ETHNA

Report on the ETHNA System Implementation Analysis

December 2022

Elsa Alves (DBT)

Project Information	
Project Number:	872360
Project Full Title:	ETHNA System. Ethics Governance System for RRI in Higher Education, Funding and Research Centres
Project Acronym:	ETHNA System
Funding Scheme:	SwafS
Call identifier:	H2020-SwafS-2019-1
Start Date of Project:	01/01/2020
Duration:	36 months
Project Website:	Ethnasystem.eu

Deliverable Information	
Deliverable No:	5.4
Deliverable Title:	Report on the ETHNA System Implementation Analysis
WP Number:	5
Lead:	DBT
Contributing Partners:	Marko Hajdinjak (ARC Fund), Gábor Szüdi (ZSI), Ülle Must (Harno), Giovanni De Grandis (NTNU), Eva Pardo Gil (ESPAITEC), Luis M. Camarinha-Matos (UNINOVA), Philipp Hövel (EUREC), Ramón Feenstra (UJI), Maya Bidstrup (DBT), Xavier Eekhout Izaskun Lacunza (FECYT)
Related Task(s):	5.6
Type:	
Author(s):	Elsa Alves (DBT)
Due Submission Date:	30.11.2022
Actual Submission:	18.12.2022

Dissemination Level	
Public	

ABSTRACT: This deliverable is an account and short analysis of the status of the ETHNA System implementation pilots, based on the 2 participatory evaluation workshops with the ETHNA System implementing partners held online on 15 and 16 September 2022. The main aim of this report is to structure statements by the partners gathered at the workshops as a supplement to the further data gathered in the evaluative activities in T4.4 and T6.1. Furthermore, this report also indicates some reflections regarding the ETHNA legacy and the outlook for its future at the implementing organisations.

Versioning and constribution History			
Version	**Date**	**Modified by**	**Reason for Modification**
1.0	05.12.2022	Marko Hajdinjak (ARC Fund), Gábor Szüdi (ZSI), Ülle Must (Harno), Giovanni De Grandis (NTNU), Eva Pardo Gil (Espaitec), Luis M. Camarinha-Matos (UNINOVA), Philipp Hövel (EUREC), Ramón Feenstra (UJI), Xavier Eekhout Izaskun Lacunza (FECYT)	Peer-review

Abbreviations	
ARC Fund	Applied Research and Communications Fund
ESPAITEC	Parc Científic Tecnològic i Empresarial
ETHNA	Ethical Governance of RRI in Innovation and Research Performing Organisations and Research Funding Organisations
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
Harno	Education and Youth Board of Estonia
NTNU	Norwegian University of Science and Technology
RFO	Research Funding Organisation
R&I	Research & Innovation
RRI	Responsible Research and Innovation
UJI	University Jaume I
UNINOVA	Instituto de Desenvolvimento de Novas Tecnologias

ACKNOWLEDGMENT & DISCLAIMER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an account and short analysis of the status of the ETHNA System pilots, based on the 2 participatory evaluation workshops with the ETHNA System implementing partners held online on 15 and 16 September 2022. The main aim of this report is to structure quotes by the partners as a supplement to the further data gathered in the evaluative activities of tasks 4.4 and 6.1. The overall objective of task 4.4 is to create a blueprint for institutional change to bring to life an effective RRI governance. The objective of T6.1 is to evaluate the implementation of the ETHNA System, critically examining the findings and outcomes from the WP5 implementation process.

In particular, this report is focused on the progress update following the initial implementation scope[1], as well as indicates some early positive impact, institutional changes, and constraints. For a detailed account on the challenges faced by the pilots, refer to D5.5: *Report collecting the difficulties found in the implementation processes*. Furthermore, this report also indicates some reflections regarding the ETHNA legacy and the outlook for its future at the implementing organisations.

The evaluations focused on the added value of the ETHNA System in general and particular challenges and adaptations at the piloting activities carried out throughout the implementation. By participatory evaluation was meant involving implementing partners as active participants in the evaluation. The goal for these workshops was to create a space for self-evaluation discussions and critical reflections on their own hands-on experiences working to implement the ETHNA System through the living lab approach.

