

Responsible Internationalisation Workshop 2 on Responsible Research

CY-Cergy, 27-28 November 2024

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary, p. 1
2. Background to Workshop, p. 1
3. Session One Summary: Roundtable on Perspectives, European and Global, p. 2
4. Group Discussions: Proposals for Action, p. 6
 - a. Roundtable, p. 6
 - b. HE Requirements for Responsible Research (Breakouts), p. 7
 - c. Practical Tools and Solutions, p. 10
5. Workshop 3 and Summit, p. 11
6. Annexe 1: Outline Programme, p. 11
7. Annexe 2: Speaker Biographies, p. 17

1. Executive Summary

Following background introduction (section 2), this report briefly summarises invited speaker perspectives (section 3); proposals for action that arose in Q+As and open-forum discussion (section 4). The following themes emerged as potential priorities for EUTOPIA:

- **Recognition that risks exist both to under- and over-securitisation**, including on the latter to academic freedom, and retrograde retreats into nationalism
- **EUTOPIA should consider establishing training on responsible research** (see *Practical Tools and Solutions, Section 4*)
- **EUTOPIA should consider establishing a central bank of resources**, accessible throughout the year (see *Practical Tools and Solutions, Section 4*)
- **Wider stakeholders beyond researchers may benefit from training to meet our end goals**, including in building trust and fair partnerships
- **Good practice should be illustrated through case-studies**, promoting sharing among individuals and institutions, including on how to address the situation when things go wrong
- **Guidance should be tailored by faculty/ discipline**
- **Guidance should support researchers and ancillary staff to assess the balance of risks in different scenarios**, with avoidance of micromanagement
- **Participants noted the challenges associated with divestment and diversification away from funding sources**

The reports concludes with proposals on themes that Responsible Internationalisation Working Group may wish to explore for our final workshop and culminative summit (section 5).

2. Background to Workshop 2

Workshop 1 surfaced several interests was held at Stellenbosch, South Africa, on 14 March 2024. Responsible Internationalisation Working Group has since met monthly to discuss and define an agreed approach to the next event at CY Cergy, which incorporated interests at the first event in: (1) tackling grey areas that offer scope for collective intervention, likely situated where staff have freedom to make decisions beyond the red lines of compliance; (2) providing structured guidelines and training, including for early-stage researchers (PGR, ECR); (3) a commitment to understanding the range of drivers for RI across European and Global Partners to determine our scope for collective action.

Initially the thematic proposal that emerged at Stellenbosch had been focused on Inclusion and Integration on Campuses, but after discussion, our Responsible Internationalisation Working Group (30 April, 4 June) has opted to focus on Responsible Research, including how EUTOPIA can support a balanced approach to both Open Science and Research Security. To support understanding on institutional perspective on the topic, a survey was circulated 27 June 2024, for RIWG members to share with their

home-institution research office colleagues. A preliminary meeting was held on 28 October 2024 to provide a supplementary explanatory narrative to the survey. These priority topics included interests in Cyber and Information Security; values and ethics; and an interest in comparative insight into Alliance-wide staffing and resource. These topics were taken forward as breakout topics for our workshop (see Section 4).

Speakers were sought for the opening Roundtable that could speak to opportunities and tensions already surfaced in Workshop 1 between governance and academic perspectives; between institutional and Alliance identities; between Local (including Institutional), Regional (including European) and Global vantage points and between aspirational commitments and on-the-ground praxis. Details can be found in *Session One: Roundtable on Perspectives, European and Global*, and Speaker Biographies (see Annexe 2).

3. Session One: Roundtable on Perspectives, European and Global

- Chair: Professor George Christou (UW, Chair of EUTOPIA Responsible Internationalisation Working Group; Deputy Pro-Vice Chancellor Europe at Warwick; and Professor of Politics and International Studies with an interest in European Politics and Cybersecurity)
- **Participants** (see also Annexe 2: Speaker Biographies): (1) **Mirko van Muijen** (Policy Officer, DG R+I, EC); (2) **Prof. Cecilia Hewlett** (Pro-vice Chancellor Europe, MU); (3) **James Hammond** (Director of Public Affairs, U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities); (4) Sean Rowlands (Senior Policy Officer, The Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities); (5) Sara-Ann Comel (Director of Operations: International, Europe and Ulyssus European University Alliance, Université Côte d'Azur)

