1] Owen, R., von Schomberg, R., Macnaghten, P., 2021. An unfinished journey? Reflections on a decade of responsible research and innovation. Journal of Responsible Innovation 8, 217–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2021.1948789

2 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP2

2.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	All aspects of WP2 can be considered open access - the goal of WP2 is to disseminate and communicate to our targeted Quadruple Helix (QH) audience. Relevant materials are available to view on the project's social media channels and website. WP2 ensures that deliverables created across WPs are made available through these channels to the public.
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	All results / data collected internally within WP2 are shared with relevant project consortium members. Where appropriate this material is disseminated publicly through the project's various channels. Currently as per the newsletter plan, the data collected comprises interviews detailing partner's specific interactions and actions taken under the commitments of the GRRIP Project. Following an editorial process this information is shared with the general public.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	Ownership of WP2 outputs / deliverables can be considered wholly transparent. Materials created under other work packages are disseminated / made available publicly through the project's digital assets.

2.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	Specific attention to Gender Balance is not considered and work is carried on with people who are willing to create D&C materials.
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	GRRIP formed its Dissemination, Communication & Editorial Board in September 2021. This voluntary committee has four male and three females of which one male and one female has authority to finalise materials for dissemination. All opinions and feedback are given equal and fair consideration.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	No issues were identified as the WP Leader has been mindful of following inclusiveness best practices in relation to gender equality.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	All registration forms for GRRIP-related activities, including training seminars and workshops, include gender, age and professional seniority level of participants.

In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Only demographic details are included in Work Package analysis. No other significant / in-depth data or analysis is included.

2.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Consent is required where an interviewee is being recorded and the recorded content may be used at a future date for further dissemination and communications.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	Work Package leader.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	The Dissemination, Communication & Editorial Board serves as a collaborative space for discussing ideas related to the project and how they are best presented to a wider audience. The consortium was briefed on the creation process for the project newsletter, including details on draft content, structure, design and the reasons for the decisions made in relation to final output. The consortium was also involved in a series of meetings which focused on the revision of the projects KPI's related to Work Package 2. Decisions were made collaboratively with regards to setting realistic targets and classifications of specific outputs.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Consent is considered a key component with regards to the dissemination and communication of all final outputs. The acknowledgment of funding sources is another important aspect where ethical principles are followed. The commitment to transparency underlines project outputs and communications.

2.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	The Work Package to date has primarily focused on internal stakeholders. However, all outputs are subsequently disseminated to the wider public through the project's website and digital channels. External QH members were involved in the project's closing meeting, having been informed 8 months in advance. The Work Package team is cognisant of the many and varied commitments of external stakeholders and has therefore adopted a considered approach to planning events so as to accommodate those we wanted to attend the closing event.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	One of the activities in WP2 is to partner with other similar European projects working on implementing RRI. Discussions have focused on barriers, drivers, and successes of RRI implementation.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	The GRRIP Project website acts as a one-way communication channel for the wider public. As such we have not directly involved the wider public in WP2.

What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	See above.

2.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	To make the research and scientific results accessible to the wider public, simplifying complex concepts and research, and presenting them in a way that does not alienate people of different backgrounds.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Students. To conduct sessions on marine animals, climate change, coastal defence structures, etc.

3 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP3

3.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	All deliverables in WP3 are open access and is made available on the GRRIP website(grrip.eu).
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	Data collected within this WP was shared with relevant team members responsible for analysing the data within the project consortium and results of the analysis were approved by responsible WP and Deliverable leads.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	Only one (i.e., D3.2) of the three deliverables of this WP has details about ownership.

3.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	There were no issues in terms of gender balance, as female researchers were strongly represented as WP and Deliverable leads, as well as teams being equally gender balanced.
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	Project coordinators were interviewed based on their project affiliation, regardless of their gender. Deliverables were state-of-the-art reviews and based on secondary literature. As gender equality is an RRI pillar, it was tightly integrated within this WP's work of reviewing other research projects.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	None - as mentioned above, the WP and Deliverable leads were gender balanced, as were the teams engaged in the research activities. .
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	Recommendations of the state-of-the-art review made sure that GRRIP's implementation activities of embedding RRI within institutions kept gender issues in mind. The deliverables had gender equality aspects included as part of the state-of-the-art review of EC funded projects. This included projects integrating gender equality issues within institutional research, which were reviewed, and best practices collated. These best practices were shared within the project consortium, so that in the implementation practices (downstream WPs; 6,7,8, and 9) gender would be kept in mind as a cross-cutting issue across all activities. Thereby gender issues were given top priority.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Gender equality is one of the RRI pillars and by default were integrated in the analysis, findings, discussions, and recommendations.

