Name of impact case: SoPlace

Summary of the impact
Urban planning and place-making have the last two decades increasingly focused on aesthetics, architecture and place marketing. Research done by members of this group has been important for generating knowledge about the social implications of such strategies, and has had a substantial policy impact by developing a methodology to analyse the social and cultural conditions for places and place-making. This methodology has become widespread in urban planning and place-making, and has supplemented traditional methods focusing on landscape, built environment and architecture. Per Gunnar Røe has been a key researcher developing this methodology, and disseminating research results and methods.

Description of the research underpinning the impact
The key researcher in the development of this methodology is Røe, together with colleagues at the NIBR. At the start in 2000 we were a small group (2-3 researchers) developing the theoretical and methodological approaches. More researchers were involved as this became a growing field, and the number of contract research projects increased. The research on social conditions for place-making, underpinning the development of a methodology for analysing places and place-making as social constructs, has taken place over a period of 15 years.

It consists of research projects based on: i) Case-studies of place-making and urban development projects, ii) mapping the practices and views of certain groups, and iii) theoretical and methodological innovations. In 2007 a guideline for “Socio-cultural place analysis” (Brattbakk et al. 2007) was made and distributed widely (every municipality in Norway got a copy, and an electronic version was made accessible to all). This led to a widespread use of the methodology (see below). The methodology is also applied in research and planning by researchers outside the group. The last five years Røe has focused on the role of architecture in urban and suburban place-making and the social implications of architecture in today’s compact city policy. This research is an outcome of Røe’s engagement in the project “Global Suburbanisms” (York University) and the research project “Governance and learning” (University of Oslo, Department of Political Science). An important collaborator in this research is Bengt Andersen (University College of Oslo).

The impact from this research is based on innovative theoretical and methodological research, as well as empirical studies. We have argued for a methodology that reveals representations and practices that make a place, a type of knowledge as important as built form and landscapes per se. It builds on a conception of place neither based on material or essentialized thinking, nor on purely individual experiences or social reductionism. Complex processes such as larger planning and place-making processes should be based not only on knowledge about the built environment and infrastructure, but also the social and cultural aspects of a place. In this way, knowledge and experiences of people living in and having interests in a place may be made available to inform planning. Acknowledgement of the fact that places are social representations, socially produced and imbued with power relations, is crucial if places are to be developed in order to achieve social sustainability.

Details of the impact
As important for impact as the research itself, are the dissemination activities by the key researchers, and especially Røe. In addition to the international scientific publications, Røe has taken part in the national public discourse on urban planning and place making, by i)
publishing widely in national journals and books, and ii) holding a large number of lectures, giving talks and taking part in conferences, seminars and meetings with policy makers, public authorities and researchers. As a result, socio-cultural place analysis has become a widely used methodology in planning and place-making. A google search on “sosiokulturell stedsanalyse” (socio-cultural place analysis) received more than 830 results, and “sosiokulturelle stedsanalyser” nearly 600 results. A high number of such analyses have been done, by a range of actors, assigned by several public institutions. Because of this variation it is difficult to give an account of the magnitude of this impact. But it is reason to believe that 50-100 such analyses have been done.

Socio-cultural place analysis is recommended by a range of public authorities. Here are some examples:

Husbanken (Norwegian State Housing Bank):  
http://www.husbanken.no/omradeloft/kunnskapsmateriale/verktøy-og-veiledningsmateriale/overordnet-planlegging/underartikkel-stedsanalyser/

Statens vegvesen (Norwegian Public Roads Administration):  
http://www.vegvesen.no/_attachment/320520/binary/563834

Helsedirektoratet (Norwegian Directorate of Health):  

A specific example of how socio-cultural place analysis has been used, is in the area-based strategy for the state funded renewal of Grorud valley ("Groruddalssatsingen"), a suburban district of Oslo with 130 000 inhabitants, several high-rise estates, and a larger share of social challenges than other districts. As part of this state funded project (2007-2016, and to be continued), five such analyses have been done, in order to investigate how inhabitants perceive, use and identify with places in the valley, and to develop strategies for place-making. The specific reports are to be found on the home page of Groruddalssatsingen:  

E-mails from Husbanken and Groruddalssatsingen/Oslo municipality (see attachment) confirm the use and importance of this methodology, and that it is a result from the research done by Røe and his colleagues.

References to the research


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact


External references

Elisabeth Sem Christensen, project coordinator for prioritized areas (områdesatsinger) 
Byrådsavdeling for byutvikling, Oslo Municipality. Phone: +47 93 86 01 53. E-mail: elisabeth.sem.christensen@byr.oslo.kommune.no

Maja Flåto, senior advisor, Norwegian State Housing Bank (Husbanken). Phone: +47 958 75 141. E-mail: maja.flato@husbanken.no

Attachment to SoPlace: External references
## Impact case study

**Name of impact case:** NOR-EU-DEM

### Summary of the impact

**Democratic implications of Norway’s EU affiliation**

The 2014 Constitutional bicentennial served as a catalyst for reflection on the state of democracy in Norway. ARENA’s researchers scrutinised the nature of the country’s EU affiliation. The findings provided high-level policy makers and civil servants with an independent, critical assessment of the constitutional implications of Norway’s agreements with the EU, thus providing sound knowledge basis for their policy deliberations. Through numerous contributions, ARENA’s findings triggered a revival of public debate on the democratic implications of Norway’s affiliation with the EU, and redefined the terms of the public debate on this issue.

### Description of the research underpinning the impact

**Erik O. Eriksen** and **John Erik Fossum** coordinated the project *The Norwegian Constitution in a Changing European Context* (NORCONE) (2011-2014). The book *Det norske paradoks: Om Norges forhold til Den europeiske union* [The Norwegian paradox: On Norway’s EU affiliation] was the project’s key outcome. ARENA’s researchers found that Norwegian democracy is undermined due to the country’s peculiar relationship with the EU. As Eriksen coined it, Norway has been caught in an *integration trap*, with no possibility of escape. Membership is impossible due to the prevailing EU scepticism in public opinion. Termination of the EEA and other agreements is impossible, as Norway would not be able to obtain a free-trade agreement similar to that of Switzerland. In fact, the EU uses the EEA as a benchmark, due to its non-bureaucratic features and low costs, for developing relations with other states. In addition to Eriksen and Fossum, the following ARENA researchers contributed to the publication: **Morten Egeberg** and **Jarle Trondal** (on national administrative sovereignty under pressure), **Helene Sjursen** (on foreign and security policy), **Cathrine Holst** (on parliamentary debates) and **Espen D. H. Olsen** (on the depoliticisation of citizenship).

As a follow-up of this research, Eriksen and Fossum published a second volume in 2015 entitled *The EU’s non-members: independence under hegemony?*. Here, the findings from Norway were compared with the state of affairs in other EU-associated non-member states, as well as Britain. Contributions by Egeberg and Trondal, Eriksen, Fossum and Sjursen were revised and expanded. A new study by **Christopher Lord** on UK-EU relations as well as studies of Switzerland and Iceland were added. The main finding of this cross-national comparative study is that whereas EU members pool sovereignty in EU institutions they control, non-members are rule takers and experience a loss of sovereignty. This happens regardless of whether a country has bilateral agreements with the EU (Switzerland) or is affiliated through the dynamic EEA Agreement (Norway, Iceland). The EU’s closely associated non-members are living under a form of ‘self-inflicted hegemony’. It is not imposed on them from the outside, but is a consequence of close incorporation in a polity (the EU) that they have no influence on.
Details of the impact

Redefining the terms of public debate on Norway’s relations with the EU

The EEA is the most important international agreement Norway has entered into, yet due to the integration trap highlighted by Eriksen, the dire effects on democracy have been passed over in silence by Norwegian policy makers [1]. One commentator described the publication of the book as the equivalent of ‘letting off a bombshell’, and argued it was ‘the most important book published on the occasion of the Constitutional Bicentennial’ [2]. Intensive and systematic interventions in public debate by ARENA’s researchers triggered a change in the terms of public debates on the implications of Norwegian EU affiliation: The democratic deficit that follows from the EEA Agreement is now openly acknowledged. Norway’s most important printed newspaper concluded that there was a need for reconsidering the democratic implications of Norway's affiliation with the EU. Another stated that one should be concerned about the current state of affairs due to the suspension of democratic principles [3]. *Det norske paradoks’ findings regarding the EEA Agreement’s ‘threat to democracy’ were extensively reported by Norwegian media [4] and has since become a standard reference in public debates on democratic and constitutional implications of EU-Norway relations [5].

Providing high-level policy makers, civil servants and the Norwegian Parliament with an understanding of the constitutional and democratic implications of Norway’s agreements with the EU.

ARENA researchers were invited to discuss their findings with high-level civil servants in a number of Norwegian ministries, as well as the Office of the Norwegian Prime Minister [6]. Minister for European Affairs, Vidar Helgesen, highlighted ARENA’s research as a key contribution to the knowledge basis for policy making [7]. But most important was that ARENA’s research underscored lack of debate in parliament and breach of procedure for ceding sovereignty. ARENA’s researchers presented their findings to members of parliament in June 2014, and engaged with MPs in several public debates [8]. Based on her reading of ARENA’s book, MP Jette Christensen, member of the Standing Committee on Scrutiny and Constitutional Affairs, concluded that Norwegian parliamentarians needed to better organise parliamentary debates on European politics. MP Per Olaf Lundteigen asked the government for a more analytical approach to the issue referring directly to ARENA’s research [9].

ARENA’s findings have also informed public debates and decision makers in the UK as the debate on British EU membership gained speed, which would represent another impact case [10].

References to the research (scientific publications)

• *Det norske paradoks: Om Norges forhold til Den europeiske union* [The Norwegian paradox: On Norway's EU affiliation], Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum (eds), Universitetsforlaget, 2014
• ‘Grunnlov som kritisk standard’ [Constitution as a critical standard], Erik Oddvar Eriksen, *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift*, 1/2014
• ‘Sykkelteorien, EU og Norge’ [The bicycle theory, EU and Norway], John Erik Fossum, *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift*, 3/2014
• ‘Enighet for enhver pris? Om legitimitetsgrunnlaget for norsk utenrikspolitikk’

- *The EU's non-members: independence under hegemony?*, Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum (eds), Routledge, 2015

References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


[4] ‘EØS-avtalen truer demokratiet’ was reported across a wide range of national broadcast and print media, including *NRK*, *Nationen*, *Adresseavisen*, *Stavanger Aftenblad*, as well as local newspapers, in January 2014.

[5] MP Per Olaf Lundteigen referred to the book in a radio debate at the daily news magazine *Dagsnytt Atten* at NRK (Norwegian Public Broadcasting Corporation), 16.12.2016, which has a daily audience of around 160,000 (radio and web TV).

[6] Erik O. Eriksen and Helene Sjur were invited to meet Norway’s first Europe Minister Vidar Helgesen at the Office of the Prime Minister, 19.12. 2013; Erik O. Eriksen, Jarle Trondal, Helene Sjursen, John Erik Fossum, and Cathrine Holst, lectures at the Partnerforum seminar ‘Norge og Europa i endring: Må demokratiet redefineres?’ with 85 attending public administration officials, 24.2.2014; John Erik Fossum, presentation to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries, 7.4.2014; Erik O. Eriksen, ‘Det norske paradoks’, presentation to the Ministry of Finance, 12.6.2014; Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal, ‘A new European administration?’, presentation at a full-day seminar organised by The Delegation of Norway to the EU, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation, with civil servants and high-level policy makers, including the active participation of Ingvild Næss Stub, State Secretary to the Minister of EU/EEA affairs and Paul Chaffey, State Secretary to the Minister of Local Government and Modernisation, 23.4.2015.

[7] ‘ARENA contributes to increased understanding and a more open debate. As a result, wiser and better decisions are made’, Norwegian Minister for EU/EEA Affairs Vidar Helgesen at the ARENA Lecture, 4.3.2014 (published in *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 02/2014 as ‘Grunnlov, EØS og demokrati’ and podcast available at ARENA’s website).

[8] Three separate public debates were organised with ARENA researchers and Members of Parliament: (1) ‘Er norsk EU-tilpasning i strid med grunnloven?’, Helene Sjursen (Fredrik Sejersted and Eirik Holmøyvik, chair Cathrine Holst) in debate with MPs Nikolai Astrup (H), Ingrid Fiskaa (SV), Svein Roald Hansen (Ap), Morten Høglund (FrP), Erlend Grimstad (Sp), and Hans Olav Syversen (KrF) at the House of Literature, 29.8.2013; (2) ‘Norge, EØS og et EU i forvandling’, seminar at the Norwegian Parliament where Egeberg, Eriksen, Olsen and Sjursen presented relevant research and discussed opportunities and restrictions for Norway with MPs, 5.6.2014; (3) ‘EU og grunnlovene’, debate at the House of Literaure with MPs Jette Christensen (Ap), Michael Tetzschner
We have a job to do in equipping our system to allow for a better and more operational debate on European politics and we are currently in a situation where we are not able to clarify the issue regarding article 93. I’m very pleased that ARENA contributes to that discussion, MP Jette Christensen during the ARENA-organised debate ‘EU and the constitutions’, 4.11.2014. MP Per Olaf Lundteigen referred to the book while posing a question to the Minister of EU/EEA Affairs Vidar Helgesen following the Minister’s biannual address to the Storting on EU and EEA matters, 10.11.2015.

John Erik Fossum interviewed by Charlotte Dubenskij, TRT World (TV): ‘Money Talks: Norway model for Brexit?’, 20.7.2016 (available at: https://youtu.be/Bd4QyrSp0Fo); ‘Norway: A Model For Brexit?’, John Erik Fossum, radio interview with BBC World Service, Business Daily, 14.6.2016 (http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p03xj8r5); Erik O. Eriksen, radio interview with Deutsche Welle, 22.6.2016; Jarle Trondal interviewed by The Economist, ‘Norway’s deal with the EU still holds lessons for Britain’, 4.2.2017. John Erik Fossum contributed to several debates in the UK, most notably ‘In or Out? Informing the political debate and popular opinion on UK’s EU membership’, organised by the James Madison Charitable Trust and the University of Kent in London, 21.4.2016, with MPs Sir William Cash, Timothy Kirkhope (Conservative), Lord Donoughue, Richard Corbett (Labour), Julie Smith (Lib.Dem.) and Bill Etheridge (UKIP) followed by dinner, and the conference ‘Understanding European Challenges’, organised by The Royal Society of Edinburgh, the Centre on Constitutional Change, and UK in a Changing Europe, in Edinburgh, 16.2.2016 (report available at http://rse.mtcserver6.com/cms/files/events/reports/2016/Understanding_European_Challenges.pdf). After the latter event, John Erik Fossum had a one-hour interview with Katy Orr and Iain McIver from the Scottish Parliament’s European and External Relations Committee, who summed up the meeting as follows: ‘It was extremely helpful for us in terms of understanding the Norwegian position, particularly as I think the Committee had heard a rather rose-tinted perspective from the Norwegian officials that gave evidence to it’. Fossum was subsequently invited to give evidence to the Scottish Parliament on 17.11.2016.

Public/stakeholder events:

- ‘EU og det norske paradoks’, book launch and debate at the House of Literature. Contributions by Eriksen, Holmøyvik, Fossum and Sjursen, comments from Kristin Clemet and Sten Inge Jørgensen and an ensuing discussion, 17 March 2014
- ‘Popular Rule Towards 2050: What Are the Main Challenges Facing Democracy and Popular Rule?’, John Erik Fossum, Constitution Seminar, Frogn municipality,
Drøbak, 16 May 2014

• ‘Grunnloven vs EØS - Hva har vi egentlig å feire i jubileumsåret?’, Erik O. Eriksen, Protestfestivalen, Kristiansand, 18 September 2014

• ‘Democratic constitutionalism in Europe’, NORCONE concluding conference, part of the Norwegian Parliament’s and the UiO’s official programme for the 2014 bicentennial constitutional celebration, 4-6 November 2014

• ‘All makt i denne sal? ...eller i EU-regimet’, Helene Sjursen, Saturday Lecture ‘Er Stortinget satt på sidelinjen?’ on the occasion of the 2014 Constitutional Bicentennial, 1 November 2014, aired on NRK2 31 January 2015 [available online at Kunnskapskanalen, www.nrk.no]

• ‘Is living under the EEA Agreement akin to “independence under hegemony”?’, John Erik Fossum, ‘EEA: State of Play and Future Challenges Conference’, Institute of International Affairs, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, 10 April 2015


• ‘Hvorfor klikker ingen på EU?’, Erik O. Eriksen, book launch and debate with Minister for EU/EEA Affairs Vidar Helgesen and journalist Alf Ole Ask, Oslo, 23 September 2015


• ‘Will Britain end up like Norway?’, John Erik Fossum and Christopher Lord, panel discussion, House of Literature, Oslo, 26 October 2015

• ‘Is Brexit akin to independence under hegemony?’, Erik O. Eriksen, John Erik Fossum and Christopher Lord, European Studies Centre, St Antony’s College, University of Oxford, 10 November 2015

• Egeberg, Morten, ‘Nasjonale direktorater og tilsyn – også styrt av EU-kommisjonen?’, course on agency management, Oslo, 4 December 2015

• ‘Brexit ahead’, John Erik Fossum, public debate organised by ARENA and British Politics Society, House of Literature, Oslo, 10 May 2016

Popularised findings/comments/op-eds:

• ‘Mot en felles europeisk forvaltning’, Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal, Stat & Styring - Tidsskrift for politikk og forvaltning, 2/2014

• ‘En ny form for integrasjon’, op-ed by Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal, Aftenposten, 5 February 2014

• ‘Skattlegging uten representasjon’, op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, Dagens Næringsliv, 7 January 2014

• ‘Jubileum med bismak’, op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, Dagbladet, 3 March 2014

• ‘Paradokset i jubileumsåret’, op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, Bergens Tidende, 15 May 2014


• ‘Europas forente stater’, op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, Dagbladet, 9 September 2014

• ‘Demokratisk selvskading.’ op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, VG, 4 November 2014

• ‘Britain and the European Union: four futures’, Chris Lord, British Politics Review,
No. 3, Summer 2015

- ‘Norway entrapped in the EU’, op-ed by Erik O. Eriksen, 9 November 2015
- ‘Should I stay or should I go’, John Erik Fossum, Centre on Constitutional Change’s blog, 27 May 2016
- ‘What does Norway do?’, John Erik Fossum, Prospect Magazine, 6 June 2016

Media items (not exhaustive):