There were three session objectives for this roundtable:

- (1) To identify gaps in existing provision that represent promising 'grey areas' for action
- (2) To revisit EUTOPIA priorities based on what is impactful and feasible for our Alliance to tackle
- (3) To define stakeholders we may need to engage to support change

George Christou (Chair) introduced speakers and invited each to respond to two prompt questions. A summary of contributions is given below:

- (1) **From your vantage point, what do you think are the greatest risks that universities (including HEI Alliances) face in taking a responsible approach to research security**
 - **Mirko van Muijen (DG R+I, European Commission)** –
 - There is lots of geopolitical change, which is impacting many sectors of the economy and society
 - Research is defined by openness, which is also its vulnerability

- Research is decentralised, which further increases the challenges for effective coordination on risk management
- The EU is working on approaches, including tech transfer (outbound) and foreign interference (inbound)
- We recognise a tension with funding
- There needs to be an ethical dimension to avoid complicity in human rights violations
- Universities need to self-regulate – with academic freedom comes responsibility
- Governments also need to play a part through responsible disclosure of (potentially classified) information that can help universities understand the nature of risks and possible countermeasures
- **Cecilia Hewlett (Monash University) –**
 - Primary concern in Australian context is espionage and foreign interference with universities significant target
 - Australian Foreign Relations Act (2020) requires public universities to notify on any agreements with foreign institutions, including those that may not be able to demonstrate separation from government interference
 - Monash has large global footprint, with 1,300 agreements assessed in past year; 200 merited notification to government
 - Needed extra staffing to cope
 - Nothing yet has surfaced that required deeper government intervention
 - At University level Monash have needed to declare interests
 - There is concern that staff may not be declaring positions held with foreign universities
 - Reluctance to publish on sensitive topics, with questions on secondary uses for surveillance or military application
 - Those hitherto investing most heavily in R+D are often the most exposed to threats from espionage and foreign interference
 - Risk – chilling effect, retreat into nationalism
 - **George (Chair):** There is a question emerging on the appropriate role of government
- **James Hammond (U15 Group of Canadian Research-Intensive Universities) –**
 - Canadian U15 works closely with German, French and UK counterparts, including the Guild
 - Like Mirko, sees constantly evolving risks- a moving target
 - Need a balance ('as open as possible, as secure as necessary') including support for academic partnerships, alongside the maintenance of trust (public, funders)
 - Risks are institutional and reputational
 - Canada requires a Framework for Due Diligence and Risk Management, with a STRAP Policy – implemented July 2024 with a prohibit-list of research organisations
 - Risks – need to balance security against over-bureaucratisation
- **Sean Rowlands (Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities) –**
 - Commonalities between Australian, Canadian and European perspectives
 - Guild has a focus on balance of risks
 - A lot of the policy on European economic security is viewed through the lens of continental competitiveness, with R+I given a prominent role
 - Work on competitiveness and cooperation undertaken in Portugal has concluded that isolation is to be avoided; instead we need to be proactively and positively working on fair partnerships (e.g., Africa)

- It does not always need to be large-scale structural partnerships that make a difference; informal and open dialogue with wider partners can also lead to wider impacts
- Risk-side policy changes to bolster security need to consider opportunity costs that come from the risk of non-collaboration
 - **George** (Chair): We need to keep the risks of oversecritisation in view
- **Sara-Ann Comel (Ulysseus European University Alliance) –**
 - Three main risks: (1) malign misappropriation of research to make an erroneous case for another agenda (instrumentalising research, with science policy a potential counter-measure); (2) structural differences between institutions that cause asymmetric priorities (e.g.s, IP, policies for international collaboration; (3) geographical and cultural separation that needs to be bridged
 - **George** (Chair): Speaks to the heart of our work in EUTOPIA, which looks at the tension between convergence and divergence
 - (Q+A) Need to recognise RI is bigger than research security. There is a risk that Global North and Global South can ‘miss each other’, without recognising the equal importance of fair partnerships

(2) Where do you see the main synergies and tensions in relation to how security risks are perceived and acted upon between different international partners and actors? Have you seen examples of good practice?