The report does not draw out final conclusions about the viability of the ETHNA System or its implementation. Rather, its main aim is to structure evaluative statements by the partners and the involved stakeholders in order to submit these to the evaluative activities needed for drafting the blueprint for implementation of effective RRI governance, the evaluation report about the ETHNA System implementation, and for finalisation of the ETHNA System concept. This report therefore supplements the data gathered independently for these tasks.

---

[1] See D5.1: *Report of the selected aspects that can be tested and accompany the implementation process.*
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6592468

Table of contents

1   Introduction

This report is an account and short analysis of the status of the ETHNA System pilots, based on the 2 participatory evaluation workshops with the ETHNA System implementing partners held online on 15 and 16 September 2022. The main aim of this report is to structure quotes by the partners as a supplement to the further data gathered in the evaluative activities of tasks 4.4 and 6.1. The overall objective of task 4.4 is to create a blueprint for institutional change to bring to life an effective RRI governance. The objective of T6.1 is to evaluate the implementation of the ETHNA System, critically examining the findings and outcomes from the WP5 implementation process.

In particular, this report is focused on the progress update following the initial implementation scope[2], as well as indicates some early positive impact, institutional changes, and constraints. The implementers have followed the ETHNA guide for the system implementation, issued as D4.2: *A Guide to the Ethical Governance of RRI in Innovation and Research in Research Performing Organisations and Research Funding Organisations*[3]. For a detailed account on the challenges faced by the pilots, refer to D5.5: *Report collecting the difficulties found in the implementation processes*. Furthermore, this report also indicates some reflections regarding the ETHNA legacy and the outlook for its future at the implementing organisations.

The overarching goal of this series of workshops was to involve the participants in shaping the evaluation questions within the themes of the Living Labs, the methodology of the ETHNA Lab process and the ethical governance system ETHNA System. The workshops were organised as semi-structured events centred on these main themes, leaving great flexibility to pursue questioning and dialogue among participants. Furthermore, the participatory approach generated collective reflections on the insights and lessons learned from the ETHNA System implementation, as well as ethical governance as a whole. The workshops employed a diversity of exchange formats to support mutual learning and feedback gathering as needed. Some desirable results are recommendations to improve the ETHNA System implementation.

2   Report on the status of the ETHNA System implementation

2.1   Concept and methodology

The implementing partners' participatory evaluation workshops happened on the 15 and 16 September 2022, 3-hour long each, aimed at holding self-evaluation discussions among implementers by sharing their views within the themes of the Living Labs, the methodology of the ETHNA Lab process and the ethical governance system ETHNA System. Six representatives from 4 organisations attended the first workshop (ARC Fund, ESPAITEC, UNINOVA, and NTNU) and other 5 attended the second one from 4 organisations (UNINOVA, NTNU, Harno and UJI).

The purpose of the workshops was to create a common space for the implementing partners to critically reflect on their experiences with the ETHNA Lab and the ETHNA System implementation and share their honest assessment of the overall experience.

The first 2 sessions were dedicated to discussing the ETHNA Lab process and the Living Lab methodology, followed by the ETHNA System implementation's first results, based on the implementation status and challenges, which allowed to focus on the different concerns and issues, which the implementers have been facing. Specifically, the aim was to address the more unique situations and aspects that they have come across and worked with as part of the implementation work throughout the implementation phase. The actual experiences and insights reported here, which are not meant to be final conclusions, will be laying the foundation for the evaluative activities further on in the project, as a supplement to the further data gathered in these tasks.

---

[2] Idem.

[3] See D4.2: *A Guide to the Ethical Governance of RRI in Innovation and Research in Research Performing Organisations and Research Funding Organisations.* https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6532789

These sessions consisted of a short panel, where each participant elaborated on a given question, followed by open discussion. The questions were: *What would be one experience with the ETHNA Lab implementation and Living Lab methodology you would like to highlight?* And *how have you experienced the added value of the ETHNA System at your institution?* The participants were guided by some questions by the facilitator but also motivated to steer the conversation and critically reflect together. A generous amount of time was allocated, which aimed at going deep into the challenges the implementers have encountered while at the same time learning from the different approaches they have taken. A third open slot theme was programmed for a brainstorm task on a Mural board, where the participants could elaborate their own questions or identify issues which haven't been tackled or deepened enough before. Finally, there was a takeaway task where the participants were asked to identify and sum up the main learnings from the whole process of the implementation phase in a one-liner.