- Flaggar ut makta, interview with Erik O. Eriksen, Nationen, 10 January 2014
- Forskere mener EØS truer demokratiet, NRK, Nationen, Adresseavisen, Stavanger Aftenblad, Hallingdalen, Møre-nytt, Fremover, Avisa Nordland, Framtida, Hordaland, 21 January 2014
- EU-paradoks ved Norges grunnlovsjubileum, interview with Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum, Juristkontakt no. 2/2014
- Er det norske sjølvstyre i fare?, interview with John Erik Fossum, Bladet Forsknings no. 1/2014
- Lobbylandet, interview with Erik O. Eriksen, DN Magasinet, 8 March 2014
- ‘Det umyndige Norge’, comment by Per Anders Madsen, Aftenposten, 9 March 2014
- Akademisk alenegang, book review, Klassekampen Bokmagasinet, 15 February 2014
- Har redusert sjølvstendet og tapt medverknad i EU, interview with Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum, Apollon no. 1/2014
- Gammel EU-temperatur blusset opp igjen, Smaalenenes Avis, 22 March 2014
- Norway’s Constitution and EU affiliation, radio interview with Erik O. Eriksen, Historietimen, NRK P2, 13 April 2014
- 1814 på 24 timer, TV lectures by Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum, NRK, 10 May 2014 [available online at www.nrk.no]
- De norska EU-lobbarna har gått under jorden, interview with Erik O. Eriksen, Hufvudstadsbladet, 22 May 2014
- Suvereniteten utfordres, interview with Jarle Trondal, Ukesavisen Ledelse, 22 August 2014
- ARENA på jakt etter demokrati i Europa: – Norges befolkning er i ferd med å bli annenrangs i Europa, ABC Nyheter, 4 November 2014
- ‘Brexit and the UK’s future’, 22 June 2015 (also available at sciencenordic.com)
- Oslo-forskere gir britene råd om livet utenfor EU, Christopher Lord, ABC Nyheter [interview], 24 June 2015
- Norsk EU-politikk er ikke aktiv, men dominert av direktorater, Jarle Trondal, Ukeavisen Ledelse, 9 October 2015.
- ‘What options for EU non-members?’, 26 October 2015
- ‘Norway entrapped in the EU’, Erik O. Eriksen, ARENA blog, 9 November 2015
- ‘Democracy lost for non-members’, 21 December 2015
# Impact case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of impact case: <strong>NORWEU</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of the impact:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewing Norway’s EU affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2008, ARENA’s researchers published a series of analyses reviewing Norway’s affiliation with the EU. These analyses suggested that the depth and breadth of Norway’s entanglements with the EU were far more extensive than what had so far been assumed. These research findings played a central role in prompting the Norwegian Government to appoint a broad-based independent committee to undertake a thorough review of the EEA Agreement in 2010. The ensuing 900-pages report – used daily as a source of information for civil servants in all Norwegian ministries – draws principally on research provided by ARENA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the research underpinning the impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARENA has documented how the process of European integration transforms the legal, political, economic and social relations within member and affiliated non-member states. Further, ARENA’s research highlighted how the process of integration had led to the development of an autonomous EU polity, embodying a reorganisation of political power in Europe and a transformation of government structures (Erik O. Eriksen 2005). With the concept of Europeanisation, Johan P. Olsen (2002) pointed to the manner in which nation states are transformed to member states under the weight of European integration. This understanding of Europeanisation was applied to analyses of states across Europe. Under the heading of European integration a range of separate publications documented how closely integrated Norway had become in the legal and economic arrangements developed. A critical moment where these findings were systematically assembled, supplemented with new insights and made publicly available, was on 3-4 March 2008 when Helene Sjursen and John Erik Fossum, co-organised a conference in Bergen to revisit the implications of Norway’s particular affiliation with the EU. The main articles presented at this conference were revised and subsequently published in a special issue of Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift in 2008, edited by Fossum and Sjursen. Through six articles, Norway’s EU affiliation was scrutinised and assessed. The special issue was unprecedented in the way in which it pulled together systematic assessments from a range of issue areas that had not been considered in conjunction before. Firstly, this broad-based assessment showed that the extent of Norway’s EU incorporation was far more extensive than was generally assumed and commented-upon among politicians and publics alike. Since the contributions contained chapters on the EEA Agreement as well as issues not covered by this agreement – under the headings of justice and home affairs (the Schengen and Dublin agreements) and foreign and security affairs – the special issue made apparent for all to see that Norway’s EU affiliation affected virtually all aspects of Norwegian society and economy. Second, the publication made clear how dynamic the EEA Agreement was, and how difficult it was to delimit what was EEA-relevant and what was not, especially since...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norway was so closely integrated in EU activities not formally part of the EEA Agreement.

Third, two of the contributions to the special issue relied on the broad-based assessment of Norway’s EU affiliation made available in the other contributions and showed how pressing the issue of democracy was for Norway.

Details of the impact

Enhancing public awareness of the deep political and legal implications of Norway’s adaptation to the EU

ARENA’s research played a central role in prompting the Norwegian Government to undertake a review of the EEA Agreement in 2010 [1]. Norwegian society has for decades been torn over the issue of EU membership, despite the fact that Norway has become deeply incorporated into the EU. On 7 January 2010, the Norwegian Government appointed a broad-based independent committee to undertake a research-based review of the Norway’s agreements with the EU. The decision was based on an unprecedented political compromise aimed at addressing pressing political concerns regarding the implications of Norway’s agreements with the EU, without reopening the question of Norwegian membership in the Union.

Constituting the key knowledge source for the writing of the Report

The EEA expert review committee presented its work in an official report on 17 January 2012 (NOU 2012:2) [2]. This is an extensive report covering all aspects of Norway’s relations with the EU. It formed the basis for a white paper to the Norwegian Parliament [3]. The NOU is used daily as a source of information and reference for civil servants in all Norwegian ministries handling some aspect of Norway’s relations with the EU [4]. Jan Ole Gudmundsen, senior adviser in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and responsible for the preparations leading to the establishment of the EEA expert review committee in 2010 confirms that ‘The task of the EEA review committee was very challenging given the very ambitious mandate given to it by the government. It would clearly not have been possible to carry it out successfully within the given time frame of two years without the existing research from ARENA’ [5]. Two of ARENA’s researchers were invited to sit on the Committee: Helene Sjursen (committee member) and Ulf Sverdrup (head of the secretariat). They were key actors in communicating the findings from ARENA’s research to the rest of the Committee [6]. The Committee also commissioned two external reports from ARENA researchers: Morten Egeberg and Jarle Trondal, and Åse Gornitzka and Meng Hsuan Chou [7]. The 2008 special issue of Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift was identified as key reference for the Committee’s work and was circulated to all members prior to their first working session [8].

References to the research (scientific publications)


• ‘Norge og EU – rett og politikk’ [Norway and the EU – law and politics], John Erik Fossum and Helene Sjursen (eds), Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift, 4/2008.

• John Erik Fossum and Cathrine Holst, ‘Norske intellektuelles syn på EU’ [Norwegian intellectuals’ views on the EU], Internasjonal Politikk, 67(3), 2009, pp. 441-52.

References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.):


[4] This is confirmed by Maria Martens, Senior Adviser, Secretariat of the Minister for EEA and EU Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, e-mail, 2.2.2017 (see attached testimonial).

[5] Jan Ole Gudmunsen, Senior Adviser, Department of European Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, e-mail, 1.2.2017 (see attached testimonial). He further confirms ‘ARENA research has played a major role in improving the understanding of the EU and the EEA and as such the quality of the European debate in Norway. And although difficult to state precisely, the very idea of an EEA review would have been difficult to imagine without ARENA.’

[6] Incidentally, the Norwegian Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre also drew on concepts coined by ARENA researchers when reporting to the Norwegian parliament on the country’s relations with the EU (Address by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Storting on EU and EEA matters, 5.5.2009): ‘Matters that used to be addressed at the national level have been Europeanised, and the shaping of politics and regulations [law and politics] increasingly take place within a European framework’.


[8] E-mail from the Chair of the Committee Fredrik Sejersted to the committee members, 20.1.2010 (on file with Helene Sjursen).

Media

• Helene Sjursen, radio interview with BBC, January 2013

External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases):

• Maria Martens, Senior Adviser, Secretariat of the Minister for EEA and EU Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see attached testimonial).

• Jan Ole Gudmunsen, Senior Adviser, Department of European Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see attached testimonial).
To whom it may concern

I was official in the Ministry of foreign affairs responsible for the preparations leading to the establishment of the EEA expert review committee in 2010. I had a central advisory role in the definition of the mandate and in the selection of its members as well as the establishment of the secretariat for the committee.

The expert committee was mainly composed of academic experts in the field of European integration and Norwegian European policy, with many of its members as well as those of its secretariat having a background from the Centre for European Studies, ARENA.

The report presented by the Committee was very extensive (911 pages) and did to a considerable extent draw on existing academic research, not entirely, but in large part carried out by ARENA and researchers affiliated to ARENA.

The task of the EEA review committee was very challenging given the very ambitious mandate given to it by the government.

It would clearly not have been possible to carry it out successfully within the given time frame of two years without the existing research from ARENA.

ARENA research has played a major role in improving the understanding of the EU and the EEA and as such the quality of the European debate in Norway. And although difficult to state precisely, the very idea of an EEA review would have been difficult to imagine without ARENA.

During the period 2001-2008 I carried out numerous studies on the EEA agreement and the Norwegian government administration at Statskonsult, a government public policy body (now Difi). These were studies with a practical purpose but strongly influenced by the academic research carried out by ARENA.

Jan Ole Gudmundsen
Senior adviser

Department of European Affairs
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Tel: +47 23950590 – Mob: +47 941 33 336
Jagu@mfa.no
www.government.no/mfa
To whom it may concern,
I hereby confirm that the report NOU 2012:2 is in frequent use in the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and it is used both by bureaucrats and politicians in their daily work within the European policy field. The report covers all aspects of Norway’s relations with the EU, and it is very well written. We recently ordered some new copies.

Best regards,

Maria Martens
### Name of impact case: SREX Report

#### Summary of the impact

The research group has had a documented impact on international climate change policy. The impact case presented here describes a key role in providing the knowledge that justified the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Special Report on Extreme Events (SREX). The group’s research knowledge allowed the Norwegian Government to propose a special IPCC report, after a first proposal was dismissed. The research group mobilized its research network and produced a commissioned report for the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The proposal was accepted and the research group played a key role in the production and dissemination of the SREX report.

#### Description of the research underpinning the impact

The research underpinning the argument for an IPCC special report on *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation* highlighted the relationship between three themes: Human security, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk reduction.

*Human security* was a key research theme of the Global Environmental Change and Human Security (GECHS) project, whose international project office was based at ISS. Human security research focuses on the capacity of individuals and groups to respond to threats, and it raises questions about equity, ethics and environmental justice. The research recognizes that climate change cannot be dealt with as an isolated environmental issue and that the social context is an important determinant of risk and vulnerability. The relevant research on human security was published in “*Global Environmental Change and Human Security*,” edited by Richard Matthews, Jon Barnett, Brian McDonald and Karen O’Brien (MIT Press, Cambridge, 2010) and “*Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*,” edited by Karen O’Brien, Asunción Lera St. Clair and Berit Kristoffersen (Cambridge Press, 2010).

The research group has also conducted leading research on how individuals and communities adapt to a changing climate. Through the PLAN project, which was the largest social science project to date in Norway, the group focused on adaptation as a social process. The research adopted holistic and integral approaches to adaptation, with special focus on how culture, values and worldviews influence what is considered responses and answers to the climate challenge. By defining adaptation as a social, cultural and human process that is non-linear and often non-rational, the research went beyond the traditional discussions of adaptation to include deeper analyses of subjective perceptions and attitudes. An important outcome of this research on adaptation has been “*Adapting to Climate Change: Thresholds, Values, Governance*”, edited by Neil Adger, Irene Lorenzoni and Karen O’Brien (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Karen O’Brien served as a coordinating lead author on Chapter 8 “Towards a Sustainable and Resilient Future” and was on the writing team for the Summary for Policy Makers. Linda Sygna and Kirsten Ulsrud were contributing authors to Chapter 8, and Linda Sygna was Review Editor for Chapter 7. The research group was also actively involved in disseminating the report through outreach events around the world, and organized an “Extreme Dialogue on
Extreme Events” in 2013 at the University of Oslo, which brought together national and international stakeholders to discuss risk and vulnerability to extreme events.

Details of the impact

The IPCC is a scientific and intergovernmental body set up in 1988 under the auspices of the United Nations. It received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2007 (shared with Albert Gore) "for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change." The five Assessment Reports published since 1990 provide state-of-the-art knowledge about climate change through three Working Groups on I) the physical basis, II) impacts, vulnerability and adaptation, and III) mitigation. Special reports are produced at the requests of governments to fill in knowledge gaps on themes of importance to society.

The IPCC Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation” (SREX) has had an important impact on society’s understanding of the relationship between climate change, extreme events, and disaster risk. The SREX report established links between human-induced climate change and some extreme weather events and drew attention to strategies for reducing risk and vulnerability. It was considered a novel report in terms of both science and policy, as it involved an interdisciplinary collaboration between researchers in Working Groups I and II, while at the same time it was written by an interdisciplinary writing team that included experts from UNISDR, WHO, and Red Cross/Red Crescent Society, who were later able to incorporate the findings into policies and practices.

The research group participated in both international dissemination and capacity related to the SREX report, with support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The international launch of the SREX report took place at the University of Oslo from 24-25 January in 2012. After the report was published, the IPCC, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Norway’s Climate and Pollution Agency (KLIF), Norway’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN) organized a series of regional outreach events for policymakers, business leaders, academics and civil society organizations.

The outreach events presented the findings of the report and informed stakeholders about the possible impacts of and options for managing the risks of climate extremes and disasters in the regions. The regional events were designed to bridge the gap between science and practice by improving access to, and use of, the latest science and social science information on changing disaster risks, to better anticipate climate-related disasters and build resilience.

References to the research (scientific publications)


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact
See the three Reference Letters attached
See the attached copy of Nobel Peace Prize

External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Utenriksdepartementet (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
- Arman Aardal (now retired) <armaa@online.no>
- Marit Viktoria Pettersen Pettersen Marit.Viktoria.Pettersen@mfa.no

Miljødirektoratet (Norwegian Environment Agency)
- Øyvind Christophersen <oyvind.christophersen@miljodir.no>,
- Solrun Figenschau Skjellum <solrun.figenschau.skjellum@miljodir.no>
- Ole-Kristian Kvissel <ole.kristian.kvissel@miljodir.no>

Attachment 1-3: Reference letters
Attachment 4: Copy of Nobel Peace Prize
### Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words):

Professor Kristian Stokke has contributed to political capacity building among civil society organizations (CSOs) advocating peace and democracy in Myanmar. Lectures, courses and workshops have been held for CSOs and political parties to disseminate research knowledge about the character and shortcomings of transitions to peace and democracy, and about comparative experiences with transformative politics for substantive democratization and conflict resolution. These activities have been carried out since 2012, in collaboration with Myanmar, Norwegian and Swedish civil society organizations. This work has contributed to increased political capacity among CSOs, and new collaborative research on politics of peace and democracy in Myanmar.

### Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)

The research basis consists of contextual and comparative studies of the political dynamics and challenges of transitions to peace and democracy, and the need and strategies for democratic transformative politics. This work has been done in collaboration with Professor Olle Törnquist (Department of Political Science, University of Oslo) and a network of international scholars working on politics and development in different parts of the Global South. Stokke and Törnquist have taken the lead in producing a series of three research anthologies that examines (1) challenges and shortcomings of democratic transitions and local democracy (Harriss, Stokke and Törnquist 2004); (2) problems of substantive popular political representation (Törnquist, Webster and Stokke 2009); and (3) strategies and experiences of democratic transformative politics in Scandinavia and the Global South (Stokke and Törnquist 2013). Stokke has in addition to this especially examined the linkages between illiberal democracy and intrastate conflict in Sri Lanka and the political dynamics and obstacles to conflict resolution through state reforms (Stokke and Uyangoda 2011). He has also co-directed a research project on the post-transition politics of citizenship in Indonesia (Hiariej and Stokke 2017). The research in Sri Lanka and Indonesia has been carried out in close collaboration with researchers at University of Colombo (Sri Lanka) and Universitas Gadjah Mada (Indonesia). These and other research activities and publications, including earlier work on post-apartheid social movements in South Africa, have created a comparative knowledge basis for analysing the dynamics and challenges of popular politics for peace and democracy in Myanmar. Since 2012, Stokke has examined the character of the democratic opening of Myanmar, as well as international peace engagement, political parties and civil society politics in Myanmar (Stokke, Khine Win and Soe Myint Aung 2015, Stokke 2017, Stokke, Stave, Temesgen and Soe Myint Aung 2017). In the absence of well-functioning social sciences at university level in Myanmar, this research has relied on collaboration with informal schools and think-tanks in civil society, including Myanmar ethnic organizations that are based or meet in Chiang Mai (Thailand). And since there are few funding opportunities available for such research, the work has relied on Stokke’s own research time combined with internal small grants (“Småforsk”) from ISS. The research in Sri Lanka and Indonesia, which forms a basis for the Myanmar research, has been funded by the Research Council of Norway, Norad’s NOMA and NUFU programs and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Norway’s Embassy in Indonesia.
Stokke’s work in Myanmar is based on experiences from Indonesia and Sri Lanka, where he and Törnquist have led collaborative projects in research and higher education with the University of Colombo and Universitas Gadjah Mada. In both cases there has been a strong focus on state/society-relations, including research and dissemination in civil society.

This model has not been directly transferable to Myanmar because of the weak state of higher education (especially in the social sciences) and lack of funding opportunities. Instead, Stokke has organised small-scale research collaboration with civil society partners based on internal ISS funding and dissemination through resource centers and training organizations in civil society. Important partners have been Yangon School of Political Science (YSPS), Sandhi Governance Institute and Tagaung Institute of Political Studies (TIPS) in Yangon; Burma Resource Centre (BRC) in Chiang Mai, the Norwegian Burma Committee (NBK); the Swedish Burma Committee and the Olof Palme International Center.

The key dissemination activities include: (1) a diploma course on “Democratization and Civil Society” with YSPS (Yangon, 2014); (2) a workshop with BRC for ethnic civil organizations on “International Peace Engagement” (Chiang Mai, 2012); (3) a workshop with Sandhi and NBK for ethnic political organizations on “Democracy and Civil Society” (Yangon, 2013); (4) contributions to two-day training workshops on “Democracy, governance and civil society” for CSOs (Hpa-An, Mawlamyine and Mandalay, 2014-2015); and (5) contributions to a two-day CSO workshop held by SBK and the Palme Center (Yangon, 2016). There are also plans for forthcoming dissemination and capacity building activities in collaboration with ethnic civil society schools in Shan State and Kachin State.