3.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	In accordance with the data management plan (D1.4) and research ethics protocols, consent was attained prior to an interviewee being recorded.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	Work Package leader.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	All voices and thoughts were heard and addressed in Deliverable planning, development, and final report preparation. Decisions were made collaboratively with regards to setting realistic targets and classifications of specific outputs.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Ethics is fundamental to all work within this work package and has been followed according to institutional protocols, as well as the data management plan and ethics protocols.

3.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	WP3 includes a review of projects to create the state-of-the-art deliverables, and hence did not aim to involve external stakeholders, except interviewing selected coordinators of other EC funded projects.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	During the interviews the RRI pillars were discussed with project coordinators and how they were implemented within their activities. Details on specific questions can be found in the D3.1 Annex.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	WP3 includes a review of projects to create the state-of-the-art deliverables, and hence did not aim to involve external stakeholders.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	Not applicable, as WP3 did not aim to disseminate directly, but instead fed its outputs to WP2.

3.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	Not applicable
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Not applicable.

4 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP4

Note: Responses for this work package were provided in a different template, but still address all relevant dimensions.

4.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which parts of what you will have achieved by the end of the project will be open access (incl. specific details as to which stakeholder groups we will have shared results / data with)?	The interviews conducted as part of D4.4 contain lots of identifiable personal information. Budget constraints in the GRRIP project limits the opportunities for transcription and anonymisation, therefore, we decided to make the deliverable openly accessible, but the recordings of the interviews and meetings, which are still audio or video records at the present, is only accessible to team members and/or GRRIP WP leaders (based on consent received) to ensure confidentiality of the research data. The survey data will be made available in Zenodo. Materials for data collection, such as interview questions and survey questions for QH, are included in the GRRIP deliverables. All WP4 deliverables are available and will be made available in the GRRIP website and within the MARINA RRI platform after EC approval. Survey data collected from QH members has been shared via MS Teams with GRRIP WP leaders and relevant consortium members.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables (that is, whether anyone can view the ownership or only certain individuals)?	The deliverables/outputs detail the project partners and team members involved in the study.

4.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
About the gender balance and gender expertise in your WP, and how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines (in particular, how do we address gender stereotypes in your WP); specific steps taken to ensure gender-differentiated data collection and analysis.	For establishing the QH at each case study site, project members were advised to keep gender balance within their QH groups. In Task 4.5 external Quadruple Helix (QH) representatives were interviewed and a gender balanced approach was considered while recruiting interview participants. Questions on gender and other demographic information were included in the survey for QH engagement. Gender percentage was calculated and reported in D4.4.

4.3 Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which ethical considerations have you had for your work?	In their interactions with the participants during data collection for D4.4, the WP leader always provided information on the aims and objectives of the research and their affiliations to the participants. Participants attended the meetings, interviews, and surveys voluntarily. Informed consents were

	obtained from people who agreed to take part in the activity. All their responses were anonymised for the analyses and report writing, thus ensuring confidentiality of the research data participants.
	We involved other WP leaders, the project coordinator, and site representatives in ethics-related reflection and decision-making for finishing T4.5. Specifically, we exchanged ethical aspects during meetings or via emails.
How have you provided for different values, interests and ideas in your WP; how did you benefit from incorporating ethics (e.g., avoiding research misconduct or market failure; gaining credibility; improving quality; winning greater support from other actors by being open, transparent)?	We tried to involve representatives from different groups in terms of gender, age, educational backgrounds, role in the project, ethnicity, etc., to openly express their concerns, ideas, interests, values, etc. during the process of finishing any specific task. We gained trust from participants and won greater support from site representatives by being open and transparent.