Programme

9.30-9.40	**Welcome and agenda**
9.40-10.15	**Theme 1: The living lab implementation process** Panel session followed by open discussion **Panel session question**: What would be one experience with the ETHNA Lab implementation and Living Lab methodology you would like to highlight? Each implementing partner will be able to present their answer for 2-3 minutes. Preparation is optional.
10.15-10.25	*Coffee break*
10.25-11.15	**Theme 2: The use and implementation of the ETHNA System** Panel session followed by open discussion **Panel session question:** How have you experienced the added value of the ETHNA System at your institution? Each implementing partner will be able to present their answer for 2-3 minutes. Preparation is optional.
11.15-11.25	*Coffee break*
11.25-12.00	**Theme 3: Open slot** Brainstorm and discussion about other relevant theme(s) selected by the participants
12.00-12.25	**Takeaways** Summary and discussion of the main learnings
12.25-12.30	**Wrap up**

2.2 Research Centre Context

2.2.1 ARC Fund

ARC Fund has chosen commitment level 2, implementing the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in R&I, and the Ethics Committee on R&I and all four RRI keys will be considered. ARC Fund established an RRI Officer and developed a Code of Ethics and Good Practices which includes all RRI key areas. There is a plan to set up a Research Ethics Board consisting of three members, but it has not been formalised yet. The Code was developed following the methodology. It represents a more than 40-page document which covers ethics, gender equality, open access and public engagement keys. It was developed by a working group consisting of 4 people and all the other ARC Fund employees commented and contributed. The document, however, was rejected by the senior management, for being too much like a project deliverable, having too many references to different documents, having been written in a style which does not look like a code. ARC Fund was considering at the time to perhaps produce two different documents, one to be acceptable by the upper management, and another to be compliant with the ETHNA project guidelines.

As for early positive impact, the ETHNA System implementation helped reveal that the Code of Ethics ARC Fund had was rather outdated, as it was written and endorsed in 2008. Also, in order to work within the Horizon2020 programme, ARC Fund needed a Gender Equality Plan, which ETHNA also facilitated the process of creation. Below some quotes from ARC Fund stressing the positive institutional changes so far:

> *The ETHNA System appeared in an exactly right moment and offered our organisation a very good manual and tool to address these issues and update existing documents or develop new ones.*

> *We have been working for 5-6 years already on RRI related projects, so ETHNA was not a novelty, but it offered a well-structured and practical way to develop these issues and formalise them within the organisation with the establishment of the RRI Officer and the forthcoming, hopefully, Research Ethics Board.*

2.3 Higher Education Context

2.3.1 UJI

Jaume I University has chosen the highest level of commitment and will therefore implement both the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in R&I, the Ethics Committee on R&I, and the Ethics Line.

UJI has been working in 5 groups: governance ethical structure, gender issues, open access, integrity and public engagement and communication with 48 people in the different groups. They had two meetings in the first working group and one for each RRI key area. The new Code of Ethics and Good Practices and the new Ethics Committee were to be approved on 26 September. They have also hired an external to be a full-time RRI Officer. As for the specific RRI topics, the process has been accomplished as well, where several exchanges with experts helped refine the final documents. Regarding external stakeholder involvement, they have had one meeting so far, and although UJI regarded this experience as being interesting, they considered it to be too soon in the process, as the tools are still being prepared for the internal stakeholders.