In terms of impact, these dissemination activities have especially contributed to (1) increased knowledge and critical reflections on the character and shortcomings of international peace engagement, as seen in the critique of the Myanmar Peace Support Initiative from 2012; (2) a more critical understanding of the democratic opening, as seen in the shift from earlier representations of the democratic opening as an elite negotiated transition, to an emphasis on the autocratic dynamics and semi-authoritarian outcomes of the reforms; and (3) increased reflectivity on the need for transformative political agendas and broad alliances between CSOs, political parties and state actors. These represent observable changes in Myanmar politics in recent years. While these shifts cannot be directly attributed to the aforementioned dissemination activities, these activities have supported and furthered vital dynamics in civil and political society in Myanmar.

References to the research (scientific publications)

Key publications on conceptual, contextual and comparative analyses of transitions to peace and democracy:


Key publications on contextual politics of peace and democracy in Sri Lanka and Indonesia:
Evaluation of Social Science Research in Norway


Key publications on politics of peace and democracy in Myanmar:


### References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)

Norad assessment of the UiO/UGM collaboration in Indonesia:  

Article in Aftenposten A-magasinet about Norway’s peace engagement in Myanmar, including Stokke’s role in disseminating knowledge about international peacebuilding:  

### External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

**Scandinavian civil society resource organizations**:  
Frida Perjus, Olof Palme International Center, Sweden.  
Audun Aagre, The Norwegian Burma Committee.

**Myanmar civil society resource organizations**:  
1. Pippa Curwen, Director, Burma Resource Centre, Chiang Mai, Thailand. E-mail: [brcentrecm@gmail.com](mailto:brcentrecm@gmail.com)
2. Khine Win, Director, Sandhi Governance Institute, Yangon, Myanmar. E-mail: [khine64@gmail.com](mailto:khine64@gmail.com)

- Attachment for CivSociety: External references
**Institution:** Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo

**Research discipline/panel:** Human Geography

**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** SolarX

**Name of impact case:** SolarX

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)**

The project has led to impacts on the energy sector in Kenya through inspiring new activities incorporating the use of solar photovoltaic (solar PV) technology carried out by the Kenyan government. The project also led to long-term processes of research experimentation and learning on decentralized solar power supply for government officials, practitioners, people in remote villages, social scientists and other participants.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

The research projects *Solar Transitions* (2009-2014) and *Solar xChange* (2012-2017) have been led by Karen O’Brien and Kirsten Ulsrud, and included Ulsrud’s doctoral thesis. The research addressed the shortcomings of conventional strategies for electricity provision by studying alternative decentralized solutions and emerging transitions to solar power and other types of renewable energy. An international group that was interdisciplinary (several social science disciplines involved) and transdisciplinary (engineers and practitioners involved as participants) carried out the research. The project participants were based in Norway, Austria, Kenya and India. Several in-depth case studies on pioneering activities in India, Kenya and Senegal were carried out. The project group developed an analytical framework suitable for understanding experiences from technology projects and attempts to scale up new renewable energy models as part of system innovation, investigating a wide range of dimension and levels of social and technological change.

While the three case studies in India (in two different states) and Senegal were based on a relatively conventional methodological approach, the research in Kenya was different and this was the main reason for the impacts of the two projects on the solar energy activities in Kenya. Here the project developed and implemented a solar power supply in a cluster of villages in Kenya through action research, and as part of the process, transferred innovations and experience from India to Kenya. The pilot project in Kenya was done through a long process of research and planning to create a model that suited this particular context, in close cooperation with people in remote villages. The social science research was used both as input in the process and for analysis of the outcomes.

The work and results of the projects has been communicated through different events such as a large study tour and workshop in India in 2010 for a group of energy experts from Kenya, Norway and India as well as other workshops in 2012, 2013, 2015 and 2016 in the other countries involved in this research (Norway and Kenya). Other dissemination activities include a documentary film on our pilot project in Kenya and a report for practitioners about the energy model.

**Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)**

The group’s research on how people in rural areas in the Global south can get access to electricity has – among other achievements – had an impact on;

1. A cluster of villages in Kenya, especially in terms of what women are capable of doing as managers of the supply of local solar power.
The practical solar project carried out in Kenya gave an interesting extended effect locally in terms of changed views on the capacity of women. The Norwegian social scientists pushed for involving women in the planning process, and used young women as research assistants. One of these became the manager of the Energy Center, including the sub-centers in neighboring villages. This has led to a preference for hiring women for jobs in this electricity provision. Every time a new person is needed, the existing staff trains a new woman for the job, selecting young, unemployed women who have finished secondary school, and several of these have used the job as an entry point into higher education or other jobs later.

2. The pilot project in Kenya and our invitation to an interested government official to study solar energy experiences in India together with several other Kenyans in 2010 led to two main effects on the Kenyan electricity sector. Firstly, the government official obtained information in India that enabled him to convince the Ministry of Energy to give him permission to try out some ideas for new ways of using solar power in Kenya. Through his job at the Kenya Power, the Kenyan electricity utility, he installed solar power to reduce the diesel consumption in power plants previously run on diesel only, and 20 power plants have now become such diesel-solar hybrids.

Secondly, the project inspired the creation of a long-term activity to increase access to electric light in remote areas through the charging of portable lanterns (and mobile phones) by solar charging stations. Currently, solar charging stations are being started up in 420 villages with 24,000 portable lamps in total.

3. The project has led to rich joint-learning processes and the creation of new networks that have enabled pioneering actors in the renewable energy field in Kenya to move forward with their work, for instance through Kenya Renewable Energy Association and SunTranfer (a private sector company). The project has served as an arena for bridging the domains of practitioners and social science studies and thereby bridging knowledge and action.

References to the research (scientific publications)


**References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)**

Documentary movie on pilot project in Kenya (http://vimeo.com/mgfilm/ikisayaenergycentre)

Ulsrud, Kirsten (2010). Solar Learning: Facilitating South-South-North transfer of social and technological innovations on solar energy. Workshop and field excursion on solar energy in India in Kolkata and the Sunderban Islands from 9\textsuperscript{th} to 14\textsuperscript{th} February 2010. Final project report, July 2010.

**External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases)**

- Henry Gichungi, Equatorial Sunpower
- Ben Kimathi, Manager, SunTransfer Kenya Ltd

- Attachment to SolarX: External references
Summary of the impact

The governmentally appointed independent expert committee was the first of its kind in a Norwegian context – scrutinizing the relationship between international migration and the sustainability of the Norwegian Welfare Model. The report has had a quite significant national impact on both approaches to policy and public discourse. It served to increase the public knowledge base and contributed to the generation of legitimacy for more open discussions on contentious issues related to immigration and integration. The report was delivered in 2011, and a new committee, with similar terms of reference was appointed in 2015 (delivered 1 February 2017).

Description of the research underpinning the impact

The committee consisted of key researchers in the field, the majority whom were economists. The head of the committee however, was a professor of Sociology, Grete Brochmann, who has been involved in migration research since the early 1980s. Professor Brochmann’s research portfolio covers a range of areas of relevance for policy-making in the field of immigration/integration: EU-migration policy, labour immigration, integration theory and policy, historical/structural features of the Norwegian immigration regime, refugee policy, etc. Other central researchers on the committee were: Senior Researcher Knut Røed, Research Director Anne Britt Djuve, Professor of History Einar Niemi, Professor of Economy Torben Andersen. All these members had been doing research – from different disciplines and research angles – over many years. A common denominator was expertise in welfare state issues. The time frame for the commission’s work was two years.

Details of impact

The recommendations in NOU 2011:7 must be viewed in light of general, on-going reform processes in welfare and labour policies to reduce the negative effects of demographic distortions and to counteract the increased uptake of national insurance benefits. An important objective was to increase employment, particularly among groups who are marginalised in the labour market and who are less qualified. The principal initiatives in the recommendations concerned shifting cash transfers to services when possible, and focused heavily on activation, qualification and adaptation: participation requirements relating to different welfare benefits, i.e. basic education, training and qualification adapted to the immigrants’ starting points and adaptation for employers to make it easier to employ people with immigrant backgrounds.

These recommendations joined the general repertoire applied by the Norwegian authorities in their efforts to involve marginalised groups in the labour market. However, an important contribution from NOU 2011:7 was the greater inclusion of issues relating to people with...
immigrant backgrounds into these general reform processes. The trade-offs between using
general or more targeted measures were an important part of the analyses.

It is possible to trace the impact of the recommendations in NOU 2011:7 in several policy
initiatives since 2011, although these recommendations were probably only one factor
among several triggers. Some relevant examples:

- Removal of the cash-for-care benefit for two-year-old children that do not attend a
kindergarten which is subsidised by the government.
- Expansion nationwide of the scheme providing free kindergarten to low-income
families, including three-year-old children, in addition to four- to five- year-olds.
- A new disability pension scheme, which facilitated the combination of work and
pension benefits and implied the removal a supplementary benefit to spouses.
- New activity requirements for the transitional benefit to single mothers or fathers
and for social assistance.
- Access to language training as part of ALMP-programs for citizens of EEA
countries.

References to the research (scientific publications)

Brochmann, Grete and A.S Grødem (2013) “Migration and welfare sustainability. The case of

Grødem, A.S. (2016), Family-oriented policies in Scandinavia and the challenge of
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Grødem, A.S. (2015), De norske trygdene i møte med et europeisk arbeidsmarked, I Bay,
A.H., Hagelund, A. & Hatland, A. (eds.), For mange på trygd? Velferdspolitiske
spenninger. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk

Grødem, Anne Skevik. "Migration som en udfordring for de nordiske velfærdsstater."
Økonomi & Politik 85.4 (2012).

Annfelt, Trine, and Berit Gullikstad. "Kjønnslaksestilling i inkluderingens tjeneste?." 

Friberg, Jon Horgen. "The'Guest-Worker Syndrome'Revisited?." Nordic Journal of

Simonnes, Kamilla. "I stjålte klær?--En analyse av endringer i Høyres, Arbeiderpartiets og
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tidsskrift 29.02 (2013): 144-158.


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases)*

Barbro Bakken, Director General, Ministry of Justice
Joakim Bakke, Director General, Minister of Education

- Attachment to Brochmann: External references
As an expert, professor Anne Lise Ellingsæter has participated and headed policy processes that have documented impact on the development of Norwegian family policies. The impact case presented here describes her participation in two government committees appointed to evaluate and propose policy reform. 1) She was a member of a government commission appointed in 2007 to propose reforms to Barneloven (Children Act) (NOU 2008: 9). 2) She was the head of a government expert commission appointed in 2015 to evaluate and propose reform to the Norwegian family policy system of cash transfers and services (NOU 2017: x).

Ellingsæter’s research covers the study of family policy from a wide range of perspectives. She has studied the development of the parental leave systems in Norway and the other Nordic countries, including the impact on work-family reconciliation, and she has analysed policy debates on the “daddy quota”/paternal leave quota. She has done comparative research on the historical development of cash for care benefit reforms and their impact in the Nordic countries, as well as more general comparative work on Nordic family policies. She has also studied childcare services in Norway, covering both institutional and attitudinal change. She has done research on working time and social time, and studied work-family issues more generally. The relationship between family policy and fertility is another research interest.

Ellingsæter has been invited as an expert in various contexts. She was appointed to the committee set up by the Research Council of Norway to evaluate the impact of the controversial introduction of the cash for care benefit reform in 1998. In 2013 the Socialutskottet/Swedish Parliament invited her to give a talk on the Norwegian cash for care benefit in a hearing about Swedish policy reform. She was invited to write a report for the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Berlin in connection with the German debate on family policy reform in 2012. In recent years she has been invited to seminars in the Ministry of Children and Gender Equality Affairs (2014), and to talk about Nordic family policies in the Nordic embassies in Berlin (2015).

1) Ellingsæter participated in a government commission on the evaluation of Barneloven (Children Act). The mandate given to this commission was to evaluate changes in the Children Act with regard to regulation of parental custody, permanent residence and visitation rights. The aim was to assess changes in the law from a perspective where both parents are supposed to be equally important to the child, also after parental break up. The commission’s evaluations and recommendations were presented in the green paper NOU 2008: 9 Med barnet i fokus – en gjennomgang av barnelovens regler om foreldresansvar, bosted og samvær. In addition to being a commission member, Ellingsæter contributed an
Evaluation of Social Science Research in Norway

appendix on The best interest of the child to the report. As is the case with most NOUs, the report and its recommendations were first subject to a hearing process, after which the report was considered by the Parliament’s standing committee on Family and Cultural Affairs. A law reform following the commission’s recommendations on several points (see documentation below) was proposed to Parliament (Stortinget), and amendments were adopted.

2) Ellingsæter was the head of a government expert commission appointed to evaluate and recommend reform in Norwegian family policy system, resulting in the green paper NOU 2017: X Offentlig støtte til barnefamiene. This is the first commission in 20 years to evaluate the whole system of cash transfers and services to families with children. The commission was given a comprehensive mandate: 1) To describe policies, including child benefits, parental leave, cash for care benefit, child care services, after school care, benefits to single parents, child allowances in social security benefits, support to students with children, housing allowances, tax benefits; 2) To discuss what the aims of family policies should be; 3) Discuss the extent to which re-distributional aims versus work incentives should be taken into account in the formulation of policies; 4) Recommend changes, with the aim to reduce child poverty and secure efficient use of resources; 5) Make particular assessments of alternative arrangements of child benefits; assess whether cash transfers should be substituted by services; assess the consequences of recommendation, including export of social benefits.

The Commission’s report will be submitted to the Minister of Children and Gender Equality 6 March 2017. The report will then enter a similar process as NOU 2008: 9.

References to the research (selected scientific publications)

Books


Chapters/journal articles


Ellingsæter, A.L (2012) Cash for childcare: Experiences from Finland, Norway and Sweden. Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (also available in German),


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact


- Hearing: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/horing---nou-2008-9-med-barnet-i-fokus--/id511060/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation from the standing committee on Family and Cultural affairs (Innstillinger fra familie- og kulturkomiteen om lov om endringer i barnelova mv. (flytting, delt bosted, samvær, vold mv.)):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Bill in Parliament (Stortinget) 23.3.2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stortinget decided changes in the Children Act with regard to parental custody, permanent residence and visitation rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of impact case: DRUGPOL

Summary of impact
Our research in DRUGPOL (short for drug policy) has contributed to the basic change now witnessed in Norwegian drug policy. The two largest political parties in the country are now approaching the parliamentary election with a radical reorientation, where “decriminalization” of use and possession of illegal drugs is a core element. Research from our group has had an impact on the general discourse on drug policy, and has given inputs to our alcohol and tobacco policies. The impact may be identified to three levels: (i) employees in the health, social and legal sectors; (ii) civil society; (iii) the political system.

Description of the research underpinning the impact
The key researcher in the group has been Willy Pedersen and the most central co-members are Sveinung Sandberg, Tilmann von Soest and Torbjørn Skardhamar. Combined they are authors or co-authors of 200 peer-reviewed articles over the past decade. Pedersen’s publications are cited more than 3000 times in Google Scholar (h-index 30, i10-index 56). They have cooperated with approximately 15 other researchers in Norway and abroad. In the “self-assessment” of the group we describe the mixed-methods approach utilized with (i) a population-based longitudinal study with self-reports and registers, (ii) cross-sectional surveys of large samples of Norwegian youth, (iii) spatially organized so-called geodata, (iv) ethnographic fieldworks among cannabis dealers and growers, (iv) in-depth qualitative studies of groups such as (a) people taking part in the night-time economy and with a high level of alcohol consumption; (b) participants in the Norwegian high school graduation celebration; (c) cannabis users, dealers and growers; (d) incarcerated drug dealers. Combined these data sets has enabled the group to analyse a wide variety of research problems.

Details of the impact
Willy Pedersen has continuously been a critical voice with regard to drug policy, where prevailing paradigms are now changing. We identify the impact to these levels:

**A: The health, social and legal sector.** Pedersen has given numerous speeches - at national conferences and seminars. Pedersen’s book *Bittersweet* (3. ed. Universitetsforlaget 2015) has sold 25 000 copies and is used in colleges educating e.g. police officers, social workers, nurses, as well as in civil society organizations. An interview with Pedersen and professor Robin Room regarding drug policy reforms was e.g. the top download from Norwegian Research Council in 2014.¹

**B: Civil society.** Pedersen is a “public intellectual” regarding these issues, and a regular guest in the national broadcast (e.g. Dagsnytt 18, Ekko). He writes in key media such as *NRK Yring*, *Aftenposten*², *Klassekampen*, and gives speeches in alcohol and drug policy organizations, in local communities and schools. A videotaped conversation with him labelled “On being parents” has been a key element in substance use prevention in Norwegian schools over a decade³. He also writes regularly in an internet-based tool from Norwegian Directorate of Health aiming at civil society and the general public.⁴

**C: Experts and the political system.** He has continuous cooperation with ministries, the police and the prison system. He was e.g. invited to give a two hours speech on drug policy for all judges in The Supreme Court, with Director of Public Prosecutions and the Attorney General also present. He was invited as a member of The Ministry of Health and Care services’ delegation to the UNGASS negotiations in Vienna in December 2015. He then

---

wrote a chronicle about the negotiations in *Morgenbladet* offering an interpretation of the progressive Norwegian policy in United Nations. He has been in numerous informal conversations with key actors in the Norwegian Parliament and the governmental system. Below are statements from two key politicians and leaders of the two major civil society organizations.

References to the research (scientific publications)


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)

Please see the footnotes at the end of the form.

External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Excerpts from reports from four external references:
Constituted state secretary Fredrik Gierløff – a key figure regarding drug policy in the Government and the Conservative party (H):

“Willy Pedersen has been a relevant and present professional..., through his research and his communication of results, as well as in his personal interventions in public debates on cannabis policy. He has been willing to change [his own political] positions in an area where such positions are often deadlocked. .. In this manner he has also emphasized the value of sociology as a discipline.”

Member of Parliament and spokesperson for drug policy in the Labour party (AP), Torgeir Micaelsen:

“Willy Pedersen’s research has had impact on my own increased understanding and interest for political choices in the substance area. … This knowledge has led to The Labour Party now taking a leader role in what may become a major reform of Norwegian drug policy after the parliamentary election.”

Secretary General of ACTIS, Norwegian policy network for alcohol and drugs, Mina Gerhardsen:

“Pedersen has been against using penal reactions for use and possession of cannabis. His position has gained support, and is now at the agenda in several political parties.”

Leader of the major organization for drug reform in Norway (FTR), Ina Roll Spinnangr:

“[His research] has had an impact on my view that we must work for decriminalization and strict regulation of several [illegal] substances. I have referred to his work in several chronicles and blog postings, recently e.g. regarding how war on drugs leads to worldwide infractions of human rights.”