- **Mirko van Muijen (DG R+I, European Commission) –**
 - Geopolitics is unavoidable for researchers organisations who must take an interest – China is a prominent case where research is being instrumentalised
 - There are threats on both sides: to research security and to academic integrity
 - The EU are looking to share good practice across member states, in the aid of a seamless European research area
 - The EU are also seeking to define responsibilities (countries, research bodies, funders)
 - It is important that the EC takes a holistic approach as the whole is only as strong as its weakest link
 - Governments have a role to play to support academia, with good practice found beyond the EC in Japan, Canada and Australia
- **Cecilia Hewlett (Monash University) –**
 - After initial resistance on the measures needed for compliance, the Australian law has lifted a lid on the extent of literacy around RI
 - There is a heightened awareness of risks, including with mandatory training on fraud and corruption
 - There is a question whether security is our main challenge
 - In the Australian context, we have a particular agenda for decolonisation and co-creation with the involvement of indigenous knowledges
 - **George** (Chair): Part of our aim today is to look at framing around the risks, so it is useful to get a Global perspective
- **James Hammond (U15 Group of Canadian Research-Intensive Universities) –**

- Fantastic interventions, lots of coherence in institutional and governmental approaches
- Good practices include lists, which provide clarity and certainty (removing ambiguity from the grey zone by defining the field of non-cooperation)
- (Q+A) Canadian government has provided CAD25m to support information and guidance development for Responsible Research
- (Q+A) It has worked relatively well because universities have been given the tools to make decisions (support, not impose)
- (Q+A) Alongside government funding, U15 had published a guide on safeguarding research
- Some fields are particularly sensitive, with a need for defined red lines on where it is (and is not) permissible to work with external agencies
- Lists do not require extensive paperwork and help build trust
- Risk – overlapping research policies, so a goal needs to be to work towards greater policy cohesion (avoidance of layers of policy) that supports ongoing research collaboration
- How can we move towards a greater degree of policy alignment between countries? EU and Alliances like EUTOPIA have a role to play
- **Sean Rowlands (Guild of European Research-Intensive Universities) –**
 - Self-governance is part of the picture, allowing for a bespoke approach where needed (this should be welcomed)
 - Governments can make mistakes, so increased individual literacy on RI builds in resilience
 - We should be learning to build trust with other sectors, as well as being confident about the role that universities can play
 - The harder job is for universities to avoid overloading those who need to make decisions on risk (over-bureaucratisation)
- **Sara-Ann Comel (Ulyseus European University Alliance) –**
 - To finish on an optimistic note: the EC is developing policies and guidance, with a consultative approach, that promises to avoid over-regulation
 - The EC has shown willingness to strengthen European sovereignty
 - The EC also recognizes a balance between research security and an ambition for more internationalization (cf. Japan, Canada)
 - Horizon Europe has target countries in the wider world, for example on societal challenges around forest fires (US, Australia, Brazil)
 - **George (Chair):** We are looking at more than one type of risk here – national security on one level, human rights beyond this. Some issues will be harder to solve than others.

4. Group Discussions: Proposals for Action

This table summarises the discussions from three separate sessions (noted): (1) Roundtable Q+A; (2) Breakout on HE Requirements for Responsible Research; and (3) Open Discussion on Practical Tools, Solutions, Actions and Implications. It focuses on those parts of these discussions that touched on grey zones that EUTOPIA could consider working within.

Roundtable

Action	Risk / Opportunity	Speaker (Session)	Notes
Prompt diversification of funding	Heightened awareness of need to consider wider options Current over-reliance on funding from particular third-party countries	Mirko (Roundtable Q+A)	Example of one known institution where 98 per-cent of funding comes from China
Lists that prohibit collaboration with named organisations/agencies	Clarity for researchers, not overly bureaucratic Need for disciplinary flexibility, awareness it may not capture all (noting dynamic and evolving threats)	James (Roundtable Q+A)	Canada is already piloting this approach
Cyber security clinics	Train students and researchers and wider staff to undertake primary project assessment Need for resource to make possible	Sarah-Ann (Roundtable Q+A)	Ulyseus is already piloting this approach, similar to Law clinics. Discussion touched on questions of staff and budgetary resource.
Platform for sharing resources (e.g., EUTOPIA)	Mutual uplift of good practice Importance that we don't over-complicate Audiences could include PGRs as well as staff	Bostjan (UL; Roundtable Q+A) Cecilia (MU; Roundtable Q+A) Roland (UNIVE; Roundtable Q+A)	MU could share what they prepared with Australian government, e.g.s, on IP, histories of protection, extent of resource... as well as case-studies that help end-users visualize the contexts and risks)

