

**Present:** Mar Capeans (CERN), Erika Garutti (Hamburg), Matteo Cavalli-Sforza (IFAE), Kalevi Ekman (Aalto University), Sijbrand de Jong (Radboud, Chair), Michela Magas (ICF), Ezri Tarazi (Technion); Markus Nordberg (CERN, secretary).

**Excused:** Julian Birkinshaw (LBS).

**Meeting agenda:** <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1143947/>

**S. de Jong** welcomed everyone to the 7th ISAB(-G) meeting and presented the goals for the meeting.

The minutes of the previous meeting ([110222](#)) were approved, noting that in the future, it would be good to explain all used acronyms using relevant links (e.g. [Crowd4sdg](#), [SDG](#)). As it is understood that ISAB appears on the list of [CERN Scientific Committees](#) and that the minutes of ISAB are public for reasons of transparency<sup>1</sup>, ISAB requested to check with the Office of Director of Research for any possible recent policy updates (e.g. GDPR related).

S. de Jong then opened the discussion on renewal of mandates for ISAB members. He reminded of the outcome of discussions with J. Mnich (CERN Director of Research) concerning the length of the mandate of ISAB members, as this was never defined in the [mandate](#). The agreement reached is that the assignment is for 3 years, with an option for another 3 years. M. Cavalli-Sforza expressed his wish to step down having served as a ISAB member since the very beginning. S. de Jong reported that J. Birkinshaw has also expressed his wish to step down. He warmly thanked both of them for their kind services and hoped both could still stay onboard until the next annual meeting in early 2023<sup>2</sup>. While waiting for suggestions for suitable replacements, S. de Jong invited K. Ekman to continue by one additional year (i.e. early 2024), which K. Ekman agreed to.

**C. Marcelloni** presented a more detailed summary of the IdeaSquare Communication Strategy and web page update, following from the discussions from the previous meeting ([Appendix 1](#)).

Following very lively conversations, the ISAB made several remarks and observations;

- 1) The aspect of addressing (also) the “unknown” through the visual metaphor of using a feasibility spectrum is great;
- 2) There are too many (confusing) references to IdeaSquare. The label (“logo”) should say IdeaSquare. In Twitter, the hashtag should be #CERNi2, and internal shorthand<sup>3</sup> as i2<sup>4</sup>, not ID2;

---

<sup>1</sup> As a point of reference of public information, the Plenary [RRB](#) meetings and [minutes](#) were mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that as ISAB has so far met early in the year, the first actual meeting for the ISAB members has been in the following year after their nomination. Thus, the effective mandate starts from there.

<sup>3</sup> It was emphasized that i2 should only be used in internal documents when it is too tedious to repeat “IdeaSquare” or there are imposed character restrictions in a text field. A member of ISAB described using i2 in any wider context as a “bad idea”.

- 3) Current reference to Events is too restrictive. The spirit should rather be “come here to do fun with your idea or knowledge” or “fun & joint experience”, a place for things between a bootcamp and a conference, a contributor to New European Bauhaus ([NEB](#))...;
- 4) Why not share info via Department Heads about IdeaSquare?
- 5) i2 positioning between KT and Science Gateway (SG) need to be clear: As KT aims to offer technology and innovation to (mainly) industry and SG is about outreach to the public, i2 can offer a complementary, internal entry point for *both*, through a hands-on approach to co-creation and *disruptive innovation with a focus on SDGs*. “There are different doors to innovation”<sup>5</sup>;
- 6) The new website could also target private or commercial donators, as part of the income strategy.

ISAB thanked C. Marcelloni for the excellent job done and asked her to take onboard the above feedback in finalizing the communication strategy and the new web site.

S. de Jong then invited ISAB members to comment on the draft recommendations compiled from the minutes of the previous meeting ([Appendix 2](#)).

ISAB worked further on the draft, making the following supplementary comments and observations:

- 1) CBI methodology offers a truly unique opportunity to transform life-long learning through doing. This aspect makes IdeaSquare an ideal partner for NEB;
- 2) M. Magas agrees to work together with M. Capeans and the IdeaSquare team to start preparing an event at IdeaSquare to connect CERN (like e.g. Green Village) with NEB;
- 3) On CIJ: ISAB identified a couple of topics that could be written up as articles for the Journal, particularly focusing on methodologies for early adoption and scaling of technology transfer to industry. Moreover, one could consider writing up Market Adoption Readiness Levels, publishing them in the Journal and then uploading them on wiki for everyone's reference;
- 4) M. Capeans agrees to help in defining the right interface to Science Gateway (recommendations 9 and 10);
- 5) Based on the success of Crowd4sdg, IdeaSquare should exploit Citizen Science to its full potential.

---

<sup>5</sup> Gary Pisano's [work](#) was mentioned to categorize the different innovation models.