4.4 Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How have you involved stakeholders, which dimensions were usually discussed during your engagement activities, and which effect did those have, including the question what public engagement meant in the decision-making process of your WP.	The case study site leads connected with QH members to gain their support for the engagement activities. They discussed the GRRIP project, its objectives and what they expected from the QH members. They introduced the task lead of 4.5 to these QH members and we communicated with them via emails. Interviews were conducted with those interested to gather their thoughts on the various QH engagement activities undertaken at the sites. The internal stakeholders (GRRIP WG members) were involved during mutual learning events and their needs, concerns, and suggestions for the project were explored and formed part of WP8.

4.5 Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in our WP?	In WP4, the main objective is to identify relevant stakeholders from the QH and create a framework for QH engagement. To achieve this, QH members were contacted by the sites. As part of Task 4.5, we explored the perspectives of the wider society about their involvement in the GRRIP project, so that we are better placed to understand how to design activities in the future where society is involved in research and innovation.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	The interview settings, where representatives from QH were interviewed, promoted education on RRI and reflection on QH engagement in research.

5 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP5

5.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	All the deliverables and the methodology are Open Access and is on the GRRIP website.
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	Results and data are accessible to all. In the GRRIP project this data was mainly used by the case study sites for implementing RRI.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	The document information in the deliverable outlines the main authors, and reviewers

5.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	No specific issue has emerged in relation to gender balance and gender expertise in the WP team
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	WP5 collected different types of information on RRI pillars from the implementing partners,[2] special attention was given towards collecting gender disaggregated data in the different organisations. In particular, WP5 considered both gender and diversity data in relation to assigned tasks, roles, and salary levels in the organisations.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	No specific issues have emerged in gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in the WP team.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	Data collection and data analysis activities have been verified with the teams of the case study sites, during the: definition of the surveys; analysis of the data; and, production of the deliverables.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Gender analysis has been used to identify critical issues within the five research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisation (RFO) (case study sites) and to formulate suggestions for their action plans.

---

[2] The five RRI implementing partners of GRRIP. Alternatively, referred to as five RPOs&RFO, case study sites, or sites or case study partners. Sites leads are the Principal Investigators of the five RPOs&RFO.

5.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Ethical considerations are mainly related to the correct formulation of the surveys and the processing and analysis of data and the related management process (informed consent, privacy, etc.).
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	All partners participated in the WP, contributing their expertise.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	Through regular communications with partners and accommodating others' thoughts and opinions and providing justifications for or against taking a decision.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Incorporating ethics improved quality and helped gaining credibility among the employees and stakeholders of the case study sites .

5.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	Through surveys.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	Values, stakeholders' needs and perceptions, R&I dimensions, role responsibilities.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	Not applicable
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	WP5 was responsible for establishing the RRI baseline. WP5 did not directly engage with the public, however, they engaged via the sites to explore society's perception about the RRI pillars and its practice by the five case study sites.

5.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	Research and society issues are an integral part of RRI. The survey was sent to societal stakeholders linked to critical issues within the 5 RPOs&RFO .
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Not Applicable

6 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP6

6.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	Deliverable D6.1 is open access (is uploaded in the GRRIP project's website)
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	All GRRIP consortium partners.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	The document information provides the details.

6.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	Not an issue in what is a very limited team (max 2 persons, now one). The lead person was female supported by a male colleague. From June 2021, work is led by a male.
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	A high level of consciousness towards gender issues was maintained throughout and in view of gender equality being a pillar to be addressed in the Action Plans (APs) (and reflected in the 'gender equality' related interventions). Gender consciousness within the site leads is very high.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	The lead institution has benefitted from the strong emphasis given by the institution to inclusion across a range of matters including gender, ethnicity, and disability. With regard to decision-making the responsibility has lain with the WP leader but the collaborators and co-authors' knowledge and views have always been taken on board.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	Guidance was given to case study site leads to collect gender disaggregated data wherever possible when implementing their APs.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Where possible gender disaggregated data has been collected for the QH engagement activities in AP preparations. The gender of the institution's staff participating in GRRIP Steering Group and Annual meetings has been declared and reported.