HE Requirements for Responsible Research (Breakouts)

There were two breakout groups:

- (1) Approaches to coordinated awareness-raising on Responsible Research
- (2) Values, ethics, and proportionality in Responsible Research

The following themes and actions were reported in a joint wrap up session with discussion:

Action	Risk / Opportunity	Speaker (Affiliation)	Notes
Train stakeholders (influencers or practitioners)	Opportunity to set-up a future generation to succeed in appraising and managing risks in their research project design	Valérie (CY)	Potentially including PGRs, ECRs, Research Directors, Heads of Department/Faculty, senior administrators. GU'sLL approach provides a model.
Include professional services, noting that colleagues in (e.g.s.) Legal and HR will benefit from cultural sensitivity training to deal effectively with global partners	Focus on researchers alone risks omitting other staff who can jeopardise attempts to build fair partnerships	Mike (UW)	Non-academics potentially an audience that could otherwise be missed, but who can still threaten attempts to build trust when approaching as 'suspected criminals'
	TUD considering how to encourage participation in training, when it may be seen as a hinderance/obstacle	Franziska (TUD)	
Seminars for researchers and supporting teams that include illustrative case studies	Support researchers to envisage wider risks through grounded examples, beyond their immediate experience	Helena (GU)	GU spoke on what had been working for them – this is not top-down training, but rather shared and interactive experience-sharing
Shared guidance, not micromanagement	Supports exchange of experience		

<p>Create definitions of key terms</p>	<p>Avoidance of talking at cross-purposes</p> <p>Allowing for uses, we should also be mindful to avoid getting bogged down in semantics</p>	<p>Bostjan (UL)</p> <p>George (Chair, UW)</p>	<p>Examples given: security, proportionality, equity [<i>is there an existing international glossary somewhere</i>]. As a pre-requisite to research seminars that furnish example case-studies [<i>as above</i>].</p>
<p>Handbook, with technical guidance to illustrate approach to trickiest issues</p>	<p>Reference tool available year-round</p>	<p>Mette Sandoff (GU)</p>	
<p>Checklists tailored to faculty needs</p> <p>Training attuned to disciplinary differences of need</p>	<p>Reference tool available year-round</p> <p>Tailored and targeted to known risks in each field, avoiding inutility to any part of training cohort</p> <p>Potentially more resource-intensive to deliver?</p>	<p>Franziska (TUD)</p> <p>Isabel (NOVA) / Bostjan (UL) / Roland (UNIVE)</p>	<p>TUD developing</p> <p>E.g., Biological materials (NOVA); Arts (UL, UNIVE)... UL referenced risk assessment for Life Sciences and Medicine</p>
<p>Scope sanctions and/or consequences that could meaningfully ensue when security risks (e.g., links to hostile military interests) have been identified</p>	<p>Without understanding and vocalizing consequences, guidance could be toothless... Also potentially unjust</p>	<p>Nina (UL)</p>	<p>Speaker made point as part of support for balanced approach that considers open science as well as securitization.</p>
<p>Inclusion of ethics, values and proportionality in any training</p>	<p>Supports researchers (and those supporting them) to think beyond black and white and provide a moral compass that can flexibly appraise each situation as it arises</p> <p>Concern that without proportionality – and assessment of obverse risks to open</p>	<p>Sarah (SU) / George (Chair, UW)</p> <p>Rita (NOVA)</p>	

	academic enquiry – Europe may lose influence and soft-power, leaving a space for hostile interests		
Training that covers GDPR, plagiarism, workings of Ethics Committees	Extended coverage/relevance, including to meet institutional priorities	Sergiu (UBB)	UBB would be among universities that might need to notify (Romanian) secret services where risks are identified

Practical Tools and Solutions

There were two concrete proposals that emerged as a result of these discussions. In both cases, there was agreement that they should (A) support the fair partnerships; and (B) maintain a balance between open science and research security (risks on both sides):

(1) Case-study-based training that addresses EUTOPIA institution priority needs

- European and non-European, including the lens of equitable and fair partnerships
- By faculty or research area
- Normative and performative, to illustrate model procedures, then explore how they look in practice
- Case-studies that illustrate how researchers have previously appraised and navigated the issues (*could ask institutions to look at their own cases*)
- Question: Who to include (e.g.s, PGR, ECR, established academics, professional services)?
- Question: Frequency? When to run?
- Question: Resource to support development (staff, budgets, materials)?

