

**Present:** Julian Birkinshaw (LBS), Matteo Cavalli-Sforza (IFAE), Kalevi Ekman (Aalto University), Sijbrand De Jong (Nijmegen), Thierry Lagrange (CERN, Chair), Joachim Mnich\* (CERN), Ezri Tarazi (Technion), Markus Nordberg (secretary).

**Meeting agenda:** <https://indico.cern.ch/event/984811/>.

\*part-time

1. Concerning the IdeaSquare activities in 2020, ISAB-G observes that despite the many challenges IdeaSquare has been facing, its activities have not shrunk in 2020, but are instead now on a convincing path to strengthen, having a clear focus on what IdeaSquare is best at, and executing an articulated set of selected choices. ISAB-G therefore wishes to pass its congratulations to the IdeaSquare team for the above achievements.
2. Concerning the planning for the coming years, ISAB-G expresses its appreciation how the different activities described in the Strategy Plan had been integrated together, driven now by ATTRACT Phase 2, and also given its prospects to extend into the next EU Framework Program. If Phase 2 turns out to be as successful as Phase 1, ISAB-G considers the impact to be significant in Europe and the key role of IdeaSquare in that should not be forgotten.
3. ISAB-G encourages further to strengthen the CERN involvement in IdeaSquare activities, e.g. in the CBI-courses, even if the choice of using or not CERN technologies is left up to the students. Moreover, ISAB-G **recommends** IdeaSquare to explore whether, with the help of CERN HR, IdeaSquare could be promoted as an “Experiment” for Fellows and other young researchers to join on a small fraction of their time.
4. ISAB-G **recommends** that CIJ reports also on the process and results of ATTRACT Phase 1, and the student impact in the project innovation capabilities as part of the scope of the socio-economic study in Phase 2, as requested by the EC. ISAB-G **recommends** that CIJ emphasizes in its communication its uniqueness which is that it operates in the niche area of *experimental* innovation and it invites shorter submissions than journals in general, in the style of “Nature News”.
5. ISAB-G supports the “Garage” concept and wishes to hear next time in more detail how it fits in the IdeaSquare “Fuzzy Front End” spectrum of innovation; what specific activities by then it includes; plans ahead up to 2025. With the above elements together, with the effective use of hybrid-format workshops between online and physical events, ISAB-G is confident that IdeaSquare will pass over the “Valley of Death”. Experiences elsewhere, like in Israel and Finland are encouraging.
6. ISAB-G endorsed the presented Strategy Plan 2021 – 2025, waiting to hear how the operation budget of IdeaSquare (Figure 9) will be balanced, if 70% of the ATTRACT Phase-2 overheads are removed. ISAB-G encourages to seek external funding through e.g. executive management courses. ISAB-G requests an Executive Summary to be added to the current version, and **recommends** reviewing of the objectives to avoid generating self-fulfilling prophecies. Concerning the defined goals or KPIs, ISAB-G **recommends** that more thought is given to articulating the created value of

IdeaSquare from a relational point of view, instead of considering value as a form of asset. That is, placing measurable emphasis on the ecosystem view, linkages IdeaSquare can build between the partners etc.

7. While waiting for IdeaSquare to quote examples of technologies or ideas imported from the outside to the CERN community in the next Progress Report, ISAB-G **recommends** to include this as a concept in the Strategy Document.
8. ISAB-G is pleased to see that measures are taken to invite sympathetic investors to engage with activities at IdeaSquare. Although ISAB-G acknowledges the need to remain realistic about the likelihood of (large) donations, with adequate allocated management resources, it considers that the chances of obtaining donations through the proposed strategy of “inviting for advice” are fair and worth pursuing.
9. ISAB-G takes note of the Research Board minutes (CERN-DG-RB-2020-497) concerning GRADE and IdeaSquare and asks Th. Lagrange and M. Nordberg to follow up with the Director of Research the question of rotating the ISAB-G composition, the relationship between the GRADE and ATTRACT programmes and whether the review pool of 128 registered reviewers in place since several years is appropriate in terms of a reviewing scheme.