6.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	A wide range of ethical considerations have been consistently in focus. These align with project objectives and are concerned with ethical research conduct - both for individual researchers and the case study partners. Key considerations relate to the honesty, accuracy and completeness of reporting (from the sites) and their openness to enquiry, auditing, etc. (as part of their accountability, not just to project goals, but the maintenance of good and ethical practice throughout their organisations).
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	The Work Package leader has access where necessary to guidance (and further knowledge building for RRI) within the Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	By listening to all views and addressing all concerns in an affable and open manner.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	It is clear that a central focus on ethics, not necessarily as a particular pillar in itself, was evident in the APs framed by the case study sites.

6.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	Not directly applicable, though the implementing partners involved QH to discuss the RRI APs.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	See above.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	See above.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	Not directly applicable but QH engagement was done by the five case study sites to discuss the RRI APs.

6.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	The crucial importance of ethical approaches to research, and a consciousness of the potential wider impact of the project outcomes (especially when brought together with other relevant research - around RRI and the SDGs)
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Not applicable.

7   Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP7

7.1   Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	Deliverables D7.1, D7.2 and D7.3 will be made available on the GRRIP project website and the MARINA platform post-approval by the EC.
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	All data collected internally within WP7 is shared with relevant project consortium members who are responsible for analysing the data. Results of the WP will be open access.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	The document information section of the deliverables outlines the main authors, contributing authors, and revision history.

7.2   Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	No issues with regard to gender balance (though balance did fluctuate in the four years of the project, i.e., not 50:50 at all reporting periods) and gender expertise, as the team responsible for the three deliverables of this WP is gender balanced. Moreover, there is a mix of senior level (Professors), middle level, and early career researchers. The senior level has empowered the mid- and early career researchers to take independent decisions and they have been involved in actual implementation of the WP.
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	Interviews have been conducted with staff of the five RPOs keeping in mind gender/sex identity, seniority level of those interviewed. Such a process of interview does not necessitate particular focus on addressing gender stereotypes.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	No issues have been identified that require addressing as the WP Leader has been mindful of following best practices in relation to gender equality. In June 2021, for the third reporting period, there was a change in WP leader, which resulted in transfer from female to male. The WP7 leader has acted in a manner so as to empower mid-and early career female and male researchers to take lead and set the direction of the WP.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	The case study site partners have been advised to be cognisant of gender related issues and collect gender disaggregated data where possible.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis,	Gender disaggregated data has been collected by the case study sites as part of their public engagement (PE) implementation activities and for RRI training and awareness sessions.

	findings, discussions and recommendations.	

7.3 Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Ensuring proper consent on the use and future use of material from interviews. Independent checks (and validation) of interview transcripts and coding in an attempt to accurately represent the interview content.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	The researchers involved in the study and the WP leader.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	Regular meetings on work plans to arrive at a consensus. Accommodating others' thoughts and opinions and provide justifications for or against taking a decision on board.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Ethics is fundamental to all aspects of this WP, either for interviewing people, or engaging with wider public. They have been practiced as per GRRIP's Data Management Plan (DMP) (D1.4) and collaborating institutions' norms and practices.

7.4 Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	The stakeholders (actually, QH representatives) have been involved with due consideration accorded to ethical protocols (especially when related to D&C activities and sharing data collected).
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	RRI and marine research topics (e.g., offshore renewable energy, biodiversity protection).
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	Engagement and consultation with QH representatives and the public was done within this WP by the five case study sites (M&M research performing organisations) to share about RRI actions being implemented, and/or on a marine research topic or challenge. The workshop reports prepared were made available to the attendees and are also uploaded to the GRRIP website.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	Public engagement (more importantly, QH engagement) was central to many of the implementation aspects of this project. In some cases, they provided inputs to the design and implementation of the action plans outlined in D6.1. Please refer to D7.1, D7.2, D8.3 for further information.

7.5 Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	The interventions chosen by the case study sites included communication with students and wider society about the project, as well as in design of engagement and education campaigns.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	School students.

8 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP8

8.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	We plan to publish two papers open access. Further, all deliverables are made publicly accessible via the GRRIP website.
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	With partners within the consortium, based on the consent received in case of interviews.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	Making a substantial contribution is required for co-authorship of papers. GRRIP has authorship guidelines for deliverables and the document information page provided relevant details.