(2) Awareness-raising on responsible research (trusted research)

- Resources packaged together on an intranet or secure site
- Materials collated that can be used for training purposes
- Consider RI presence on EUTOPIA website
- Question: how open should this guidance be?
- Question: Resource to support development (staff, budgets, materials)?

5. Workshop 3 and Summit

Consideration was given to the timing and focus for Workshop 3. Discussion and event planning will now be taken forward at future Responsible Internationalisation Working Groups:

- **Venue:** UNIVE, with option to consider co-location at Warwick Venice Centre
- **Dates** (proposed): 3-4 April 2024
- **Format:** Hybrid. Consider incorporating institutional perspectives into main workshop, rather than holding as a separate pre-meeting.
- **Stakeholders:** To consider, noting discussions so far have involved STINT, FOREU, Ulysseus, and the Guild, who could be invited back. CY had previously suggested ESSEC and/or Cerema could be interested as EUTOPIA Associated Partners.
- **Topics for consideration:**
 - (1) Either jointly or separately:
 - Technologies for global change (including Human and Social Science approaches; potentially linked to 1-3x SDGs, with SU proposal to consider alignment with their SDG Hub)
 - Climate change
 - Knowledge transfer
 - (2) Alternative proposal, revisiting an idea that emerged in Workshop 1:
 - Internationalisation at Home, Internationalisation on Campus
- **Problematics** – just for starters based on the discussion during Workshop 2, including in this final session:
 - Tension between global good and economic competitiveness
 - How to support just transitions
 - Unevenness and duplication in policy- whose responsibility

6. ANNEXE 1: Outline Programme

Dates: Wednesday 27 November and Thursday 28 November 2024

Location: Hybrid, with in-person at CY Cergy (France) – **Maison de la Recherche Annie Erneaux**, Room **MZ01**

Audience: EUTOPIA RIWG members; EUTOPIA institutional experts working to support responsible research and research security; invited third-party speakers to represent EC, government, EUI and academic perspectives.

Session #	Time	Session Title	Format	Participants	Notes on Objectives and Fit within Programme
1	27/11, 13:45-14:00	Arrival (in-person delegates)			
2	14:00 – 15:30	Perspectives: European and Global	Roundtable (Chaired) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (10mins) Welcome and speaker introductions • (40mins) Facilitated discussion on 3x questions (40mins) Discussion based on speaker inputs and session objectives	Professor George Christou (Chair) <u>Panellists see also Annexe 2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mirko van Muijen (Policy Officer, DG Research and Innovation) • Prof. Cecilia Hewlett (Pro Vice-Chancellor, Monash University) • James Hammond (Director of Public Affairs, U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities) • Sean Rowlands (Senior Policy Officer, Guild) • Sara-Ann Comel (Director of Operations, International, Europe) 	<p>Session objectives:</p> <p>(1) To understand drivers within government, policy, and wider HEIs – so <i>EUTOPIA can connect our approach to wider needs and imperatives</i></p> <p>(2) To interrogate perspectives on the appropriate balance between academic freedom (responsible research) and risk reduction (security) – so <i>EUTOPIA can develop tools that address risks on both sides</i></p> <p>(3) To compare perspectives between the institutional, European and Global - so <i>EUTOPIA works towards tools that work for all members (covering definitions, and nature of need/risk)</i></p> <p>Fit within Programme</p>