Attachment to DRUGPOL: External references

1 http://www.forskningsradet.no/prognett-psykiskhelse/Nyheter/Norge blir nopt til a ta opp cannabisdebatten igjen/1253993006870&lang=no
2 Aftenposten is the largest newspaper in Norway and reports that Pedersen’s latest contribution: “Six reasons why adolescents drink less ” has been downloaded 55 000 times, which is reported to be “extraordinary for that kind of contribution” http://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/kronikk/Seks-grunner-til-at-ungdom-drikker-mindre--Willy-Pedersen-603991b.html
4 Pedersen’s last contribution at Forebygging.no was the second most popular download in 2016 http://www.forebygging.no/Kronikker/~2015/Hvorfor-slutter-ungdommen-a-drikke/
5 https://morgenbladet.no/ideer/2015/12/reform-i-alle-kanaler
**Name of impact case:** (max 10 characters)  
World Bank

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)**  
“Doing business” is a key annual report of the World Bank. It provides a wide-ranking assessment of the business climate across the world. In 2012, in light of our research, the President of the World Bank Group appointed an independent panel to review a range of issues surrounding this report. This panel’s report drew heavily on our paper, including a reproduction of the relevant figure from our article (page 53). The report led the World Bank to place less emphasis on the overall ranking, which is the key point in our critique.  

**Description of the research underpinning the impact:** (maximum 400 words.)  
International rankings appear precise, but they often emphasize differences when similarity is the dominant feature. The reason is that rankings do not take the inherent uncertainty in the index scores into account. To demonstrate the magnitude of the uncertainty, we single out three indices for scrutiny: the World Bank’s *Doing Business Index*, Freedom House’s *Freedom in the World*, and the United Nations’ *Human Development Index*. “Doing Business” provides the most widely read ranking; it ranks countries in terms of how ‘business-friendly’ their regulatory environment is. Freedom House publishes the most cited international regime categorization; it creates an annual index of the political rights and civil liberties enjoyed in different countries. The Human Development Index provides the most famous ranking; it ranks countries according to health, knowledge, and material resources.

The problems we highlight are common to all international country indices. Our criticism is related to how the data are summarized. The one-number-per-country practice can be highly misleading when that number's inherent uncertainty is not reported. We substantiate this criticism by estimating the uncertainty contained in the rankings using a Bayesian latent variable approach, for which each indicator is considered to be a measure of underlying performance.

Precisely reported, but inherently uncertain rankings, may invite what we refer to as “rank-seeking behavior”. Rank-seeking means that a country designs policies to improve their country’s rank on the index rather than to improve real performance. This is especially tempting when there seems to be a precise link between indicators and ranking, but a fuzzy link between indicators and real performance.

Rankings may provide a clear-cut ranking of countries that in fact are for the most part indistinguishable. By appearing precise and certain, the rankings seem so persuasive that they cannot be ignored. By incorporating uncertainty, however, it becomes clear that each of the rankings draws attention to one specific, but rather arbitrary, ordering. The popularity of the indices may simply reflect this weakness, as people seem obsessed by differences when everything is more or less on an even level. The most exciting index rankings may therefore be the most uncertain, and the attention that such rankings receive in the
international community is often inversely related to their accuracy. Media, policy makers and researchers often end up discussing the deep causes of a slight alteration in the internal rankings when there really is no significant change at all.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

The paper and a related report presented to the Bank Unit of the Norwegian Foreign Office, widely circulated in the NGO environment, were critical of the World Bank “Doing Business” Report. Our paper offers a methodological critique that applies to most index rankings provided by international organizations and governments alike. Several other observers also had substantive points of critique. In total, this made a strong case for evaluating both the inclusion of certain indicators, as well as the overall methodological approach. As a result, in 2013, the President of the World Bank commissioned an independent panel review of the “Doing Business” Ranking. This resulting report drew heavily on our paper, including the full reproduction of our key figure from the paper.

The report lead to changes in how the World Bank reports its results in the “Doing Business” report. This includes changing some of the indicators, and in line with our critique, to place less emphasis on the overall ranking, and minor changes in a particular country’s ranking. “Doing Business” also explored methods for presenting the results that incorporate aspects of our critique.

Moreover, other scholars and NGOs critical of similar indices produced by governments and other international organizations have adopted our method. As such, the impact of our paper is substantively wider than “just” the World Bank. It has raised awareness of these problems across several fields.

References to the research (scientific publications)


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


Statement by the President of the World Bank on the Report:


If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).
The project was commissioned by the European Commission to provide research-based and academically grounded expertise for the on-going policy process of designing a new framework and governance mechanism for EU’s energy policy. It began with consultations between the main researchers and EC representatives to identify key topics. These were the basis for three panels at a policy conference organized in Berlin. Research results were published as working papers/policy briefs, and after peer review, as a journal special issue. Evidence and conclusions of the discussion were presented to EC representatives who used it in the work on the designed post-2020 governance mechanism.

The research was coordinated by Dr. Kacper Szulecki, postdoctoral fellow at ISV. The steering committee of the project also comprised Prof. Karsten Neuhoff (TU Berlin/DIW Berlin) and Dr. Andrzej Ancygier (Hertie School of Governance), as well as Ingmar Juergens from the European Commission. The three topics identified were:

• Cross-border and domestic infrastructure development,
• Regional cooperation and coordination, and
• Renewable energy expansion and policy diffusion.

After issuing an open call for papers for the policy conference, the team received 42 abstracts. A sorting committee was organized, where the coordinators asked for additional help from Prof. Sebastian Oberthuer (VU Brussels), Henry Derwent (Climate Strategies) and Dr. Oliver Sartor (IDDRI Paris). The sorting committee invited 6 papers to be presented at the Berlin Conference and 6 additional papers to be submitted to the conference as working papers – while all 12 were to be submitted to the special issue of “Climate Policy” journal (Taylor & Francis, IF 1.980). The project seemed to find disciplinary balance between political science, public policy studies, economics and energy studies.

At the conference, held in June 2015 at the German Institute for Economic Research, two papers were presented in each panel, and commented by two discussants, to start a wider discussion with the audience (ca. 80 experts from Germany and other countries). An additional round table, hosting established scholars in the energy policy field: Dr. Teresa Ribera (director, IDDRI Paris), Prof. Andreas Goldthau (Harvard University) and Dr. Camilla Bausch (Ecologic). The following day, all contributors, chairs, discussants and invited experts were brought together for a closed expert brainstorming session, where K. Szulecki and A. Ancygier led the discussion around the three project themes, building on the evidence presented in the panels and working papers. The results of this discussion were later published as a policy brief.

After the conference, all authors were invited to submit their working papers to “Climate Policy”. As a result of strict double-blind peer review, a special issue with seven papers appeared in July 2016, with the entire content available in open access.
The research project perfectly coincided with the evolution of the idea of an “Energy Union” within the European Union. While the initial plan was providing evidence based policy advice for a specialized and technical discussion within the EU, the increasing societal and media attention as well as the priority given to energy policy issues at that time by European policymakers increased the project’s visibility and impact. This was clearly visible at the Berlin conference, which gathered some 50% more people in the audience than was expected by the organizers, and was attended by not only academics and think-tank experts, but also journalists, employees of German ministries and diplomats from several embassies. The precise impact is difficult to measure. Thanks to open access, all findings and summaries are available online and can be used by different stakeholders. More importantly, however, the insights from the conference, expert workshop and papers have all served as feedback for the European Commission for further work on the Energy Union’s governance mechanism.

Working papers:

- Siddharth Fresa, 2015, Multilevel EU Governance in Energy Infrastructure Development. A New Role for ACER?
- Stefan Ćetković & Aron Buzogány, 2015, Varieties of capitalism and renewable energy development in Europe
- Dorian Frieden, Andreas Tuerk, Mak Dukan, André Ortner & Johan Lilliestam, 2015, Renewable electricity exports from the Western Balkans to the European Union: What’s in for the host country?
- Andrew Lawrence & Benjamin Sovacool, 2015, Nuclear Energy Path Dependency in Europe: Toward a Post-Materialist Politics of Energy?
- András Mezősi, Zsuzsanna Pató & László Szabó, 2015, The assessment of the 10% interconnection target: security of supply, market integration and CO₂ impacts
- Adrienn Selei & Borbála Toth, 2015, A top-down approach to identify the most important natural gas cross-border infrastructure projects
- Katharina Umpfenbach, Andreas Graf and Camilla Bausch, 2015, Regional cooperation in the context of the new 2030 energy governance
- Tomas Wyns & Arianna Khatchadourian, 2015, Situational analysis of EU renewable energy legislation

Policy paper:


Journal articles:

- Kacper Szulecki, 2016, European energy governance and decarbonization policy: learning from the 2020 strategy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kacper Szulecki, Severin Fischer, Anne Therese Gullberg &amp; Oliver Sartor</td>
<td>Shaping the ‘Energy Union': between national positions and governance innovation in EU energy and climate policy</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Wyns &amp; Arianna Khatchadourian</td>
<td>Situational analysis of EU renewable energy legislation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorian Frieden, Andreas Tuerk, Mak Đukan, André Ortner &amp; Johan Lilliestam</td>
<td>Sharing the gains from EU–Western Balkan renewable electricity cooperation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>András Mezősi, Zsuzsanna Pató &amp; László Szabó</td>
<td>Assessment of the EU 10% interconnection target in the context of CO2 mitigation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Lawrence, Benjamin Sovacool &amp; Andrew Stirling</td>
<td>Retracted Article: Nuclear energy and path dependence in Europe’s ‘Energy union’: coherence or continued divergence? – the article was retracted by the authors who spotted errors in own calculations</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blog posts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The research project was meant to gather policy relevant evidence that could serve as additional input to the on-going policy process within the EU.

Ingmar.JUERGENS@ec.europa.eu – European Commission, Berlin Office
Eva.GERHARDS@ec.europa.eu – European Commission, DG Energy
Institution: Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

Research discipline/panel: 3. Political Science

Case number or short name (max 10 characters): 2

Name of impact case:
The Commission on the Election Law

Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)
As a member of the Commission on Electoral Law (Valglovutvalget, 1997-2001), professor Bernt Aardal contributed to the design of the present election law. Aardal’s contribution was particularly relevant for the distribution of seats on parties and constituencies. Aardal used his insights in the electoral system, as well as skills in analysing implications of the law, to help design a dynamic law. Since the implementation, the geographical allocation of seats has already been adjusted according to population change. Computer simulations, using a program designed by Aardal, played an important role in the work of the Commission.

Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)
The electoral system is an important structural determinant for electoral politics. The number of votes won by a party does not necessarily translate into the same number of seats in Parliament. More than the details and mathematical intricacies of a particular electoral system, the political consequences of the reforms have been the focus for many political scientists. This has also been the case in Norway. In particular, the emphasis has been put on the historical roots of the system, linking electoral reforms and political change. The reforms have often been gradual and time consuming in order to reach the overarching goal of consensus and compromise. The advantages of this approach is that reforms have not been reversed by new governments. This was for instance the case when proportional representation was introduced in 1919, and the reorganization of constituencies and a change of the electoral formula (from d’Hondt to modified Saint-Lague) in 1952. (see Kristvik 1953, Kristvik and Rokkan 1964;1966, Rokkan 1970; Valen 1981). Although the election law was not changed again until the 1980’s, the debate about electoral reform was quite lively in these years, as has recently been demonstrated by Aardal (2014). The brief reintroduction of list alliances in the 1985 election, led to a renewed debate about the shortcomings of the law and was analysed in detail by Henry Valen (1994). The introduction of adjustment seats in 1988 was seen as a major step towards better proportionality between number of votes and number of seats. Adjustment seats gave smaller parties more seats, compensating for losses at the constituency level. As Aardal (2014) has demonstrated, the tension between governability/accountability on the one hand and proportionality on the other hand, has been a recurring theme in the debate on electoral reform in Norway. The reforms of the late 1980’s gave rise to analyses of the political consequences with respect to government coalitions, indicating that the chances for the Labour party to win a majority in Parliament on their own was severely restricted with the new law (Aardal 1990; Rasch and Aardal 1994)). Matthews and Valen (1999) put the question about regional (geographical) distribution of Parliamentary seats on the table.
again, by showing that the geographical distribution of seats was more skewed in the 1990s than it had been in 1903.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

As a member of the Commission on Electoral Law (Valglovutvalget) from 1997 to 2001, professor Bernt Aardal played an important role in the design of the present law - implemented by Parliament in 2003. Aardal used his insights into the historical and political roots of the electoral system, as well as skills in analysing implications of the law for political representation, to influence the design of the law. Two major aspects of the law should be emphasized. 1) The number of seats in each constituency has never been allocated in proportion to the number of eligible voters in the constituency. This goes back to the 1814 Constitution. However, the skewed allocation became more and more contested. Matthew and Valens (1999) demonstrated that the distribution had become even more skewed over time, made the question of reform pertinent. By using computer simulations, professor Aardal showed that a purely proportional geographical allocation of seats had only minor impact on the allocation of party seats. Initially, the party representatives in the Commission agreed that such an arrangement would be acceptable. However, after conferring with their party groups, realizing that this proposal would increase the number of seats in more densely populated constituencies at the expense of more sparsely populated constituencies, they reported back that such a law would not make it through Parliament. Then professor Aardal – inspired by previous work by the economists Gunvald Grønvik and Aanund Hylland – introduced the so-called area factor as a proxy for the geographical distance from the constituency to the national centre. The ensuing law states that the distribution of seats uses a combined sum of population and constituency area in square kilometres. 2) Another aspect concerns the number of adjustment seats needed to ensure the desired proportionality in terms of seats allocated to parties. The international literature suggests that the number of adjustments should approximate 25 per cent of the total number of seats. However, professor Aardal’s simulations showed that the proportionality did not improve to a significant degree beyond 19-20 adjustment seats, or 11-12 per cent of the total. Thus, the last seat in each of the 19 constituencies was allocated for national adjustments. Even after the work of the Commission, Aardal has published several articles on the historical development and the political consequences of the present law (Aardal 2002, 2011, 2014).

References to the research (scientific publications)

References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


Mr. Sigbjørn Johnsen, leader of the Commision on Electoral Law (Valglovutvalget)

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).
**Institution:** Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

**Research discipline/panel:** 3. Political science

**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** 3

**Name of impact case:** Problems and Options of Indonesian Democratisation

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)**

1. Increased awareness in the Indonesian democracy movement of going beyond civil society self-management and single issue campaigns to political- and interest organisation and to engagement in mainstream politics.
2. Increased awareness that the problems of democratisation are not only about oligarchs, corruption, and weak rule of law but also rooted in poor representation and capacity of pro-democratic actors.
3. Research based support of less elitist and more democratic policies at the local and national level, most obviously in the rise of President Jokowi’s policies from the town of Solo, to the city of Jakarta and now the presidential palace.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

(Include names of key researchers and, if relevant, research groups. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

For more than three decades, scholars at, first, University of Uppsala and then Oslo, have together with colleagues and experts in the Indonesian democracy movement studied the challenges and options of democratisation in their country. The cooperation was first through research organisations in civil society (The Institute for the Free Flow of Information (ISAI) and the Centre for Democracy Studies (Demos); thereafter, since 2012, in the context of an agreement between the Norwegian Embassy to Indonesia, the University of Gadjah Mada, and the University of Oslo.

The joint studies have mainly been in the form of participatory democracy assessments around the country (engaging leading organisations in the movement and more than one thousand grounded experts in all provinces), follow-up case studies and workshops to discuss policy implications. In addition these studies have been combined with support for education on democratisation, welfare and power at the University of Gadjah Mada’s Faculty of Social and Political Studies itself, and some of its MA and PhD students have taken courses at the University of Oslo.

The key researchers have been Professor Olle Törnquist, (i) initially with Professor Arief Budiman and experts at the Institute for Free Flow of Information (ISAI), including its co-director, senior investigative researcher and later on head of the Indonesian Press Council, Stanley Adi Prasetyo; (ii) thereafter the Executive Director of Demos, the then retired Secretary General of the Human Rights Commission Asmara Nababan, and Demos’ research co-ordinators AE Piryono and Willy P. Samadhi; (iii) yet later with, in addition,
Dr. Aris Mundayat and Nicolaas Warouw at the University of Gadjah Mada (UGM); and (iv), finally with UGM Professors Pratikno (then Rector and currently Secretary of State), Purowo Santoso, Doctors Eric Hiariej and Amalinda Savirani, plus University of Oslo Professor Kristian Stokke’s as well as Törnquist’s and Stokke’s international network of researchers who contributed comparative insights and analyses from the Philippines, Burma, India, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Nigeria, Brazil and, of course, Scandinavia.

The research and studies have been supported by the Swedish and Norwegian international development agencies (SIDA and NORAD), the Norwegian Embassy to Indonesia, the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education (SIU), the Ford and Tifa (Soros) Foundations, the EU representation to Indonesia, and, of course, the Universities of Uppsala and Oslo, the University of Gadjah Mada, and numerous democracy organisations and individuals in Indonesia.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

1. Increased awareness in the democracy movement of going beyond civil society self-management and single issue campaigns to political- and interest organisation and to engagement in mainstream politics.

The project was initiated in cooperation between scholars and leading activists and organisations. These were also included as informants and resource persons. Yet, the research itself was strictly academic. Further, the project asked questions related to problems of fostering democracy, not just how democracy itself works. Together this fostered engagement, trust and access to best possible information – and to the possibility to disseminate and discuss the results in workshops around the country. As a result, the conclusion and recommendation that pro-democrats must ‘go politics’ beyond civil society engagements was widely discussed and accepted, both in the movement and as a concept in the public and scholarly discourse.

2. Increased general awareness that the problems of democratisation are not only about oligarchs, corruption, and weak rule of law, but also rooted in poor representation and capacity of pro-democratic actors.

The project was initially deemed partisan but gained recognition by being strictly academic in its implementation; by inviting senior scholars and experts as commentators of draft reports plus getting rooted within the main Indonesian university; by the fact that the informants from the democracy movements covered wide issue areas around the country and on the local level plus proved nuanced in their judgement; and by the focus on assessing not only the institutions of democracy but the capacities and problems of fostering them.

3. Research-based support of less elitist and more democratic policies at the local and national level, most obviously in the rise of President Jokowi’s policies from the town of Solo, to the city of Jakarta and now the presidential palace.

The project initiated discussions among concerned scholars and activists around the country on the political implications of the research-based conclusions and other important factors. Those engaged gained influence in various organisations and networks and were called on as advisors, in some cases political candidates and in one case as Minister of State.

References to the research (scientific publications)
Numerous reports and articles – byt here are the major books from the project, followed by a few articles


Some of the articles


All data are publicly available at [http://pwd.polgov.id/](http://pwd.polgov.id/).