8.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	The gender balance within the lead institution is 50-50, while the overall WP has 3 females and 1 male (for report writing purposes).
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	Further, interviews have been conducted keeping in mind gender/sex identity and seniority level of those interviewed. This process of interviews did not necessitate particular focus on addressing gender stereotypes.
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	Consensus and collaboration were at the forefront of decision making for this WP.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	In data collection gender is a core aspect. For instance, in recruitment for interviews, as reported in the deliverables (D8.2, D8.3), gender was explicitly taken into account.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Gender was incorporated for the recruitment of participants, as well as the analysis of results.

8.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	Informed consent from participants in interviews and responsible management of data were considered and respected.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	Collective teamwork.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	We strive for consensus among all actors of the WP.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Ethics is an integral part of quality care in responsible research. Ethics is core part of the research ethos. Transparency and responsibility foster trust in science.

8.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	We organised mutual learning meetings to share experiences of stakeholder engagement.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	We especially pay attention to value issues and to including other forms of knowledge (epistemic inclusion as a methodological ambition). RRI implies a transformation of research methodologies, making research more open and interactive, and this applied to our own work as well.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	Not applicable
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	Not applicable

8.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	Involving society strengthens the external validity and trustworthiness of research.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Not applicable.

9 Self-evaluation report of RRI practice in WP9

9.1 Open Access

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
Which elements of your WP are Open Access?	Both Deliverables (D9.1 and D9.2) are open access.
With whom do you share the results/data of your WP?	Results to be shared within the GRRIP project, other projects, scientific community, and RRI community.
How transparent is the ownership of your WP outputs/deliverables?	Not applicable.

9.2 Gender Equality

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and gender expertise in your WP team?	None. Eight female and six male researchers were involved in this WP, and all gender competent and task leads have gender expertise as they have been collaborators in EU funded Gender Equality projects.
Please describe how gender has been integrated across the conceptual frameworks, methodology, parameters, and guidelines that have been developed for the task/WP that you lead. In particular, how do you address gender stereotypes in your WP?	Not applicable
What do you see as the main issues to be addressed in terms of gender balance and inclusiveness in decision-making in your WP team?	It is not about balance but respecting the viewpoints of all regardless of their gender, which we did in the management of this WP.
In relation to any data collection or data analysis activities, outline the steps you have taken to ensure that gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of any deliverable or output.	Not applicable.
In relation to any analysis or research reporting activity you have participated in, outline the ways in which a gender analysis is incorporated into the analysis, findings, discussions and recommendations.	Not applicable.

9.3   Ethics & Research Integrity

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What are possible ethical considerations for your R&I practices in your WP?	We conducted interviews in this WP. Hence, we ensured consent is received on the use and future use of material from questionnaires and interviews and avoided introducing pre-conditions. Interview material was used in a manner where it is aligned with ethical guidance currently available.
Who is involved in ethics-related reflection and decision-making in your WP for your R&I practices, and how?	The approach and outputs have been reviewed by the WP leadership in consultation with the task leader and the project co-ordinator.
How do you provide for different values, interests and ideas in your WP?	We used an inclusive approach and dialogue.
How may your WP benefit form incorporating ethics?	Training on how to ethically conduct and record the outcomes from interviews.

9.4   Public Engagement

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
How do you involve stakeholders and the public in your WP?	In this WP, interviews were conducted with QH representatives. Moreover, the GRRIP community within the MARINA RRI platform, created as part of this work package, will engage with the public and support the wider marine and maritime community.
What dimensions are usually discussed during your engagement activities?	Considering engagement, RRI themes, needs, and perceptions of QH and other projects were discussed.
What does public engagement in the decision-making process mean in your WP?	Interviews with Quadruple Helix representatives were conducted, the WP leader has been diligent that these opinions are considered when proposing the design of the GRRIP platform.
What effects do your public engagement activities have on your WP?	The activities carried out in this WP shape the direction and legacy of the project.

9.5   Science Education

Work conducted in GRRIP Project	
What motivates you to involve research-and-society issues in your WP?	Good practice, provision of fresh insights, and anchoring research within the local communities.
If your WP envisages educational activities, which stakeholders are taking part in your educational activities, and why?	Not applicable.

10 Conclusion

All work packages internally monitored their five pillars of RRI in GRRIP's project activities. The self-assessment exercise assisted each work package in ensuring high performance and quality and compliance with RRI principles.