The implementer regards the whole implementation process as "generally very open and participatory". There were essentially two crucial elements identified for the positive uptake of the ETHNA System at UJI: first, the level of commitment to the ETHNA project, and the interest and support of the upper management in the topics of RRI and research ethics:

> *The combination of having the upper management very much concerned about these topics, and having researchers engaged in this project, was very fruitful in explaining many of the steps we were doing.*

The ETHNA System has been also an opportunity to update the current ethics committee:

> *We have changed the ethical committee: we had an anthological committee, and now we have built an ethical committee.*

2.3.2 NTNU

The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies at NTNU has committed to a level 1 of implementation as of February 2022, approved by their top management in March 2022. The planning stage revealed that the department staff felt that it was not clear whether implementing the ETHNA System would have not been redundant in light of several existing activities and tools already in place at departmental and university level. Therefore, there was no agreement about the fittingness and benefit of applying the ETHNA System at the departmental level. It was therefore decided that the RRI officer should be given the task of inquiring more in depth whether the building blocks of the ETHNA System would still provide benefits in a context where most aspects of RRI have already been addressed by existing instruments at NTNU and activities within the department. In this plan, the lab manager/RRI officer would mostly be mapping what is already in place at their organisation, coordinating data collection activities and reporting on what could be the most relevant next steps and recommendations for the department.

The planned and completed activities are the document analysis (Code of Ethics, Research Ethics Committee, Policy on Open Science, Policy on Gender Equality and Diversity, Ethics Portal); interviews with a sample of departmental staff (internal stakeholders); interviews with key informants (experts on the Research Ethics Committee, on the Ethics portal, on IFR activities on public engagement and on Gender Equality and Diversity); interviews with external stakeholders (only one interview). Following this data collection, a small report has been prepared and presented to some staff members (November 21). The final report and feedback collection from the top management will happen on December 14, when a final presentation of the prospective evaluation of the feasibility, appropriateness, expected benefits and costs of implementing the ETHNA System at the department to the leadership will be held.

The main goal of this pilot is, thus, to gather valuable feedback on the ETHNA System implementation challenges, which are not likely exclusive to NTNU, and which is expected to be very valuable for the upcoming evaluative tasks.

As accounted in the workshop, the interviews so far confirmed the lack of commitment initially demonstrated by the department:

> *ETHNA is in a way doubling up something that is already in place. It is a top-down measure but what is needed is another, better utilisation of existing structures. There is a general awareness of the structures in place, but the hindrance is to make use of those structures.*

Moreover, the interviews revealed that at NTNU the staff is generally sceptical over governance methods to improve ethical systems, and their ethical concerns sometimes do not correspond to the RRI key areas:

> *In some cases, I have noticed that what is really important for the researchers and professors is not always what the RRI key areas are about, but other things are felt as more important. Another interesting thing that I have learned through the interviews is that people do not have much trust and expectations in the use of governance methods to improve ethical issues. It is more a question of the culture, of what is done, practices, atmosphere, examples people provide, and, in some cases, the standards come from the accepted and shared value within the profession, international bodies, for instance journals or professional associations.*

Thus, the ETHNA System has not been perceived as bringing any added value to NTNU. However, it has been noted throughout the interview processes, that despite the organisation having already a Code of Ethics, a Research Integrity Committee, an Ethics Portal and policies for open access, gender equality and diversity, most of the junior staff is not aware of these tools. It is also a task of this pilot plan, to assess if the slightly different architecture of the ETHNA System can overcome these challenges, and make the ethical tools more relevant, closer to people's needs and working experience.

A final reflection from this pilot was that the ETHNA System and the implementation methodology could be clearer and more specific, targeting a certain level of research performing organisation, i.e., university level, institute or small unit, instead of being a broad and flexible approach.

2.4 Innovation Ecosystem Context

2.4.1 ESPAITEC

ESPAITEC has chosen the commitment level 2 of the ETHNA System and will implement the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in R&I, focusing on gender perspective. They joined the ETHNA project one year after the other implementers.

At the time of the workshop, an RRI Officer had been appointed but the document has not been produced yet. The involvement of external stakeholders has been particularly challenging. The main external stakeholders for this pilot are start-ups and, due to the fact that they are innovation-oriented small companies, they lack the resources to be involved in such projects (human, time). The positive change so far noted by ESPAITEC is awareness of RRI topics within the organisation, in particular the gender perspective in practices of innovation.

