Good ID

• ID is no goal in itself, but it can help:
  – to further science, even D knowledge
  – to help to solve GSC

• Good ID might need MD
• Good MD/ID need strong *attractors*
  *(inspiring people, ideas, solutions)*
• Good ID/MD takes *time and experience*
• Good ID/MD asks for shared aims/goals
D vs ID/MD/CoCr

• D vs ID/MD/CoCr is no good marriage because of
  – institutional barriers
  – scientific cultures
  > conflicting demands; cannot be solved by PhD’s

relates to:
  power positions & budgets
  interests, inst. objectives

• D might even grows apart from ID/MD
  – D ever and ever more in the ‘details’

• Institutional / disciplinary silos have the tendency to stick to the established system
D vs ID/MD/CoCr

• combining those in one program could be fascinating, but bears risk:
  – due to ‘scientific excellence’ D might prevail in evaluations that are not sufficiently tuned to ID/MD
  – when participants go back to homebase, all is D again

• possible solutions (1st bullet):
  – dual evaluation, staged evaluation (ID/MD first) or combined evaluation
  – appropriate evaluation criteria
  – appropriate evaluators
Interests

• in MD, be aware of different and even opposing interests:
  – for science, digging deep in a problem can be in itself already be rewarding
  – doing research is the core business for academia, so in science an important recommendation is to do more research
  – in practice, a solution orientation might force to take shortcuts & approximations (not sci-sound)
  – different actors have different KPI/success criteria
Funding

• ID/MD/CoCr need more flexible funding schemes:
  – possibilities for *quick/shorter* tracks and short lead times in call processing (i.e. ‘sand pit’ model)
  – possibilities for *long/longitudinal* tracks & follow up actions
  – support for Living Lab mechanisms over longer time
  – support for networkmanagers & intermediates
Institutions & Cultures

• For ID/MD, institutions & cultures need to adapt (or to chose) – get out of the straitjacket
  – valuing/assessment systems for tenured staff & PhD’s
  – ranking journals – introducing ID high ranking journals?

• Learn from institutional experiences
  (like LDE, AMS in NL and DRI, Inst. @ TU Delft)
  (collaborations of uni <> RTOs in Germany, France)
Stakeholders in MD

• stakeholder/user involvement:
  – put energy in finding the right people
  – funding conditions have discriminatory effects
    (f.i.: some actors cannot provide ‘own contributions’)
  – not only ‘gender’ balance, also balance in ethnic, social, minority & age groups
  – ensure early involvement of stakeholders, f.i. in ‘Sand Pit’ approaches
  – broad citizen/stakeholder involvement is usually helpful, new instruments can help out
    (be aware of free-ridership)
Generic obs. (AvB only)

• we need to understand motives (aims, ambitions) and interrelations between main actors in programming, funding and execution

• we need to understand crucial decisions processes (program & call formulation, evaluation, ...) to have effective recommendations

• maybe we need a SWOT on ID/MD/CoCr, because these approaches also have negative aspects