				Ulyssus, Université Côte d'Azur)	<p>This first session afforded an opportunity to reflect on differences in agendas (e.g, geopolitical, philosophical and cultural). It recognised differences in institutional, regional, national and international lenses, including potentiality for divergence at the European and Global levels. It raised questions of sovereignty and compliance, and ensuing this, where EUIs (including EUTOPIA) can legitimately claim scope for influence.</p> <p>In the immediate term, the session went beyond our institutional foci (research office forms, 28 October preliminary meeting) to situate EUTOPIA actions in contemporary global challenges.</p> <p>The roundtable format allowed moderated expert-led discussion on overarching challenges that are likely to have wider policy-relevance, which in the medium-term will help inform our RI Summit.</p>
3	15:30 – 17:15	HE Requirements for Responsible Research and Research Security	<p>Chaired summary of priority issues identified in EUTOPIA RI Preliminary Meeting on 28 October and EUTOPIA RI Forms; with cross-reference to pre-circulated papers (20mins)</p> <p>2x breakout groups (45mins):</p>	<p>EUTOPIA Working Group representatives</p> <p>EUTOPIA experts on RI, including Research Office</p> <p>Invited Associated Partners</p>	<p>Session objectives:</p> <p>(1) To identify gaps in existing provision that represent promising ‘grey areas’ for action – based on 28 October preliminary meeting, pre-circulated papers, and reflections from Session 1. So EUTOPIA can make decisions on scope for influence and impact.</p> <p>(2) To revisit EUTOPIA priorities based on what is impactful and feasible for our Alliance to tackle– based on 28 October preliminary meeting, so institutional priorities can be aligned with wider</p>

			<p>(1) Approaches to Coordinated Awareness-raising on Responsible Research</p> <p>(2) Values, Ethics and Proportionality in Responsible Research (Open Science)</p> <p>Full-group feedback and discussion (30mins)</p>		<p><i>national and international agendas (EC and beyond Europe).</i></p> <p>(3) To define stakeholders – based on an understanding on who is already in the room and who we may be missing. Again, consider at institutional, EUTOPIA and wider level (e.g.s, EUIs, bodies such as STINT, the Guild, EUA, Friends of Europe), so we can plan future events (Workshop 3, Summit).</p> <p>Fit within Programme</p> <p>Having surveyed wider challenges facing our sector (Session 2), this session encouraged participants to talk through relevance to institutional and Alliance-wide interests (preliminary meeting).</p> <p>Institutions were invited to join whichever breakout group best fitted known institutional priorities. There were originally going to be three breakouts, but without sufficient expertise on Cyber Information Security and Protection, this was removed to leave two breakouts.</p>
4	17:15 – 19:00	Option to return to hotels to freshen-up, or free time			
5	19:00 – 22:00	EUTOPIA Week Reception	Welcome/ Farewell crossover event hosted by CY as part of EUTOPIA Week.	All in-person delegates	<p>Fit within Programme</p> <p>Opportunity to connect invited EUTOPIA experts and third-party speakers to engage with our</p>

					wider EUTOPIA network, including Central Office and CY's team working on Science Diplomacy.
6	28/11, 09:30	Arrivals (in-person)			
7	09:45 – 11:30	Practical Tools and Solutions	<p>Chaired discussion on the challenges and requirements already identified in Sessions 2 and 3 (30mins)</p> <p>Breakout discussions (45mins):</p> <p>(1) existing tools and resources available across EUTOPIA (starting points); (2) gaps and needs; (3) obstacles to effective implementation</p> <p>Group feedback, to assess scope for action – see <i>session objectives</i> (40mins)</p>	<p>EUTOPIA Working Group representatives</p> <p>EUTOPIA experts on RI, including Research Office</p> <p>Invited Associated Partners</p>	<p>Session objectives:</p> <p>(1) To define the tools we want to create based on what we know already exists – based on 28 October preliminary meeting, pre-circulated papers, and reflections from Session 2 and 3.</p> <p>(2) To understand obstacles that currently impede effective action – based on 28 October preliminary meeting, pre-circulated papers, and reflections from Sessions 2 and 3. So EUTOPIA can begin stakeholder mapping (institutional/ EUTOPIA/ third-party).</p> <p>(3) To consider scope for action – based on 28 October preliminary meeting and reflections from Session 2 and 3. So EUTOPIA can be realistic about resource (e.g.s, staff, degree of centralisation, avoidance of overlap, finance)</p> <p>Fit within Programme</p> <p>This final session focused on defining practical outputs that support positive practitioner behaviours. We had already agreed in RIWG that Workshop 2 should not only produce words (e.g., commitments), but ultimately lead to practical outputs. Session 2 had supported understanding on need, while Session 3 had indicated where our institutions are currently under-resourced.</p>