2.4.2 UNINOVA

The Centre of Technology and Systems (CTS) at UNINOVA has committed to level 2 of the ETHNA System and will implement the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in R&I and the Ethics Committee on R&I. CTS produced the Code of Ethics and Good Practices, an open access guideline and a gender and inclusion equality plan. In terms of the RRI Officer, CTS decided for an informal ad hoc committee consisting of a small group of people. The process of implementation has generally been facilitated as the Director of CTS is a member of the ETHNA project.

It was reported in the workshop that CTS tried to produce practical and short documents, just a few pages long, which were very well accepted, and with barely any criticism. Some ideas in the documents are already being put into practice at their organisation. The Code of Ethics demanded special effort as researchers at CTS are employed by different organisations, and they already must comply with other Code of Ethics at the university they belong to. So, CTS felt the need to complement them with their own code. In second priority, CTS felt the need to clarify the principles of open access, while informing the researchers of the least serious open access journals and conferences. As third priority, they decided to extend the gender issues to inclusion, motivated by the fact that the centre has many people coming from different countries with different cultural and religious backgrounds, which raises additional challenges for inclusion in the community.

CTS's initial plan for the implementation of the ETHNA System has been followed, and generally the ETHNA System has brought some positive value to the organisation. Namely, by producing these documents, the organisation set itself in a good position regarding their contractual commitments with the National Research Funding Agency, which requires that CTS follows an Ethical Code. Also, due to the engagement of a large number of people in the workshops, there was an awareness increase around ethical practices in research. In addition, the ETHNA System guidelines provided training material for PhD students.

There have also been some positive practical changes and initiatives. For instance, regarding the guidelines produced on open access and gender issues:

> I could already see the effects of people being much more careful when selecting which channels to publish in, and how to publish in open access.

> Initially we were not very focused [on gender issues] but thanks to the project we have paid more attention to this and, as a result, we have some internal initiatives: a project proposal on this topic and a conference paper was accepted at an international conference.

2.5 Research Funding Organisation Context

2.5.1 Harno

Harno has committed to level 2 of the ETHNA System and has chosen to implement The Code of Ethics and Good Practices in R&I, including all four RRI keys.

At the time of the workshops, Harno had all activities and documents approved by top management: The concept of implementation of the Code of Ethics and Good Practices in Harno, Implementation of the ETHNA ethics management system in Harno - an overview of the status of activities, The Harno's Gender Equality Plan, except for the Harno's Diversity and Inclusion Plan (to be approved on 3 October 2022), The Code of Ethics and Good Practices in Harno (to be approved in December 2022) and the first monitoring report will be presented to the top management in February 2023. The Code is planned to be tested in November with the umbrella organisations of their target groups and partner organisations (Rector's Council, Ministry of Education and Research, Estonian Research Council).

Harno has furthermore appointed an RRI Officer (December 2021) and organised consultations with internal and external stakeholders (42 meetings) and four workshops (Good practices in Ethics, Gender Mainstreaming and GEP; Open access; Data management, Funders' requirements for data management plan; Diversity, inclusion and engagement).

Harno's scope of implementation has been followed as planned and their assessment of the added value of the ETHNA System is quite positive, not only to provide ethical guidelines and tools within an Research Funding Organisation context, but also to consolidate a newly founded organisation:

> *The implementation of the ETHNA System in a new organisation (as Harno is - four different organisations were united) has provided significant added value - joint discussions on values, valid procedural rules, requirements that have contributed to the formation of a unified organisation.*

The ETHNA System has moreover permitted to gaining new partners, increasing visibility and expanding their network:

> *We had opportunity to discuss with our colleagues from the Estonian Research Council, the main research funding organisation in Estonia. We had also the possibility to discuss with different ministries, and, for example, the Ministry of Social Affairs asked me, after our meeting, to be member of the Gender Equality Council. Also, after discussions with Human Rights Centre, we participated in competition, and yesterday we were informed that the Education and Youth Board is one of the nominees for the label "We respect differences" awarded by the Estonian Human Rights Centre.*