(Many of the manuscripts are unofficially available at Törnquist’s homepage [http://folk.uio.no/ollet/](http://folk.uio.no/ollet/))

References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)

1. Extensive and committed engagement by more than 1000 pro-democracy experts in the very time consuming research typically involving (on a voluntary level) 6-8 hours interviews plus follow up interviews and discussions. (See the major research reports for participation and very low level of dropouts among the informants.)

2. Fairly extensive interest in Indonesian media, including in its major weekly news magazine *Tempo* (Indonesian edition (2004, 2005, 2008) and now in the research magazine *Prisma*, plus in, for example, the leading dailies *Jakarta Post* and *Kompas* (including articles by senior editor Maria Hartiningsih).

3. Fair international interest among concerned scholars an experts in our results, such as indicated by the publication of a major monograph (by Törnquist) on our approach and results by Palgrave, and a previous article in *Democratization* (see book reference in the above). Interest in our approach and results within e.g. the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); International IDEA; the Indonesian Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas) expressed by invitations to their arrangements and their participation in our seminars. Interest also in our results at the Norwegian and Swedish International Development Agencies (see most recently e.g. [http://www.omvarlden.se/Branschnytt/nyheter-2017/forskare-demokratin-stagnerar/](http://www.omvarlden.se/Branschnytt/nyheter-2017/forskare-demokratin-stagnerar/))
4. Increasingly many CSOs and popular movement activists have engaged in political organising and in elections. For example, it is common knowledge (i) that the current President Jokowi were elected locally, in Jakarta, and nationally much thanks to an extensive voluntary movement that was partly inspired by our research; (ii) that our research (and local follow up studies) contributed to the post-tsunami and post-conflict attempts at democratisation and development in Aceh; (iii) that our research results were important in the remarkable successful broad alliance in Jakarta 2010-12 of progressive politicians, CSOs and unions for a national universal social security system; (iv) that the same applies to the attempt by the major trade unions in Greater Jakarta to engage in local elections in 2014 with the slogan ‘labour go politics’; (v) that the same applies right now as one of their main leader, Obon Tabroni, is running as an independent candidate for the position as Regent in the major industrial hub of Bekasi outside Jakarta; and (vi) that to the broad alliance building in north Central Java by Indonesia’s perhaps best known popular movement engaged Human-rights lawyer Handoko Wibowo.

5. Several of the leading researchers and resource persons in the project have carried along our results as they have gained influential positions in the current government as well as in organisations that have sought to affect the government, such as (i) the second person in the national government, Prof Pratikno, who advanced from fostering the project to become rector and Minister of State; (ii) the Presidents Chief of Staff, Teten Masduki; (iii) the former advisor of the previous President and PDI-P leader Megawati Sukarnoputri, Cornelis Lay; (iii) Dr Surya Tjandra who as head of a trade union rights organisation (TURC) propelled the unique alliance of politicians, unions and CSOs in favour of the national social security system; and (iv) CSO-leader Osmar Tanjung who is now secretary general in the major professional Pro-Jokowi organisation Seknas Jokowi.

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

- Professor Pratikno, Minister of State, Government of Indonesia
- Goenawan Mohamad, leading playwright, author and founding editor of Indonesia’s prime news magazine Tempo.
- Professor Gerry van Klinken, senior scholar on Indonesia and its democratisation, KITLV (Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies)
- Professor Edward Aspinall, senior scholar on Indonesia and its democratisation, Australian National University
- Professor Michelle Ford, senior scholar on Indonesia and its democratisation, The University of Sydney
- Dr. Daniel Dhakidae, former head of research national daily Kompas; senior editor Indonesian Magazine Prisma
- Dr. Luky Djani, Institute for Strategic Studies, Jakarta, who was a deputy director of the Indonesian Corruption Watch and wrote his PhD dissertation of local politics and democratisation in Indonesia and could observe the influence of our results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution: The Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research discipline/panel: 3. Political science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number or short name: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of impact case:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Norwegian gender equality legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the impact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research by professor Hege Skjeie at ISV, mainly in collaboration with research milieus at respectively the Institute for Social Research and the Department of Public and International Law, analysing normative frameworks, institutional embeddedness and structural obstacles to equality have initiated extensive public debate on the profile and content of Norwegian gender equality policy and legislation since the early 2000s. The direct policy impact of this research is here exemplified through changes to the human rights and equalities laws. Policy impact has in particular been achieved through Skjeie’s membership in two governmental expert commissions, the Power and Democracy Commission (PDC, 1998–2003) and the Gender Equality Commission (GEC, 2010 – 2012). A series of governmental white papers, legislative proposals and/or parliamentary decisions document the impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the research underpinning the impact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skjeie was a member of the core research group of the PDC and led the group’s initiatives on gendered power investigations. Locating gender equality policy within a rights’ perspective Skjeie and Teigen (2003) analyzed a set of core yielding duties institutionalized through the Gender Equality Act from 1978; the general exemption made for communities of faith; the limitation of the equal pay clause; the restricted scope of rules on gender balance in public bodies. The broader normative question of how human rights should inform political decision making divided the PDC in its final report (NOU 2003:18, cf Østerud, Engelstad and Selle 2003). The fundamental meaning of democracy is majority based decision-making in elected bodies, whereas rights based claims and politics only provide forms of “supplementary democracy”, the majority report stated while the minority report described and criticized political priorities which, in the balancing of competing interests, provide a duty to yield upon gender equality rights. It argued why national legislators should not accept a different legal status for those human rights conventions which provide special protection to groups and individuals who are particularly vulnerable to discrimination. The PDC’s contrary assessments spurred a wide range of new research initiatives in Norway and other Nordic countries; on gender equality policy and legislation this included new research programs financed by the Norwegian Research Council such as Demrok - which researched the relationship between democracy, religious freedom and women’s human rights; Plureq - which paid particular attention to the role of state feminism to policies of equality, diversity and religious pluralism; and Multidimensional Equality - which analyzed multidimensional legislative reform and development of judicial...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practice in the Scandinavian countries. In turn, major parts of this research provided bases for the comprehensive equality analyses carried out by the GEC led by prof. Skjeie. The mandate of this expert commission was to report on the current status and possible improvement of Norway’s gender equality policy in the intersections between gender, ethnicity, and class, while applying to this analysis a life course perspective. It also asked for a comprehensive review of public equality work at the national, regional, and local administrative levels also in light of UN and EØS based international commitments. The commission did ground breaking work on intersectional sensitive policy analysis and on review of adjudication in cases of multiple discrimination, as reported in NOU 2011: 18 Struktur for likestilling and NOU 2012: 15 Politikk for likestilling.

Details of the impact:

The 1999 Human Rights Act originally incorporated the human rights conventions ECHR, ICCPR and ICESCR with priority granted in cases of conflict with other Norwegian law. When Parliament adopted the Human Rights Act, two UN conventions were added to the list of candidates for incorporation, CRC and CEDAW. While the PDC made no explicit policy proposals, it still became instrumental in changing the Norwegian human rights regime, spurring new controversy among for instance human rights scholars and state lawyers. With direct reference to the PDC majority’s (Østerud, Engelstad, Selle) judicialization warnings, the government in 2004 - 2005 decided not to carry through the planned incorporation of CEDAW (St. meld. 17 (2004-2005)); Ot.prp.35 (2004-2005)). When the government changed in 2005 the new cabinet pledged to reverse the decision and incorporate CEDAW, in line with the PDC minority statement (Skjeie). The issue remained highly controversial and was internally opposed by the government’s legal advisors. In the CEDAW incorporation proposal (Ot.prp. nr. 93 (2008-2009), the government made it clear that while a prioritized incorporation of CEDAW would increase awareness of gender equality and women’s rights nationally, no new political moves would be made to incorporate other UN conventions.

The work carried out by the GEC included, on the other hand, a series of actual public policy proposals. On access to justice the GEC proposed to strengthen the protection against intersectional discrimination through the provision of explicit bans in the equality legislation, suggesting exactly how legal bans could be shaped to fit the existing anti-discrimination framework. This recommendation, which follows up on the CEDAW Committee’s general comment no 28/18, was accompanied by a proposal to reform the low threshold system of law supervision so that punitive sanctions could be located at this level. Currently, matters of compensation must be tried before the regular courts, and there is no legal aid scheme in place regarding discrimination complaints before the courts (for description cf also Skjeie 2015). Two white papers (Meld. St. 44 (2012-2013), Meld. St. 7 7

1 For project descriptions, participants and publications see the program home pages on respectively jus.uio.no/or/forskning/prosjekter/demrok; sv.uio.no/isv/forskning/prosjekter/plureq/; and samfunnsforskning.no/Prosjekter/Avsluttede-prosjekter/Multidimensional-equality-Legislative-reforms-and-judicial-practices. Skjeie 2008, Siim & Skjeie 2008, Skjeie and Langvasbråten 2008 are particularly relevant here.

2 See “Should States Ratify Human Rights Conventions?” Research Project 2009-10 at the Centre for Advanced Study at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters; cf. also Hellum & Ketcher 2008; Skjeie 2009).
by two different cabinets have built on and/or integrated/rejected the series of GEC proposals (cf. Skjeie 2013, Skjeie, Holst, Teigen 2017). On access to justice the Stoltenberg cabinet rejected all proposals, while the Solberg cabinet in its proposal for a unified antidiscrimination law both recommends an explicit ban against multidimensional discrimination and new punitive sanctions within the low threshold system. Bill proposals on this will be presented to Parliament during spring 2017.

References to the research (scientific publications):


Cf:


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact:

NOU 2003:19 *Makt og demokrati*.

NOU 2011:18 *Struktur for likestilling*.

NOU 2012:15 *Politikk for likestilling*.

St.meld. 17 (2004-2005) *Makt og demokrati*  
Ot.prp.35 (2004-2005), *Om lov om endringer i likestillingsloven mv*(Gjennomføring av Europaparlaments- og rådsdirektiv 2002/73/EF og innarbeiding av FN-konvensjonen om avskaffelse av alle former for diskriminering av kvinner med tilleggsprotokoll i norsk lov)  
Ot.prp. nr. 93 (2008-2009) *Om lov om endringer i menneskerettsloven mv. (inkorporering av kvinnediskrimineringskonvensjonen)*  
Prop. 88 L (2012–2013) *Diskrimineringslovgivning (diskrimineringsloven om seksuell orientering, likestillingsloven, diskrimineringsloven om etnisitet, diskriminerings- og tilgjengelighetsloven).*  

External references:

For PDC impact: Former General Attorney of Civil Affairs Sven Ole Fagernæs (Regjeringsadvokat), former Minister of Justice Knut Storberget (AP), former Minister of Equality Anniken Huitfeldt (AP). For GEC impact: Director General Hege Nygård (eksp.sjef Barne- og likestillingsdepartementet), former Minister of Equality Inga Marte Thorkildsen (SV), current Minister of Equality Solveig Horne (FRP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution: Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research discipline/panel: Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number or short name (max 10 characters): 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of impact case:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power and Democracy Study (PDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conclusions from The Power and Democracy study were discussed in Parliament, prepared by a special committee after a hearing organised by the Prime Ministers office. One of the conclusions from the Study, the thesis of progressive judicialisation of politics, led the Government – initiated by Minister of Justice Knut Storberget – to postpone the incorporation of international treaties for further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PDS was initiated by Parliament in late 1997 and the central research group, led by professor Øyvind Østerud at the Department of Political Science, University of Oslo, was appointed by royal resolution March 13, 1998. One more member of the research group, Hege Skjeie, was also at the same Department, together with one professor of sociology from Oslo (Fredrik Engelstad), one from Bergen (Pr Selle), and one professor of cultural and art history from Bergen (Siri Meyer). The Secretariat was established at the Department of Political Science, Oslo. The final book and the abbreviated report (NOU 2003:19) was based on more than forty books, close to one hundred reports, and numerous articles in Norwegian and international professional journals (i.o. a Special issue of West European Politics, edited by Øyvind Østerud). More than thirty researchers, mainly from the social sciences, were engaged in projects initiated by the core research group. One of the central conclusions of the PDS was that a substantial transfer of decision-making competence had been transferred from representative institutions to non-elected ones during the last couple of decades, due to globalisation, the establishment of the European Economic Space, the human rights regime, the liberalisation and privatisation of parts of the public sector, and other trends. One particular conclusion was the judicialisation of politics, which led to extensive discussion both in public and within political and administrative organs. All the projects within the Study were conducted – and finished – in the period from 1998 to 2003. The publishing house Gyldendal Akademisk published the book series from the Study, and Unipub published the report series. Routledge and Ashgate published two international books from the Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was an intense public debate during the period of Study (1998-2003) and afterwords,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on participation from the research group in meetings in organisations, ministries, political parties and more generally.

The office of the Prime Minister organised a hearing from December 1, 2003 to June 1, 2004. One conclusion from the Study, on judicialisation of politics, led to a quite heated. The President of Parliament appointed a Special Committee to prepare the debate in Parliament – “Innstilling S. nr. 252 (2004-2005) was made public June 1, 2005. The leader of the research group talked to the committee in a full day meeting, and the plenary debate in Parliament took place June 13, 2005.

Member of Parliament Knut Storberget argued that the thesis of judicialisation was an important challenge to the politicians. He took this view with him as Minister of Justice in the autumn the same year. The Government postponed incorporation of UN treaties into Norwegian law to consider the implications more thoroughly. A new book in March 2017 (Føllesdal, Rud & Ulfstein, Menneskerettigheter og Norge, Universitetsforlaget) confirms in the introduction that the PDS led to a postponement and further consideration of the incorporation of UN treaties into the human rights law. Former Minister of Justice Knut Storberget contributes on the same topic in the book.

It is difficult to measure precisely the impact of the PDS despite a wide and lengthy public debate, but the question of the timeline for incorporation of international treaties into the law of human rights seem to be one concrete case. This was followed up when Parliament prepared a revision of the Constitution in 2014, where the leader of the PDS research group was included in discussions with a special committee appointed by Parliament to propose the revisions.

| References to the research (scientific publications) |
| All the publications are listed in Østerud, Engelstad and Selle, Makten og demokratiet, Gyldendal, Oslo 2003. |

| References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.) |

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Referred to above
Evaluation of Social Science Research in Norway

Name of impact case: (max 10 characters)

**SALMONTALK**

Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)

Norway is home to the world’s largest remaining population of wild Atlantic salmon, but Norway is also the leading producer of farmed Atlantic salmon, which can threaten the wild salmon populations. This requires a careful balancing act, and research-based policies on fish farming and river management. However, the communities of scholars and state institutions are polarized and hostile. Through our research we crafted an intellectual frame for incorporating difference, and an arena for dialogue across institutional boundaries that contributed to broadening the discourse on salmon in Norway, and to gather stake-holders who rarely speak with one another.

Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)

The background for the event, was our research project ‘Newcomers to the Farm, Atlantic Salmon between the Wild and the Industrial’ (2009-2012). Marianne Lien led the project and worked closely with STS-scholar John Law. Together they did fieldwork on farmed salmon, at a salmon farm in West Norway. Gro Ween was a post doc on the project, and did parallel fieldwork on wild salmon in the Tana river. Historian Kristin Asdal contributed as well, as three master students.

Farmed salmon threaten the wild salmon populations through genetic drift and through an increased density of salmon sea-lice. As Lien and Ween became involved respective fields (farmed and wild) they also found that they began to disagree more frequently, even on issues they thought of as fundamental facts about salmon. Inspired by STS (Science and Technology Studies) they began to explore these disagreements, and found that the socio-natural worlds they learned about were shaped by rather different scientific accounts. Biological experts sometimes expressed distrust of each other’s ‘facts’, e.g. those who primarily did research on farmed salmon, and those who did research on salmon in the wild. A similar rift could be noticed between institutional bodies involved in policy, such as the Ministry of Fisheries vs the Ministry of the Environment, Directorate of Fisheries vs Directorate of the Environment. In addition, the public debate was polarised too, with vocal NGOs (Greenpeace, WWF) fundamentally challenging a defensive industry.

One of our research findings is that salmon “speak” through the material and conceptual frames and tools through which they are made to enact, and that these differ from one context to another. For example, the pens and the water surface are key modes of engagement between salmon and humans in salmon farming, shaping how fish is experienced and seen, both inside and outside the pen. Fishermen enact salmon differently, and different biological research endeavors engage salmon in different practices yet again. Hence, in line with a theoretical approach that transcends a binary division between the natural and the social, salmon is ‘multiple’ enacted in heterogeneous more-than-human practices. It is this insight that opened the possibility for an intervention in relation to a very polarized debate, and to contribute, albeit to dialogue between opposing camps.

****
Details of the impact

How can Norwegian rivers and waterways host threatened wild salmon and a thriving fish industry at the same time? This remains the key challenge related to salmon facing policy makers and practitioners in Norway today. But because scientists studying conservation and aquaculture respectively are attuned to different salmon stories, they rarely engage with each others’ facts. The challenge calls for collaboration, the use of science and therefore engagement across interdisciplinary as well as intradisciplinary divides. This requires a minimum of trust and arenas for dialogue.

With this in mind, Lien and Ween convened a meeting entitled Kan vi leve sammen?’ (Can we live together) 28th March 2012 in ‘Litteraturhuset’ in Oslo. The title alludes to the need to look after two populations of salmon, but also polarised groups of scholars and bureaucrats. We brought together key scholars in biology on both sides of the divide (from NINA and from Havforskningsinstituttet, and from ‘Redningsaksjon for Vossolakse’), a salmon farmer, and several representatives from NGOs (Greenpeace, WWf, Bellona). In addition, staff from the various governmental institutions were present.

Our main scientific contribution was a framing of the salmon as multiple, and thus of framing contested facts as valid without necessarily negating other facts. Drawing on STS, we encouraged a focus on facts as temporary outcomes of specific conjunctions of methods, site and foci. Our concerns with how salmon are enacted in practical scientific arrangements opened new ground for conversation. In this way, the meeting facilitated dialogue and overcame, to some extent, a sense of deep mistrust. Several participants said that the thanks to the framing by social scientists who had no stakes in the scientific controversy as such, it was possible to establish a ‘neutral ground’ that allowed further dialogue. Precisely because we were not biologists, and because our ethnographic affiliations were equally grounded in rivers and on farms, we contributed to a ‘re-framing’ of the controversy. We did not need to rehearse any abstract theory of science, instead we translated this knowledge to relate the practical difficulties that all biologists face in simply knowing salmon.

