PARTICIPANTS

Roberto Baldoli, PhD, Associate Staff Member, UCL

Christina Boswell, Professor of Politics, Dean of Research, College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh

Marco Cappato, former Member of the European Parliament, Science for Democracy

Laura Convertino, PhD candidate, Ecological Brain Project, UCL https://ecologicalbrain.org/

Bruno Dente, Honorary Professor of Public Policy Analysis, Politecnico di Milano

Tracey Brown, Sense about Science, London

Claire Dunlop, Professor of Politics and Public Policy, Co-PI Protego Project, University of Exeter

Anna Durnova, PhD, Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna

Antonio Guarino, Professor of Economics, UCL

Jonathan Kamkhaji, PhD, Res. Fellow, Data steward Protego project, University of Exeter

Thomas König, PhD, Head of Strategy and Scientific Services, Institute for Advanced Studies Vienna

Merethe Leiren, PhD, CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Oslo

Mita Marra, Associate Professor and Editor in Chief, Evaluation and Program Planning, University of Naples "Federico II"

Flavia Mezja, medical doctor, Science for Democracy

Kathryn Oliver, Associate Professor in Sociology and Public Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine [not in attendance]

Marco Perduca, Science for Democracy, former Member of Parliament (Italian Senate)

Claudio Radaelli, Professor of Public Policy, PI Protego Project, UCL

Katharine Rietig, Lecturer in International Politics, Newcastle University

Duncan Russel, Associate Professor, University of Exeter

Albert Weale, Emeritus Professor of Political Theory and Public Policy / Programme Director of the Executive MPA in Global Public Policy and Management, UCL

ROUND TABLES

[1] What is the nature of the beast we are talking about? In our concept note we talked about evidence-based policy 2.0: is this the best concept/approach? Do you think that advocacy organizations like Science for Democracy should embrace this concept, or is there something different that would create more traction and at the same time be more precise? What does this concept of '2.0' include exactly – according to your experience of the failures and limitations of classic evidence-based approaches?

[2] What are the causal pathways mechanisms you have observed in successful episodes of bringing science and more generally evidence to bear on public policy decisions? When thinking of specific episodes, could you think of specific elements that were helpful in connecting evidence and policy? Are replicable are the causal pathways and elements outside their original context?

[3] What is the role of specific policy instruments in these episodes of success? This question is about the policy instruments through which science-evidence play a role in policymaking. We can think of a broad range of instruments – some intervene on the process itself (e.g., changing the network of actors involved, assigning participation rights to certain groups, obliging agencies to commission peer review of their evidence, scenario workshops), some on the formulation and appraisal of policy (e.g., multi-criteria analysis, impact assessment of proposed legislation). How do these instruments empower scientists or actors willing to bring more evidence to bear on policy choices?

[4] Up until now an important aim of evidence-based policy has been to improve on the scientific awareness of politicians, bureaucrats and independent regulators. We want them to be sufficiently aware of the findings of science when they make decisions. There is nothing wrong with this approach. However, politicians and regulators have limited incentives to follow science: instead they follow consensus, standard operating procedures, and legal frameworks for taking their decisions. But what about if we were to turn the table, and promote initiatives that increase the awareness of the policy process among scientists? Would this empower scientists? Would this improve on evidence-based policy? Should scientists benefit from training in the basics of decision-making, public administration and the policy sciences? But then, what are the incentives for scientists to learn more about the policy process?

[5] What can social scientists bring to advocacy organizations such as Science for Democracy to assist them in their policy engagement?