2.6 Overview of the ETHNA System implementation

Most of the implementers reported that their initial implementation plan has been followed and the main goals have been achieved. Namely, at the time of the workshop all institutions had appointed RRI Officers, either as a single person or small team. Two Codes of Ethics and Good Practices had been approved (ARC Fund and UNINOVA), and two more were about to be approved (UJI and Harno). One Ethics Committee was also yet to be approved (UJI), while other two were still being formalised (ARC Fund and UNINOVA). Other documents have been produced such as an Open Access Guideline, and a Gender and Inclusion Equality Plan at UNINOVA, and a Gender Equality Plan at Harno. The implementer ESPAITEC, because they have joined the project one year later, are still preparing their Code of Ethics and Good Practices, which they have committed to. The delay has also been caused to challenges in following the ETHNA implementation method, in particular the engagement of external stakeholders. The implementer NTNU has also encountered some challenges, in particular institutional resistance due to the fact they already have similar structures in place. This led NTNU to opt for a low commitment level and an "alternative" plan of activities, centred around mapping the existing ethical documents and practices, in order to evaluate the viability and potential value of the ETHNA System. So far, however, the interviews and survey carried out demonstrated the ETHNA System does not bring any added value to NTNU.

All implementers are still carrying out their activities of implementation of the ETHNA System, however, some positive institutional impact has already been highlighted. Namely, at the internal level, such as increasing of awareness of the importance of ethics in research among staff, as noted by some implementers (UNINOVA and ESPAITEC); but also at the external level, by achieving political goals and expanding network, as reported by implementers UNINOVA and Harno, respectively. Moreover, it has been noted the take-up of some materials, such as the Open Access Guideline by researchers, as well as the creation of quality training materials for junior researchers, as accounted by UNINOVA. The implementers ARC Fund and UJI stressed as well the importance of the ETHNA System in updating their existing codes and ethics committees, respectively.

3 Evaluation and the ETHNA legacy

Evaluation

Implementers were asked about evaluation of the implementation: how and when it is planned. Most of them answered that it is too soon to answer, as they are still in the process of implementation. Nonetheless, this question was raised later on in the workshop, at the open slot theme: *how to evaluate results after the project?* This question was in line with the legacy of the ETHNA System and how implementers can evaluate it after the project ends and perpetuate the value the ETHNA System brought to their organisation. One participant answered that they developed some performance and process indicators, but they are long-term, so they plan at the end of each calendar year to produce an annual activity report to include these sections on how the organisation performed in terms of the four main RRI areas: public engagement, research ethics, gender equality and open access, collecting this information and share it in a public report.

The ETHNA legacy

The implementers were also inquired on the future of the ETHNA System at their organisation. Since the evaluation process is yet to take place, most partners see with reservations or "cautious optimism" the continuation of the ETHNA System at their organisations. In general, it was said that the legacy of the ETHNA System will depend on 3 main factors: strong dissemination (via training and other means, especially targeting junior researchers), deep knowledge of the organisation where the ETHNA System is being implemented, i.e., the staff perceived needs and overall culture, and the ability to be continuously updated. It was also added the reflection of how to implement the system without branding it as ETHNA. Below follow the statements substantiating these views structured thematically, followed by some recommendations.

Need for dissemination (training and communication):

> *Not possible to answer a question about the future perspective of ETHNA at our organisation as this is a long-term process. What we really need is to cultivate a culture of doing research in an ethical and responsible way. If we do proper training of the young researchers, this will have an effect. So that is why we decided to include specific training on ethics in research at the same level as training them on how to do research.* (UNINOVA)

> *The future of ETHNA depends on overcoming two main aspects: one is awareness, that all researchers understand the importance of these tools and, secondly, the focus should be with junior researchers, since they will be the future, so the only way is to change the culture of research ethics from its start, although it is important not to forget senior researchers as well.* (UJI)

> *We see it as a seed we planted within the ETHNA System project, and we need to pay attention to properly nurturing and produce the effects we hope it will. If all goes as planned and the documents, the code of ethics, the gender equality plan, the guidelines for open access and public engagement are in place this will serve as source for inspiration and compliance for the researchers at the organisation, especially for the new ones to follow. So, there should be a place for cautious optimism.* (ARC Fund)