					An outcome of this session was to produce a list of recommendations for future support that can be discussed in the wrap-up (Session 8).
8	11:30 – 12:30	Actions and Implications for EUTOPIA	Chaired summary, followed by discussion where all represented institutions are encouraged to reflect on how the workshop has influenced their thoughts on responsible research and research security (especially linking institutional priorities with those of partners)	EUTOPIA Working Group members or nominated representatives	<p>Fit within Programme</p> <p>A summative session that captures the essence of discussions, with a focus on agreements linked to actions.</p> <p>As with Workshop 1, it is proposed that this leads to a written report that will support future initiatives, including Workshop 3, Summit and recommendations for practical implementation (EUTOPIA/ EUIs). Proposals will then be taken to future EUTOPIA RI Working Group meetings, including on how ideas may be developed through Workshop 3 and/or Summit.</p>
9	12:30 – 14:00	Lunch and departures (in-person delegates)			

7. ANNEXE 2: Speaker Biographies (Roundtable)

EUTOPIA Responsible Internationalisation Working Group nominated and voted on priority third participation in the Roundtable. As noted in the Background to Workshop 2 (section 1), members sought to ensure diversity of perspectives. In practice not all nominated speakers could attend (e.g., French Ministry), with some late changes to the line-up. The final panel, however, represented a sectoral and geographic breadth of expertise and experience to inform our discussions:

Mirko van Muijen, Policy Officer: DG Research and Innovation, European Commission

Mirko van Muijen is responsible for research security issues in the International R&I Unit. In this capacity, he was the penholder for a Council Recommendation on strengthening research security in Europe.

Mirko is a seconded national expert from the Netherlands, where, before coming to Brussels he was programme manager at the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science for the development of Dutch knowledge security policy. Mirko has worked for more than 20 years in public administration, for different ministries in the Hague (NL), as well as Brussels, where he worked as Education Counsellor at the Permanent Representation of the Netherlands to the European Union.

Mirko has previously interacted in policy dialogue with the Guild's Responsible Internationalisation Task Force, as part of similar conversations on the heterogeneity of research security contexts across Europe.

Professor Cecilia Hewlett, Pro-Vice-Chancellor Europe; Associate Dean International of the Faculty of Arts; and Professor of Renaissance Studies

Professor Cecilia Hewlett leads the strategic planning and direction of Monash's Prato (Italy) campus. Cecilia was a director of the Prato Centre (2012-2020) and played a key role in its establishment with the founding director, the late Emeritus Professor Bull Kent. Cecilia serves as the Chair of the Board of the recently-established Monash University European Research Foundation. Cecilia has also taught on Monash's longest-running history immersion programme in Italy, as a passionate advocate for the transformative impact of student mobility. Cecilia has been engaged for several years both in the Monash-Warwick Alliance and as a Global Partner within EUTOPIA, bringing comparative international perspectives that span the Australian and European. Previously, Cecilia has held fellowships at Harvard (US) and European University Institute, with publications focused on the Italian Renaissance.

James Hammond, Director of Public Affairs, U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities

James is responsible for advising the EVP CEO and U15 Canada's Board on public affairs and issues affecting U15 Canada institutions and the Canadian research ecosystem, including supporting U15's activities in government relations and communications.

Before joining U15 Canada, James worked as a Senior Government Relations Officer with Universities Canada and as a legislative assistant to several Members of Parliament in Canada's House of Commons, following studies at Durham (UK) and British Columbia (Can).

Sean Rowlands, Senior Policy Officer, The Guild of European Research Intensive Universities

Sean joined the Guild in September 2023 as Senior Policy Officer. Within this post, Sean leads policy monitoring and development on responsible internationalisation (including RI Working Group), UK and Swiss association to the Horizon Europe research and innovation funding programme, and engaging in European Research Area discussions on international cooperation in R&I. Previously, Sean worked at the UK Research Office in Brussels as a European Research Council National Contact Point and an Expert Advisor to fifteen research organisations in the UK and the BBSEC (UK research funding council), following studies at Westminster and Leiden.

Sara-Ann Comel, Director of Operations: International, Europe and Ulysseus at Université Côte d'Azur

Sara-Ann is European and International Operations Director at the University Côte d'Azur, with responsibilities including the deployment of the European University Ulysseus, as well as to wider networks including U7+, EUA and FOREU. Sara-Ann has a background as an Academic and Scientific Officer and Campys France Director for the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As Senior Consultant, Sara-Ann specialized in HE and Research. EUTOPIA and Ulysseus have already been engaged together through Sara-Ann's colleague, John Gardiner, who ran a workshop in April 2024 on the internationalization of European University Alliances.