References to the research (scientific publications)


Gro B. Ween. Fiskere, forskere og forvaltere i Tana. Calliidiagadus, Karasjok. (bokmanus til vurdering)

References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


Mediaomtale:


Forskningsomtale:

Anna Tsing 2014, AURAs openings; Unintentional design in the Anthropocene. AURA working papers No 1. [http://anthropocene.au.dk/fileadmin/Anthropocene/Workingpapers/AURA_workingpaperVol1_01.pdf](http://anthropocene.au.dk/fileadmin/Anthropocene/Workingpapers/AURA_workingpaperVol1_01.pdf)

NFR: [http://www.forskningsradet.no/no/Nyheter/Vil_skape_fred_i_lakseleirene/1253976434090](http://www.forskningsradet.no/no/Nyheter/Vil_skape_fred_i_lakseleirene/1253976434090)

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Anna Tsing, a social anthropologists who has engaged in interdisciplinary dialogue between anthropology and biology, comments on this event as follows; ‘Perhaps plain speaking was not just plain: the concrete details of salmon lives took on multiple meanings as common talk, as social theorist’s “material-semiotic practice,” and as a non-threatening descriptive biology. In this multiple rendering of salmon, there is something productive to pursue—something generally applicable for our attempts to move beyond discursive fences.’

Bjørn Barlaup, forskningsleder i Uni Research Miljø og leder av forskningen om Vossolaksen skriver i en epost: ‘Mye av diskusjonen rundt temaet
villaks vs. oppdrettslaks gjøres med utgangspunkt i naturvitenskapelige undersøkelser. Seminaret inkludert ditt innlegg «Nytt dyr på gården» viste at det er nyttig og viktig å også ha med det samfunnsvitenskapelige perspektivet i denne type debatter. Inntrykket jeg sitter igjen med etter seminaret er at det bidro til opplysning, dialog og økt forståelse på tvers av fagmiljø og interesser’.

The following year Research Council Norway invited Marianne Lien to the working group to relaunch the 2nd round of ‘HAVFORSKNINGSPROGRAMMET’ with the explicit aim of integrating social science in a research program which had been heavily dominated by the natural sciences. The new research program, and subsequent collaborative projects, is thus another outcome, shaped in part by our spearheading social science contributions to salmon research.

Other external references: Torbjørn Forseth NINA (leder vitenskapelig råd for lakseforvaltning). Ola Braanas owner of Firda Sjøfarmer (salmon farmer), Jørgen Christiansen CEO Marine Harvest, Geir Lasse Taranger (Institute for Marine Research).
Template for case studies

Name of impact case: (max 10 characters)

3 CRISES

Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)

The ERC-funded project “Overheating” (led by Professor Thomas Hylland Eriksen) is dedicated to the exploration of the multiple crises that affect our world today. In the early 21st century, the challenges we face in the economic, social and cultural domain cannot be analysed individually, but rather, should be explored as interlinked phenomena triggered by the acceleration of human activities across the globe. Since the project has begun, the term crisis has only gained in social significance. The rise of new nationalisms, the “refugee crisis” and growing awareness of environmental deterioration are some of the issues that Overheating has sought to raise, also amongst non-academic audiences.

Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)

(Include names of key researchers in the group. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

“Overheating. The three crises of globalisation. An anthropological history of the early 21st century” commenced in July 2012 after being awarded an ERC Advanced Grant in 2011. With Principal Investigator Professor Thomas Hylland Eriksen obtaining EUR 2,496,344.00 in funding, which was to be spent over the duration of 60 months, a research team consisting of nine core members at the Department of Social Anthropology was established that has dedicated itself to the comparative study of globalisation in its early 21st century manifestation. As of early 2017, Overheating consists of: Professor Thomas Hylland Eriksen (Principle Investigator, University of Oslo); Professor Chris Hann (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology and University of Oslo); Associate Professor Elisabeth Schober (University of Oslo – formerly a postdoctoral fellow on the project); Postdoctoral Fellow Astrid Stensrud; Postdoctoral Fellow Wim van Daele; Postdoctoral Fellow Cathrine Thorleifsson; Researcher Henrik Sindig-Larsen; PhD candidate Lena Gross and PhD candidate Robert Pijpers.

While the research literature on various dimensions of globalisation is enormous, Overheating has constituted the first major attempt to weave disparate empirical strands together within a shared conceptual framework, namely that of crises resulting from the acceleration and intensification of global processes. Through the collaborative effort of all participants under the guidance of the PI, three major crises of globalisation were explored and analysed: 1) crises emerging in the realm of environmental issues/climate change; 2) crises in the financial and economic realm; and 3) crises in the area of culture contact and identity. A key term we have worked with has been “sustainability” in the sense of social and environmental reproductive capability. The main research question that has guided us during ethnographic fieldwork is to what extent contemporary world society is sustainable in relation to the three crises and their internal dialectics. In seeking to approach this problematic, the project has entailed in-depth ethnographic studies in five continents, global surveys (drawing chiefly on existing research literature) and systematic comparison.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

Professor Thomas Hylland Eriksen has a long-standing record as a key actor in the wider attempt to popularize social anthropology (that is, the effort to bridge the gap between the academic discipline and the public at large). Anthropology as a discipline is comparatively small, and with significant...
barriers in place (such as the often rather complicated language used in much of the discipline’s knowledge output) anthropology tends to be primarily accessible to highly educated groups who often come from wealthy backgrounds. In an effort to achieve a wider dissemination of anthropological knowledge related to crisis and globalisation beyond the core audience constituted of other fellow academics, Overheating have thus relied on a mix of strategies.

We have, for instance, made systematic use of digital technologies and social media: The project’s Facebook-profile regularly updates followers of events, news items and articles related to Overheating-activities (and has 1,150 followers as of early 2017). On the university network-based Overheating-website, dozens of news articles can be found that have been written by Lorenz Khazaleh, a freelance journalist specializing in the promotion of anthropology to wider audiences. A good example of an article of his that has gained a wider traction is “People, be wary of anthropologists!” which portrays the work of Catherine Coumans, who is MiningWatch Canada’s research programme coordinator, and who took part in an Overheating-workshop on “Mining Encounters” in April 2015. The article has received 4,428 clicks, making it the most widely read article hosted on the Social Anthropology department’s website in many years.

In addition, all nine project members have engaged in producing publications for popular blogs and newspapers, have regularly given talks in a number of non-academic forums (e.g. by organizing one evening at the Literaturhusset that was part of UiO’s “På Flukt” lecture series), and have engaged with many broadcast media in order to increase the reach of Overheating’s findings. A comprehensive report detailing all these activities would go beyond the scope of this impact study; hence, the public anthropology activities of postdoctoral fellow Cathrine Thorleifsson will serve as a case in point for these broader efforts undertaken by the whole team to broadly publicise our research findings on globalization and crisis to non-academic audiences.

Cathrine Thorleifsson, who since 2016 is also an affiliated researcher with University of Oslo’s Center for Research on Extremism, has conducted ethnographic fieldwork in Oslo, Doncaster, and Budapest as part of her Overheating-sub-project. Her multi-sited ethnography provides critical perspectives on globalised xenophobia both as ideology and as an intimate form of everyday practice. The project has included in-depth interviews and participant observation with the perpetrators and supporters of radical nationalism and right-wing extremism. Following her fieldwork, Thorleifsson has engaged in dozens of media appearances in major Norwegian (e.g. Aftenposten, Morgenbladet, Klassekampen, Dagsavisen, Dagbladet) and foreign newspapers (The Guardian, Meidat Shemona), in Norwegian television (NRK1 Dagsnytt, Dagsnytt 18, NRK Kunsskapskanalen, NRK2, NRK Supernytt) and radio programmes (NRK P1, NRK P2, NRK P3, NRK Ekko). In addition, Thorleifsson has also given talks at a number of central policy shaping institutions, such as the United Nations, the Norwegian Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi), the European Commission in Brussels, or at the Parliament of Norway, where she took part in a hearing on the rise of extremism.

References to the research (scientific publications)


Thomas Hylland Eriksen and Elisabeth Schober (eds.) 2016.” Economies of Growth or Ecologies of Survival?” (Introduction to Special Issue of Ethnos, together with Thomas Hylland Eriksen).


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)
“Overheating”-university website: www.uio.no/overheating


“Overheating”-Video lectures: http://www.sv.uio.no/sai/english/studies/resources/overheating-2015/

“Overheating”-Facebook site: https://www.facebook.com/Overheatedworld/

“På Flukt. I en overopphetet verden”-event (with livestream):
http://www.uio.no/om/samarbeid/akademisk-dugnad/arrangementer/pa-flukt/pa-flukt-overopphetet-verden.html

Postdoctoral Fellow Cathrine Thorleiffson’s media appearances and public talks are listed in detail at:
https://www.cristin.no/as/WebObjects/cristin.woa/wa/fres?sort=ar&la=no&action=sok&pnr=53174

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).
## Template for case studies: The societal impact of the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Department of Social Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research discipline/panel:</td>
<td>5 Social Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number or short name (max 10 characters):</td>
<td>Anthro-Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of impact case:</td>
<td>Contemporary Art and Anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)

Schneider has opened a new interdisciplinary field between anthropology and contemporary art. Schneider edited (with Christopher Wright, Goldsmiths College) three books, ‘Contemporary Art and Anthropology’ (2006), Between Art and Anthropology (2010), and Art and Anthropology Practice (2013) which are key reference works for a new field beyond academia, involving art institutions, museums, curators. The success of these books, and the wider interdisciplinary discussion they promoted was consolidated by other major interdisciplinary conferences organized by Schneider: Performance, Art and Anthropology (2009), Experimental Film, Art and Anthropology (2012) – both at the Musee du quai Branly, Paris; considered among world’s leading anthropology museums.

### Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)

(Include names of key researchers and, if relevant, research groups. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

Following the Writing Culture critique (Clifford /Marcus 1986), which addressed the crisis of representation, in anthropological writing, writing about the ‘Other’, more generally, and following similar initiatives in cultural and literary studies (e.g. Said's Orientalism, 1978), the visual side of representation was somehow was left unaddressed. Contemporary artists since the late 1960s had critically reflected on anthropological museum collectons, and fieldworks as modes of representation and research about the other - however, in anthropology this field was only opened up about a good decade later, e.g. Karp /Levine 1991(Schneider 1993).

Building on this insight, Schneider proposed in a number of articles (1993, 1996) – and later in a series of edited volumes (with Christopher Wright, 2006, 2010, 2013) to explore the epistemological potential of artistic practices both for anthropological research and representation. Hal Foster 'The Artist as Ethnographer ', published in the seminal anthology 'The Traffic in Culture' (1995) edited by anthropologists George Marcus and Fred Myers (and later reprinted in Foster’s own anthology, Return of the Real) critically challenged artist’s engagement with anthropology as pseudo-ethnography, characterized also by artists’ and anthropologists’ envy towards each others’ practices. However, George Marcus (in Schneider & Wright 2010) pointed out that the assumed other anthropology constitutes for artists is anything but a stable disciplinary practice. Schneider (2011, 2013, 2016) building on this insight has repeatedly stressed the hermeneutic and dialogical potentials of new interdisciplinary practices, opening up for new epistemic insight and practices between art and anthropology.

In his newest book “Alternative Art and Anthropology: Global Encounters” (2017, editor: Arnd Schneider ) which takes stock of over a decade’s work in this new field and applies the discussion on a global scale, and the latest anthropological thinking in theoretical fields of hermeneutics, Actor-Network-Theory, and agency to propose a new working agenda for the future.

### Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).
Since 2003, when he co-organized the international conference ‘Fieldworks: Dialogues between Art and Anthropology’ at the Tate Modern, London (the world’s major modern Art Museum, together with Museum of Modern Art, New York), Prof. Arnd Schneider has opened up a new interdisciplinary field between anthropology and contemporary art which had considerable impact beyond academia. Since coming to SAI/UiO, the conference papers (and other contributions), which Prof. Schneider edited (together with Christopher Wright, Goldsmiths College), were published in three books, ‘Contemporary Art and Anthropology’ (2006) (21; 154), Between Art and Anthropology (2010) (8; 124), and Art and Anthropology Practice (2013) (5; 28) which have been key reference works for a new field beyond academia, involving also art institutions, museums, and curators. The books are widely reviewed and quoted (numbers of book reviews after year of publication above; followed by number of citations in Google Scholar). The success of these books, and the wider interdisciplinary discussion they opened up was consolidated by two other major international and interdisciplinary conferences organized by Schneider during his tenure at SAI: Performance, Art and Anthropology (2009), and Experimental Film, Art and Anthropology (2012) – both at the Musee du quai Branly, Paris; considered among the world’s leading anthropology museums. All conferences have attracted large audiences (and were often oversubscribed), also beyond academia, especially in the art world, among film-makers, critics, and museum curators.

More specifically in Norway, Schneider has on several occasions collaborated with public events, beyond academia, with the Oslo Art Academy and the Office for Contemporary Art. Schneider has just edited his newest book “Alternative Art and Anthropology: Global Encounters” (2017) which takes stock of over a decade’s work in this field and applies the discussion on a global scale, and the latest anthropological thinking in theoretical fields of hermeneutics, Actor-Network-Theory, and agency to propose a new working agenda for the future.

For the period 2016–2019 Prof. Schneider has obtained a grant of 375.000 EUR as a member TRACES: Transmitting Contested Cultural Heritage with the Arts, a large interdisciplinary research consortium with many members outside academia (NGSs, museums etc), and part of the EU’s Horizon 2020 programme (www.traces.polimi.it).

References to the research (scientific publications)

Papers in peer-reviewed academic journal:


Book chapters:


Reprinted as:


Reprinted as “Art and Anthropology” in:

(treprint of Schneider 2012 “Art and Anthropology”, in: Sage Handboook of Social Anthropology, book chapter)

And in Norwegian translation:


Books:


Arnd Schneider, Art and Anthropology Practice (co-edited with Christopher Wright), London: Bloomsbury Group. 2013. [ISBN 9780857851796]


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)

The reviews mentioned above, websites of TATE Modern, etc.


If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Prof. George Marcus, University of California, Irvine, gmarcus@uci.edu

Prof. Dick Blau, Dept. of Film, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, dickblau@gmail.com

Dr. Dominic Willsdon, Leanne and George Roberts Curator of Education & Public Programs, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (formerly at Tate Modern, London) dwillsdon@SFMOMA.org

Gerardo Mosquera, Independent Curator, cabaqueiro@gmail.com
Template for case studies: The societal impact of the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institution:</strong></th>
<th>Department of Social Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research discipline/panel:</strong></td>
<td>5 Social Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case number or short name (max 10 characters):</strong></td>
<td>Biotech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of impact case:</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of the Biotechnology Act, Norway (2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)**

In 2011 the Norwegian Directorate of Health published a report (IS-1897 Rapport) entitled *Evaluering av bioteknologiloven* ("Evaluation of the Biotechnology Act"). This report was commissioned by the Norwegian Parliament, as part of the process to evaluate the Biotechnology Act of 2003. The report covers a broad range of issues, describing the status and development of the different fields that are regulated by the Biotechnology Act (such as assisted conception, pre-implantation diagnosis, prenatal diagnosis, gene therapy). Ethical issues are given special consideration, as are comparative perspectives.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

(Include names of key researchers and, if relevant, research groups. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

Marit Melhuus has over many years carried out research on the meanings of kinship in Norway, with a particular focus on assisted conception, involuntary childlessness and legislative processes in Norway. Incorporation of biotechnologies in Norway has been and still is a contentious issue. In comparison with other European countries, Norway has a rather restrictive legislation. Among other things, this implies that many couples, single men and women circumvent the law and travel abroad to have treatments not permitted in Norway. Hence there is a discrepancy between law and actual practice. One aim of the research has been to understand the values underpinning the legislative moves. This involved a historical contextualization, a processual approach and an attention to Norwegian offentlighet. Another aim was to explore the practices and attitudes of the involuntary childless themselves, focussing specifically on notions of relatedness and their understandings of what an “own child” means. The research indicates that kinship relations are not immutable, and that understandings of “a child of ones own” is situationally determined.

This research has, over the years, had different sources of funding:

Jeanette Edwards (University of Manchester) in collaboration with researchers across Europe.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)
(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

The report *Evaluering av bioteknologiloven* (2011) is as mentioned a very comprehensive piece of work (261 pages). The working group consists of different experts in the various fields (see page 13 for the complete list). One of these (Eva Olssøn) has delivered a contribution on the ethical and cultural aspects of assisted conception. In that connection, one of my publications is cited (page 48). That same publication is again cited under the section on “the difference between egg donation and sperm donation” (page 62).

The fact that the publication is cited in a report commissioned by Parliament is an example of knowledge dissemination – and hence an impact of research on political processes, potentially on political deliberations.

(Include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

References to the research (scientific publications)


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)


If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Not relevant.
**Template for case studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of impact case: (max 10 characters)</th>
<th>TelenorR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)**

Following empirical research in partnership with TIK’s innovation group and other actors, the company Telenor has shifted its innovation strategy, strengthened the assessment of innovation results and capabilities in the follow-up of individual personnel, improved its innovation management and the ranking of this aspect in the Dow Jones Sustainability Index, and committed to new R&D and innovation partnerships with an emphasis on how Telenor can be an engine for innovation and entrepreneurship in Norway.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

(include names of key researchers in the group. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

Professor Magnus Gulbrandsen initiated TIK’s innovation group’s first collaboration project with Telenor, which started early 2012 and has been ongoing since. Other research units in Norway (e.g. the Norwegian School of Business in Bergen) and abroad (e.g. London School of Economics) have been involved as well. For TIK, Telenor proved an interesting empirical arena for theories and controversies about innovation. A long-standing debate in innovation has been about the typology and definition of innovation, especially whether there is a fundamental distinction between manufacturing and services. This is related to discussions about the most widely used data source for innovation, the Community Innovation Survey (CIS) and if this is appropriate for all industries. In addition, there are debates about the nature of innovation in digital settings, and more generally whether there is a tension between central aspects of organisational structure/culture and the ability to innovate.

The first empirical work was to develop a new measurement tool for innovation in a digital service company like Telenor. Using literature on service innovation with newer perspectives on “platforms” and “infrastructures” arising from studies of digital innovation, a detailed instrument was developed. Data was gathered from all business units in Telenor (including in different parts of Europe and Asia) and later presented in various meetings in the company (including a leadership seminar with the CEO), in the media and at scientific conferences. TIK’s postdoc Jarle Hildrum (now in Telenor) was the most important researcher here.

The second empirical work was an organisational culture survey where TIK contributed with state-of-the-art survey tools and theoretical perspectives to develop a questionnaire that would fit the setting of Telenor. The survey received close to 20,000 responses from people in business units all over the world, gaining a unique insight into the culture of a digital multinational. Results showed that the cultural profile was astonishingly similar across business units, e.g. the high weight on customer orientation and integrity and the relatively low weight on innovation in locations as different as Norway, Serbia and Bangladesh. TIK Director Fulvio Castellacci has been central in analysing the survey data.