Need for continuous update:

> *ETHNA should be a living body that should continuously updated. Perhaps implementers should give some feedback and try to enhance the ETHNA System.* (UNINOVA)

> *In a community of engineers, people are more pragmatic than, say, from social sciences, they want practical tools. One issue that has been more difficult to deal with is the authorship of publications. We have been promoting the ideas that ETHNA suggested as examples of guidelines for authorship and also adopting similar ideas from other international bodies. We did not get many hints from the ETHNA System on how to address this difficult issue.* (UNINOVA)

Using the idea and content without the branding:

> *To answer the question on the future of ETHNA at my organisation, we need first to overcome the challenge of how to implement the idea and content of the ETHNA System without branding it as ETHNA System. It is a good thing to have a new code, a gender equality plan, an RRI officer and a research ethics board, but because the organisation wants it and not because it is a project methodology and agenda. On the other hand, implementing a code without branding it ETHNA System is a kind of violation of our requirements to the ETHNA System project.* (ARC Fund)

Knowing the organisational and national/local culture:

> *The hard work is starting now because we need to communicate in a very accessible way the information and the usefulness of what we are creating. For instance, we have run a survey among our researchers to measure how the tools are being used. It is not enough to have tools to be more ethical if they are not being used.* (UJI)

> *The challenge of keeping ETHNA alive relies on knowing very well the organisation where one is working and the perceived needs, so that the elements of the ETHNA System which are implemented are very much demand-driven and not supply-driven. It won't work to have a range of tools and impose them onto employees. We need to give the organisation something that will help their needs, which will make them appreciate it and keep it alive.* (NTNU)

> *Perhaps to have a sort of evaluation line, and ask young researchers or newly employed researchers, what do you think would be the proper way of being evaluated? For you to do a good work which is scientifically valid, robust, but also meet the ethical expectations? And then having the management having to respond to this to stimulate a bit a bottom-up input on the way people is being evaluated.* (NTNU)

> *We were the latest to join the project and we are in a continuous improvement process. ETHNA is very interesting to change mindsets, but it is true that – and the mindset links to the culture – we will not change at the same speed as the northern countries, for example. In the Mediterranean south is quite different and this should be something that should be taken into account when designing these subtle concepts like the ethical codes or the basis of ETHNA. In the case of technology companies, the people involved are aware that is important to be ethical, but they do not know how to do it. It is a hard job to apply a methodology in so many different contexts, but this is the aim, to change the mindset and also get lessons that we transfer to the European Commission.* (ESPAITEC)

4   Conclusion

This report aimed at providing an account of the implementation status regarding the implementers' initial planned goals and activities, based on 2 participatory workshops held with the implementers in 15 and 16 September 2022. The focus of this report is on the progress update, as well as some early positive impact, institutional changes, and some constraints. Furthermore, this report also indicates some reflections regarding the ETHNA legacy and the outlook for its future at the implementing organisations. The aim of this report is to provide data for the last evaluative tasks of the ETHNA project.

Most implementers reported a positive assessment of the ETHNA System at their organisation. They reported that their initial implementation plan has been followed and the main goals have been achieved. Two implementers have, however, been facing some challenges which have either delayed or hindered the ETHNA System uptake.

Some positive impact from the ETHNA System implementation has also been highlighted. Namely, at the internal level, such as increasing of awareness of the importance of ethics in research among staff, but also at the external level, by achieving political goals and expanding network. Moreover, it has been noted the increasing take-up of some materials by researchers, such as an Open Access Guideline, as well as the creation of quality training materials for junior researchers. Other implementers stressed as well the importance of the ETHNA System in updating their existing codes and ethics committees.

As for the legacy of the ETHNA System, its longevity will depend on 3 main factors, according to the implementers: 1) strong dissemination (via training and other means, especially targeting junior researchers), 2) deep knowledge of the organisation where the ETHNA System is being implemented, i.e., the staff perceived needs and overall culture, and 3) the ability to be continuously updated, in particular by incorporating the feedback gathered by the implementers.