In addition to these large-scale (and still ongoing) empirical projects, the TIK-Telenor collaboration has involved a number of joint seminars, involvement of students and other activities. The research collaboration continues, now focusing more on the evolutionary transition perspective (the disruptive shift in the telecom industry) and on exploiting the data.

---

**December 2016**
When Telenor redefined itself as a service company in the early 2000s, the status of research, development (R&D) and innovation was unclear. These activities went through a large number of reorganisations, and the company was heavily criticised for a lack of focus on research and innovation by various actors including the Ownership Department of the Ministry of Trade and Industry. Telenor also scored at the bottom of the industry in the innovation management section of the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI), an influential series of indices about stock exchange listed companies.

TIK’s first measurement project showed that the actual innovation expenditure in Telenor was much higher than what was officially reported in the research and CIS surveys. This had a powerful symbolic (and perhaps to some extent political) impact on Telenor, but it also led to changes in data gathering practices and innovation management that moved Telenor up as an “industry leader” in the DJSI. The company now does the annual innovation measurement exercise itself. Several people in Telenor, including Hanne-Stine Hallingby, have been essential in the implementation and follow-up here.

More direct impact can be seen from the culture survey, which clearly demonstrated that innovation is emphasised less in the company than all other aspects that were defined as important. As such the research identified and articulated a problem that was recognised also by many people in Telenor. This problem was discussed at a board meeting where the (former) CEO was given 10 months to improve the innovation work in the company, leading to new strategies, new personnel management systems and more experiments with changes in organisational structure. This work has been strengthened with the new CEO. The research has also been influential in Telenor’s expanded role in the Norwegian innovation system where the company increases its partnership e.g. with incubators and accelerators and gets involved in large-scale initiatives like Toppindustrisenteret together with many research organisations and firms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to the research (scientific publications)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.sv.uio.no/tik/om/aktuelt/aktuelle-saker/2012/undervurderer-nyskapningen.html">http://www.sv.uio.no/tik/om/aktuelt/aktuelle-saker/2012/undervurderer-nyskapningen.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.innovasjonnorge.no/no/Nyheter/--innovasjon-kan-ikke-outsources/">http://www.innovasjonnorge.no/no/Nyheter/--innovasjon-kan-ikke-outsources/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is also a Telenor internal report on the measurement approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).

Jarle Hildrum, Vice President, Telenor Research (and others in Telenor)
# Template for case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of impact case: (max 10 characters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NENT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words)

Based on her competence in history of animal experimentation in biomedicine, Tone Druglitrø is a national member of the research committee on natural science and technology, appointed to a working group responsible for developing ethical guidelines for the use of animals in research, collaborating with scientists and animal activists. The guidelines will directly affect and improve the practices of experimenting on animals.

Internationally, Druglitrø has been part of developing a collaborative agenda between scholars from social science, humanities and the natural sciences on laboratory animal welfare and innovation. LASSH is initiated by social scientists and humanities scholars in the UK.

## Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)

(include names of key researchers in the group. A time frame for when the research was carried out should also be included).

The research underpinning the impact is based on Postdoctoral research fellow Druglitro’s PhD thesis on the history of laboratory animal science in Norway. The research was carried out in the period 2008 and 2012. It is also based on ensuing collaborative work regarding the international development of laboratory animal science, together with UK based scholar in history of science Robert G.W. Kirk (Building Transnational Bodies, 2014) and collaborative work with the network “Laboratory animals in social science and humanities” (LASSH, see above).

Druglitro’s PhD thesis traces the history of laboratory animals in Norway by looking at processes of standardization in biomedical science. The thesis also deals with the controversial aspects of laboratory animal science as it has unfolded in the sciences as well as in society. By close investigations of the scientific practices of standardizing laboratory animals for biomedical research as well as the political and social work involved in this process, the thesis contributes to a greater understanding of how laboratory animals and animal experimentation are valued in science and society and how the ethical infrastructures of laboratory animal science have developed over time.

## Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

(include a description of how the research has contributed to the impact on society).

1) The membership in NENT is closely linked to academic profile and competence and the guidelines currently soon out on public hearing are also linked to this competence (see below). Together with other academic work, Druglitro’s publications has provided the foundation for discussions in the working group as well as in the user-oriented workshop arranged by NENT as part of developing the guidelines. The guidelines themselves will not include these types of references (only references to other guidelines and regulations). Druglitro’s participation in NENT and the working group is however a good example of how social science research can take part in policy development on controversial issues. The guidelines will be presented and
discussed at a public meeting this upcoming fall (2017).

2) The LASSH initiative arranged three workshops assembling stakeholders (scientists, technicians, policy makers, NGOs) in laboratory animal science to discuss collaborations across scientific disciplines and between science and other social actors. Druglitrø was asked to hold a key note at one of the events with a paper on “Skilled care and the history of laboratory animal science”. The LASSH initiative resulted in a joint publication in PlosOne in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to the research (scientific publications)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Etiske retningslinjer for forskning med dyr” (NENT) to become part of a public hearing process the coming autumn. They are currently under discussion in NENT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helene Ingierd, Sekretariatsleder for NENT: <a href="mailto:helene.ingierd@etikkom.no">helene.ingierd@etikkom.no</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).
**Institution:** Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

**Research discipline/panel:** Economics/2  **Group:** ESOP

**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** Oil-curse

**Name of impact case:** Resource management, institutions and the resource curse.

**Summary of the impact:**

Management of oil wealth has several purely economic dimensions but also several political dimensions. For any oil rich country a challenge is to assure that the political system is not rigged by influential groups so that the oil income only benefits a few. Hence, management of oil resources for the benefit of all requires strong institutions. Norway is one example where oil has been a blessing, while many developing countries are examples of countries were oil, due to dysfunctional policies, is actually a curse. ESOP researchers have contributed to the insight into the importance of institutional strength in oil management. This insight has been influential in the policy debate about resource management across the globe.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact:**

Natural research management is a classic theme in economics. Since the discovery of oil in the North Sea, resource economics has been a major focus for economists at the Department of Economics. One early definitive example is [R0]. This publication builds on research from the 1980’s and reflects the challenges that an established oil economy was facing. The list of contributors contains as many as seven names from the current department staff. The book illustrates well the width of issues covered by the research at the department. This research has turned out to be immensely important for Norway's current economic policy. The logic behind the Oil fund and the spending rule “handlingsregelen” are both to be found in this edited book.

The more recent contributions bring an international comparative politics perspective into this research. The question is how resources affect the domestic economy in different institutional environments. In [R1] and [R2] (Mehlum and Moene, ESOP and Torvik, ESOP and NTNU) investigate the so called "resource curse". They find that rich resources may hamper growth, and resources may be a curse, rather than a blessing, if the government institutions are weak. This finding has been very influential in the resource management literature across the world. According to Google scholar [R1] has been cited 1800 times. It is still being cited and for the last four years it has been cited at least 200 times per year. When doing a search for "Resource curse" [R1] is the highest ranked hit. Hence, [R1] is a cornerstone in the resource curse literature itself and as such [R1] influences most policy discussions about political economy of resource management.

[R1] and [R2], together with [R3] (Aslaksen, ESOP and Andersen BI) have all formed the discussion about political regime type, and regime strength on the one hand and resource management on the other. Most recently, [R7] (Kotsadam and Olsen, ESOP with Knutsen, Political Science and ESOP and Wig, Political Science), takes a closer look at local politics and local corruption resulting from opening of mines.

Moreover, these insights have been combined with Norway's actual economic performance leading to [R4] (Mehlum,Moene and Torvik), [R5] (Holden, ESOP) and [R6] (Mideksa, ESOP). These contributions all discuss the role of oil for the Norwegian economic development and the importance of the political institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institution:</strong> Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo</th>
<th><strong>Research discipline/panel:</strong> Economics/2  <strong>Group:</strong> ESOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case number or short name (max 10 characters):</strong> Oil-curse</td>
<td><strong>Name of impact case:</strong> Resource management, institutions and the resource curse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of the impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of oil wealth has several purely economic dimensions but also several political dimensions. For any oil rich country a challenge is to assure that the political system is not rigged by influential groups so that the oil income only benefits a few. Hence, management of oil resources for the benefit of all requires strong institutions. Norway is one example where oil has been a blessing, while many developing countries are examples of countries where oil, due to dysfunctional policies, is actually a curse. ESOP researchers have contributed to the insight into the importance of institutional strength in oil management. This insight has been influential in the policy debate about resource management across the globe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the research underpinning the impact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural research management is a classic theme in economics. Since the discovery of oil in the North Sea, resource economics has been a major focus for economists at the Department of Economics. One early definitive example is [R0]. This publication builds on research from the 1980’s and reflects the challenges that an established oil economy was facing. The list of contributors contains as many as seven names from the current department staff. The book illustrates well the width of issues covered by the research at the department. This research has turned out to be immensely important for Norway's current economic policy. The logic behind the Oil fund and the spending rule “handlingsregelen” are both to be found in this edited book. The more recent contributions bring an international comparative politics perspective into this research. The question is how resources affect the domestic economy in different institutional environments. In [R1] and [R2] (Mehlum and Moene, ESOP and Torvik, ESOP and NTNU) investigate the so called &quot;resource curse&quot;. They find that rich resources may hamper growth, and resources may be a curse, rather than a blessing, if the government institutions are weak. This finding has been very influential in the resource management literature across the world. According to Google scholar [R1] has been cited 1800 times. It is still being cited and for the last four years it has been cited at least 200 times per year. When doing a search for &quot;Resource curse&quot; [R1] is the highest ranked hit. Hence, [R1] is a cornerstone in the resource curse literature itself and as such [R1] influences most policy discussions about political economy of resource management. [R1] and [R2], together with [R3] (Aslaksen, ESOP and Andersen BI) have all formed the discussion about political regime type, and regime strength on the one hand and resource management on the other. Most recently, [R7] (Kotsadam and Olsen, ESOP with Knutsen, Political Science and ESOP and Wig, Political Science), takes a closer look at local politics and local corruption resulting from opening of mines. Moreover, these insights have been combined with Norway's actual economic performance leading to [R4] (Mehlum,Moene and Torvik), [R5] (Holden, ESOP) and [R6] (Mideksa, ESOP). These contributions all discuss the role of oil for the Norwegian economic development and the importance of the political institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of the impact

The research above has informed Norwegian policy makers. It has also informed policy makers in other resource rich countries and policy makers and advisors in international organizations. The ESOP authors above have all presented their research in a multitude of policy settings with an international audience.

In the case of Norway we will mention the commission reports and the white papers [C1]-[C6]. These documents fall in two categories. They relate to resource management in Norway and development assistance as well as development policy. All points to the primordial importance of the institutional environment for a successful resource management. In addition to the documents themselves, the ESOP researchers have contributed as commission member/leader (C1,C2), participated in roundtable discussions and given presentations in relation to these and other similar documents.

The impact is even stronger on the international scene. By a Google search in the three main international organizations we find reference to [R1] 131 times in documents at WorldBank.org, 71 times at IMF.org and 63 times in the most relevant UN agencies, 18 times in The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (eiti.org) and 9 times in the extractive industries source book (www.eisourcebook.org). The referring documents have varying status but they are all documents that are contained on these sites to inform policy makers or to inform the public. [C8]-[C12] contain a small set of examples, ranging from seminar presentations, via discussion papers to official policy documents(e.g. [C8]). The authors have participated in policy panels in the institutions themselves but also in developing countries. In fact both [R4] and [R5] are products of such policy discussions and seminar presentations.

Lastly there is a strong impact on various other organizations, think tanks, awareness agencies etc. across the globe. By doing a Google search we find that [R1] is referred to by oecd.org, usaee.org, iadb.org, eadi.org, trapca.org, miningfacts.org, wikipedia.org, oxfam.org, africaportal.org, rand.org, cegadev.org, cato.org parliamantarystrengthening.org, corruptionresearchnetwork.org, sustainabledelawareohio.org, fao.org, paidafrica.org environmentalpeacebuilding.org, lacea.org, cerdi.org, bis.org, peru economics.org, hoover.org, resourcegovernance.org, etc. etc. We have not scrutinized these references but all these sites and hundreds of more show that the policy debate about the resource curse is a lively one and that [R1] is the cornerstone of this debate in a wide variety of camps.

References to the research (scientific publications)


Evaluation of Social Science Research in Norway


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)

[C1] NOU 2009: 19 Skatteparadis og utvikling
[C2] NOU 2013: 13 Lønnsdannelsen og utfordringer for norsk økonomi
[C8] IMF (2012) MACROECONOMIC POLICY FRAMEWORKS FOR RESOURCE-RICH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES—BACKGROUND PAPER 1—SUPPLEMENT 1
**Institution:** Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo  
**Research discipline/panel:** Economics/2  
**Group:** OFS  
**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** Childcare  
**Name of impact case:** Public childcare and consequences for the individuals and for the economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public education is one of the main expenditures of the government. From a fiscal point of view, it is both important to know the costs of education and what the effects are on prospective labour market careers. Public childcare can also be evaluated along those lines. Compared to regular schools, however, public childcare have additional fiscal consequences, as it may also affect the labour market career of parents. OFS researchers have contributed to the insight into the many consequences of expansion of public childcare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research on the different aspects of childcare is carried out by core OFS member Tarjei Havnes in collaboration with the Economics Departments adjunct professor Magne Mogstad, University of Chicago, our Phd research fellow Astrid Sandsør and Nina Drange SSB. The empirical data underpinning most of this research is based on the families that were exposed to the the massive expansion public childcare in Norway in the 70’s. Combining this information with register data on individual labour market careers, the authors have been able to identify the short and long run effect of childcare both on parents and children. The use of register data in combination with reforms has proved to be a research strategy that makes it possible to address important and challenging questions. In [R1] the authors analyse the effect on the mothers. The results reveal that there is little, if any, causal effect of child care on maternal employment, despite a markedly positive correlation. Instead of stimulating mothers to work, the new subsidized childcare mostly made it possible for already working mothers to replace informal childcare with public care. Hence, the childcare expansion did not come with a fiscal dividend via mothers’ tax payments. The quality of childcare was affected though and in [R2] the focus has moved to the children. The analysis reveals that subsidized childcare had strong positive effects on children’s educational attainment and labour market participation. Hence, via the children there was indeed a fiscal dividend. In [R3] the issue is the effect of childcare on inequality. The study points to the importance of universal child care programmes in explaining differences in earnings inequality and income mobility across countries and over time. It estimates that the universal childcare programme substantially increases intergenerational income mobility. Finally, in [R4] dataset from another reform is used to identify possible effects of childcare particularly on children from disadvantaged families. The reform used was the lowering of mandatory schooling age in Norway in 1997. The new program was in effect a mandatory low intensity kindergarten program. The estimates reveal no particular positive effect for the children of disadvantaged families. Hence, if the concern is how to best help the disadvantaged, making regular kindergarten mandatory does not help that much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of the impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The research summarized above share a focus on fiscal and distributional consequences of education. Both are issues of huge importance in the policy debates in modern welfare states like Norway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research is well cited with a total of 559 citations (some overlapping) in Google scholar. This high academic interest demonstrates two facts. First that the methods employed and the data used are at the international research frontier in its own right. Second, and most important in this impact documentation, that the many policy implications are catching the imagination and stimulate further policy relevant research internationally.

The more direct visible policy impact is found domestically, however. The role of childcare in the Norwegian welfare system is of first order importance for Norwegian families and policy makers. Havnes and co-authors’ research has been highly influential as it has delivered hard facts to a quite emotional and ideological debate. The important questions has been: What's good for gender equality? What's good for the children? Is childcare worth the subsidy? Why not hand out a voucher to parents? These questions used to be answered more based on gut feeling than on facts. With Havnes and co-authors' solid research there is finally some basis for knowledge. References to [R1]-[R4] appears in 91 documents and pages hosted at either regjeringen.no (the cabinet) or stortinget.no (the parliament). The documents are background papers, commission reports and white papers. To mention a few: [C1] white paper The quality of childcare, [C2] white paper Learning together [C3] white paper The future of child care, [C4] white paper Play and learning in childcare, [C5] Commission report Minority children in school, [C6] Commission report Pedagogy in school, [C7] Commission report Integration [C8] Commission report New law for childcare. The list of official documents could have been made longer. It is in fact hard to find any policy document on education or childcare, since 2010, that do not include a reference to [R1]-[R4]. In addition comes letters, statements by parliamentarians and NGOs etc etc.

In addition, [R1]-[R4] has informed the debate in Sweden. Havnes participated a roundtable about childcare. The research is also referred to 5 times at the Swedish parliament's web page riksdagen.se. Havnes has also participated in roundtable with OECD.

Lastly [R1]-[R4] is referred to a total of 40 times in documents or pages at World Bank, UN or IMF. Most of these references are related to policy discussions about development issues like inclusive growth and gender equality.

All in all [R1]-[R4] shows that issues at the academic research frontier can also be highly policy relevant. The papers did not only have indirect policy implications, they were already from the start motivated from an urge to understand and describe important policy questions. This combined with the high quality explains why the research has had such strong and immediate impact.

References to the research (scientific publications)


References to sources to corroborate the claims made about the impact (publications, reports, media items, policy papers, etc.)
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[C5] NOU (2010a) NOU 2010: 7 Mangfold og mestring — Flerspråklige barn, unge og voksne i opplæringssystemet
[C8] NOU (2012) NOU 2012: 1 Til barnas beste— Ny lovgivning for barnehagene
**Institution:** Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

**Research discipline/panel:** Panel 2 Economics

**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** Environment

**Name of impact case:** Environmental economics

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words).**

Our own research and our participation in a number of government-appointed expert commissions have heavily influenced the current Norwegian guidelines for public sector cost-benefit analysis, the design of several environmental indicators presented in several National Budgets, and the Norwegian climate policy and debate.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

**Applied CBA:** Own research, e.g. R1 and R2 (Nyborg 2000, 2012), and participation in a number of government-appointed expert commissions (C1–C5) have heavily influenced the current Norwegian guidelines for public sector cost-benefit analysis (C6) as well as environmental indicators presented in several National Budgets (C7).

**Climate agreements and climate policy:** Our research has covered several topics related to the design of climate agreements and to climate policy. Consequences of policies that differ from the standard first best have been extensively studied. We have also studied the relationship between climate policy and the supply side of fossil fuel markets (R17: Harstad, 2012). A third important topic has been the design of policies to encourage the development of environmentally friendly technologies, and how such policies might be incorporated in an international climate agreement (R18: Harstad 2016; R16: Battaglini and Harstad, 2016). Criteria for intergenerational justice and sustainability are also of importance for normative analysis of climate policy (R19: Zuber and Asheim, 2012).

**Environmental norms and behaviour:** Research on employee motivation, firm culture and firm reputation has contributed to the interdisciplinary debate on corporate social responsibility, and has been included in the IZA World of Labor, a free online library for policy makers and journalists (R5: Nyborg 2014). Research on social and moral norms has contributed to cross-disciplinary understanding on the relationships between economics and environmental behaviour (R6: Nyborg et al., 2016).

**Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)**

**Applied cost benefit analysis:** Nyborg participated actively in all commissions (C1)–(C5) on which current guidelines (C6) are based. The English translation of (C5) is often cited in international work on guideline development (e.g. the French). Ch. 3 in (C5) is largely based on R2: Nyborg (2012), a book also cited in the most recent IPCC report. Asheim wrote Appendix in (C3) and is cited several other places in this report. Asheim gave a presentation based on R19 at a seminar on the social discount rate arranged in connection with (C5).

**Climate agreements and climate policy:** The research in this area and our own participation in the government-appointed expert commissions C4 (Hoel and Nyborg) and C8 (Hoel) has had a significant influence on Norwegian climate policy and debate. The references R7–R15 (a small subset of our research within this area) have all been referred to in either (C5) or (C8). Harstad has advised the IMF and COP22 prior to the 2016 Marrakech climate negotiations (C9), and both he and Asheim have been cited and referred as an expert reviewer in the IPCC Assessment report (C10).
Nyborg participates in Denmark’s Council of Environmental Economics (Det Miljøøkonomiske Råd), which gives policy advice to Denmark’s government.
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If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).
### Institution: Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

### Research discipline/panel: Economics/Panel 2

### Case number or short name (max 10 characters): Equality

### Name of impact case: The political economy of equality.

#### Summary of the impact

Inequality is on the rise. Political and social cleavages also become wider. There is a huge interest within politics, in the media, and the civil society to know more about the causes and consequences of increased inequality. Is equality now less feasible? Providing answers to such questions has proved to have a considerable impact both directly as inputs to the policies of the government and the large interest organizations – and indirectly as challenging insights and contrasting views for the discussion of distributional issues at home and abroad. We document both direct and indirect impacts below.

#### Description of the research underpinning the impact:

R[0] outlines concepts and problems of much of the research our group later performed.

*Why do the most generous redistribution take place in countries with the smallest differences in gross earnings, the lowest levels of corruption and the highest levels of social cohesion?*

[R1] emphasizes how many nations fail to achieve feasible equality. It derives the *Miser index*, ranking countries by its level of unnecessary poverty in the midst of affluence. It demonstrates a dramatic rise in global miserliness over the last 30 years.

[R2] derives and estimates an *equality multiplier* from the mutual interaction between wage setting and the determination of welfare generosity. It magnifies initial changes by almost fifty per cent.

[R3] explores theoretically and empirically *political reinforcement* - how more inequality before taxes and transfers reduces the welfare generosity of political party programs in the OECD area.

[R4] explores the overall working of the *Nordic model* with an emphasis of the mutual dependence between the causes and consequences of wage compression for productivity and the support for welfare spending.

[R5] explores how and why more *fractionalized societies* have less redistribution of income and less generous welfare states.

*What is the role of fairness in redistributive policies and preferences?*

[R6] uses a comprehensive controlled experiment to assess the distributional ideals within and across rich and poor continents. It demonstrates the importance of *entitlement considerations* and the willingness to cover basic needs. The distributional ideals are more meritocratic in Europe and more egalitarian in Africa. [R7] derives how one can incorporate the distinction between *fair* and *unfair* inequality in the standard inequality measures. The new measures show how the income distribution in Norway becomes less fair from 1986 to 2005 even though overall inequality declined.

[R8] discusses the importance of including unpaid child-care and women’s income capability in the evaluation of how just social contracts are.
[R9] explores the preference for belief consonance for equity, conflict and social behaviour.

What are the foundation of distributional justice and equity within and across generations?

[R10] sheds new lights on what the present generation owes future generations, deriving a conception of intergenerational equity more in line with the intuitive notion of distributional equity within a generation.

[R11] provides a fairness based justification and interpretation of utilitarianism, enabling a ranking of social alternatives based on the fairness of their assignments and the degree of inequality aversion in society.

Details of the impact

The research summarized above demonstrates the importance of the political economy of equality, a theme that has been widely discussed recently. The research is well cited, with more than 400 citations on Google scholar.

The direct impact on policymaking is evident.

Public commissions have incorporated several popularized policy reports written by our research group. For instance, the first report of the Public Productivity Commission [C4] relies heavily on results from [R2], [R3], and [R4] and the Public Productivity Commission’s second report [C5] utilizes results from [R2]. Moreover, the report [C8] summarizes the research from [R2]-[R4] for the Commission’s use.

In addition, the Public Distribution Commission [C2] relies on results from [R1]-[R5], and contains an appendix [C2b] written by our group, being used by e.g. [C3]. The research results have also been used independently by public commissions such as [C2] using [R2] and [C6] using [R2] and [R4].

The Miser index [R1] is much read. Policy documents, in particular documents and white papers produced by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for instance [C1] and [C7] uses the index frequently. The Miser index also influence policies of large development NGOs, think tanks, and the Church of Norway.

The outline of our research interests in [R0] has been utilized heavily in public reports, see for instance [C11] to [C17] that all cite our work and work plans.

Internationally the research from [R1]- [R10] laid the foundation for much of the work in the International Panel of Social Progress [C9]. The impact is particularly evident in the long chapters 2 and 8 including our results related to equity as a development strategy – the role of wage compression and welfare state expansion.

Other international policy documents and databases also use our research. For instance, the UN Globalis database [C10] uses our Miser index [R1], the World Development Report 2006 (World Bank) utilizes working papers from our research group, and World Development report 2017 uses our research and advice.

What is the indirect impact on policy debates and social beliefs

The indirect impact is evident from the many presentations our group has had for international delegations from Brazil, China, Nepal, Chile, India, Zimbabwe, South Africa to mention some. Parts of the delegations included ministers and top leaders in unions and employers’ associations.
The indirect impact is also evident from the extended list of invitations by important decision makers to participate in panel discussion and brainstorming meetings – including most political parties, the LO and the NHO. Often the role is to provide challenging contrasts and research-based perspectives to the debate. Those who have a particular preference for equality are not the only ones who invite us. The list include several presentations for the conservative party (H) and the social democratic party (DNA), as well as the socialist left party (SV) and the social liberal (V) and Christian democratic party (KrF). We have also given presentations for the right wing progress party (FrP). Recently we were also called upon to a seminar in the office of the prime minister Solberg, presenting our research.

One indirect policy impact is evident from [R9] in the sense that the editors of this most read journal published by the American Economic Association delayed the issue so it could come just before the 2016 presidential election. The editors thought that the content of common beliefs was highly relevant for the heated debate in the US. (But don’t blame us for Trump).
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[C13] NOU 2009: 10

[C14] St.meld. nr. 7 (2008–2009) Et nyskapende og bærekraftig Norge

[C15] NOU 2012: 15 Politikk for likestilling

[C16] NOU 2004: 13 En ny arbeids- og velferdsforvaltning — Om samordning av Aetats, trygteetatens og sosialtjenestens oppgaver

**Institution:** Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo

**Research discipline/panel:** Panel 2 Economics

**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** Macromodel

**Name of impact case:** Operational macro models for policy and scenario analysis.

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words).**

Wage formation is one of the most important economic processes. The relevance of the policy implications of empirical macro models for policy analysis therefore depends on the ability to give econometric treatment and analytical tractability to wage formation, without creating an unnecessary large gap between the model and the model user’s view and knowledge about real world wage formation. Research at the Department has influenced how wage formation is represented in the macro models that have used been regularly in macroeconomic policy documents. Recently, the impact has widened to the financial supervisory authority and to the confederate labour market organizations.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**

Research that originated in the 1980s created a lasting research interest about wage formation and labour market regulation at the Department of Economics. With a foundation in bargaining theory, see e.g. [R1], the research developed in a direction that sought to incorporate the economic theory in models that were made operational by the use of dynamic econometric methods and the statistical theory of cointegration. The book [R2], Ch. 4-6, surveys this development and contains references to publications from this period, e.g. [R3], [R4], [R5], [R6] to name a few. [R2] is at the same time an example of the wider research cooperation of this research program, with Gunnar Bårdsen (NTNU) and Øyvind Eitrheim and Eilev S. Jansen (Norges Bank) as important participants, of the widening of the program to development of a practical methodology for empirical macroeconomic model building.

Encompassing, the requirement that newer models explain the properties of existing ones, is an important principle of empirical model development. Also in this respect nominal and real wage formation represented an important research area. [R2] demonstrated the use of the encompassing principle, both with respect to pre-existing models (the wage Phillips curve, and the so called Norwegian and Scandinavian models of inflation) and the New Keynesian Phillips curve model [R7], [R8], [R9]. An important focus area within wage and price modelling is the parameterization, and relative invariance of the equilibrium rate of unemployment of the economy. Within our research program, several papers have analysed this problem theoretically and empirically, with the aim to incorporate the results in an operational macro model, see [R10], [R11], [R12], [R13], [R14].

Another relationship that has a large influence on overall model properties, in particular in the context of fiscal and monetary policies, is between income and consumption. The emergence of the housing market as a significant market for the macro economy was identified in [R15], and the encompassing implications tested within the framework of the VAR in [R16].

The end-use of the research output has always been operational models to aid policy and scenario analysis, including financial stress-testing. [R17] addresses several issues related to the importance of empirical validity when the purpose is monetary policy advice. [R18] sets out a coherent strategy for model construction based on the results of our research. [R19]
documents a model for the Swedish economy. Documentation of the operational version of the Norwegian model is available in [R20].

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

The research above have influenced the treatment of wage formation in the medium term models of Statistics Norway (the provider of models to the Treasury and to the political parties represented in the Norwegian parliament. The following from Mr. Ådne Cappelen, who has had a career-long responsibility for model developments, as well as being a distinguished researcher, may be of interest, [C1].

“From the early 1980s and onwards, the Institute of Economics produced a number of well published academic papers that changed how other Norwegian academics and policy makers analyzed Norwegian labour markets. This change may be summarized as a move away from a fairly standard Phillips-curve model of wage determination to a bargaining theory of wage determination. The impact of this contribution is easily seen in the well-known government study NOU 1992:26 (A national strategy for higher employment in the 1990s) that reinvigorated incomes polices in Norway framed within a broader policy package in the early 1990s. At that time this was quite different from what was the standard view within the OECD (as presented in the 1994 OECD Employment Study). Prof. Ragnar Nymoen was one of the young students of wage formation in Norway at the time and his Ph.D in particular included a number of papers published in high ranking academic journals that contributed to this change of minds. I also changed how macro models at Statistics Norway were constructed in this regard. We still rely on Prof. Nymoens current research when modelling wages in the macromodel we supply to the Ministry of Finance and use for analyzing the Norwegian economy at Statistics Norway. Thus, his impact is not only related to past achievements’’

[C2] contains reference to recent research on the impact of labour immigration in Norwegian wages [R21]. The research work on econometric modelling of wage formation also represented the knowledge basis to [C3], which formed a premise for the ruling in the Norwegian High Court in March 2013, about an extension of an collective agreement in Norwegian shipyards, see [C4], 226-26.

The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway has chosen the Norwegian Aggregate Model (NAM, [R20]) as the macroeconomic model for the stress-testing of the Norwegian economy. NAM based tests appeared in Risk Outlook 2014, 2015 and 2016 ([C5]). In 2016 the model was also used in the autumn report, [C6]. The Supervisory Authority will use the model again in the stress-testing for Risk Outlook 2017.
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**Institution:** Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo  
**Research discipline/panel:** Economics / Panel 2  
**Case number or short name (max 10 characters):** Oil taxes  
**Name of impact case:** Taxation of oil companies.  

**Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words):**  
Many countries use taxation (including royalties) to channel much of the value of oil and gas to the government. Economists point out that design of such taxes is nontrivial, since decisions of companies are affected. A combination of design and rates to maximize government revenue must consider the high uncertainty in the activity.

Research that combined insights from public and financial economics showed the importance of symmetry in such taxes. If income is taxed at 78 percent, the tax value of deductions for costs must also be 78 percent. Largely, this recommendation is implemented in Norway.

**Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)**  
This is a long-term research topic of professor Diderik Lund. In [R1] and [R2] he criticized Norwegian petroleum taxation for distortionary effects, in particular due to imperfect loss offset. This is particularly problematic for new firms without possibilities to deduct costs in profits from ongoing activity. Newer methods from financial and public economics, used in [R1], allowed a quantification of the negative effect on investment.

Lund became a member of the public commissions on petroleum taxation in Norway [C1] and Denmark [C2]. In Norway, he authored Appendix 1 to the commission’s report [C1, pp. 185–226]. Professor Karine Nyborg was also a member of the Norwegian commission.

Lund has summarized Norwegian experiences in [R3], [R4], and [R14], extending the analysis to remaining, unresolved issues. These included the riskless interest rate to apply in (i.e., write into) the tax system, whether other nations could learn from the Norwegian experience, a comparison of the Norwegian and Danish experience, and the problem of base erosion and transfer pricing, which is treated theoretically in [R5]. The conclusions reached in research and by the commissions have been defended against criticism from the industry and some academics, [R9], [R11], and environmentalists, [R10].

The commission [C1] also inspired further research. It asked what discount rate firms should apply to net cash flows under various tax systems and various circumstances. This was answered in the appendix [C1, pp. 217–225] and developed further in [R6] and [R13]. A new distinction between the marginal and average risk was discovered and analysed, with implications for firms’ optimal decision making and the possibility of deriving required returns from observed returns in the stock market.

Lund’s standing as an international expert on these issues is also indicated by invitations to contribute to international volumes [R7], [R8], [R12].

**Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)**  
The impact in Norway, through the public commission [C1], is twofold: The petroleum tax system was changed, and the Ministry of Finance changed its methods for evaluating the effects of the system. The change in the petroleum tax system was in line with the recommendation from the commission, in line with [R1] and [R2]. The most important issue here was the imperfect loss offset in the old system. This was a serious disincentive for investment for new companies, who were unable to deduct costs against profits in ongoing activity. In the old system, the nominal costs could be carried forward for
The deduction if and when the company made a profitable discovery and started extraction. In the new system, the 78 percent tax value of the deduction for exploration costs is refunded. In later phases, costs can be carried forward with interest. If a company closes its operations with still unused deductions, the tax value of the balance is refunded. These refund arrangements are quite unique worldwide. The IMF writes [C6, p.24], “Norway has perhaps the closest to a pure rent tax … .” The subsequent development in the sector in the decade after the reforms confirmed the predictions: The number of companies increased from 30 to more than 50.

The impact in Denmark, through the public commission [C2], is less obvious. The commission’s recommendations were in line with the research, but later governments have not followed all recommendations. Lund gave testimony in a public hearing [C3] and lectured at an evaluation conference organized by the Danish Ministry of Taxation [C5].

The methods for evaluating tax systems have also changed. Before 2000, there was no formal analysis of the maximization of market value by companies under uncertainty. Since 2000, the methods are in line with recommendations in public and financial economics [C6, p. 48], and with [R1].

Lund has also given lectures for Norwegian authorities, [C4], [C7], [C8], and industry groups [C9], [C11]. An extensive interview appeared as [C10].
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<tr>
<th>No.</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[C3]</td>
<td>Folketinget (2003), public hearing on regulation and taxation of Danish oil and gas, in two subcommittees of the parliament of Denmark, testimony by Diderik Lund, December 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The societal impact of the research

| Institution: Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo |
| Research discipline/panel: Panel 2 Economics |
| Case number or short name (max 10 characters): School assignment |
| Name of impact case: Resource management, institutions and the resource curse. |
| The performance of school assignment mechanisms |

Summary of the impact (maximum 100 words).
In order to allocate students to schools, many cities operate centralized school assignment mechanisms; the most well-known are the Boston and the Deferred Acceptance mechanism. An extensive theoretical literature shows that these two mechanisms have important advantages and disadvantages. The study by De Haan et al (2016) quantifies these advantages and disadvantages by using unique data collected in Amsterdam with information on actual choices under the Boston mechanism combined with survey data on ordinal and cardinal preferences of students over schools. Based on the findings of this study Amsterdam decided to change their mechanism to the Deferred Acceptance mechanism.

Description of the research underpinning the impact: (maximum 400 words.)
Our research relates to how quality of schooling affects the students: knowing the admission rules and controlling for selection is essential.

There are two main school assignment mechanisms: Boston and DA (Deferred Acceptance). The recent theoretical literature points out that each of the two has its virtue. While DA is strategy-proof and gives a stable matching, Boston might outperform DA in terms of ex-ante efficiency. [R1] quantifies these advantages and disadvantages by using information collected in Amsterdam in 2013 about actual choices under the adaptive Boston mechanism complemented with data from a survey that elicits students' true cardinal preferences regarding schools. [R1] compares Boston with two different versions of DA: DA with one centralized lottery to break ties among students in the same priority group (DA-STB) and DA where each school runs its own lottery (DA-MTB).

[R1] finds that under Boston around 8% of the students disguise their true preferences and apply to another school than their most-preferred school. When evaluating the mechanisms in terms of how many students are assigned to a school from their most-preferred n schools, DA-STB does better than Boston for any value of n, while DA-STB (and Boston) do better than DA-MTB for n=1, whereas DA-MTB does better for n>1.

To estimate the degree of ex-post inefficiency [R1] simulates the fraction of students that would like to switch places without harming other students. The fraction of switchers is highest under DA-MTB followed by Boston, while under DA-STB almost no switches are possible without harming other students. Replacing Boston by DA-STB (DA-MTB) increases average ex-ante welfare equivalent to a reduction in the distance from home to school by around 10 percent.

In contrast to previous studies, [R1] does not make any assumptions about the degree of sophistication of the students/parents. This turns out to be important for the welfare comparison between Boston and DA. [R1] finds that when they disregard students that make a strategic mistake or do not allow them to make a mistake, average ex-ante welfare is higher (instead of lower) under Boston than under the two DA mechanisms. This shows that it is important to consider the possibility that individuals make mistakes, both for
policymakers that decide on whether or not to adopt a mechanism that is not strategy-proof and for researchers evaluating this mechanism.

Details of the impact (maximum 400 words)

In 2014 the authors of [R1] have presented their results to the organization of secondary schools boards in Amsterdam. Based on these results, the members of this organization unanimously decided to replace the adaptive Boston mechanism by the DA-MTB mechanism. The key reason to choose DA-MTB over DA-STB was that it spreads the “pain” of a shortage of places at some popular schools, more equally. This was considered more important than the larger fraction of students that may want to switch schools under DA-MTB than under DA-STB. In May 2015 DA-MTB was used to assign students to secondary schools for the academic year starting in September 2015. Students needed to submit preference lists and could list as many schools as they want. Students were informed that under this system they cannot improve their assignment by submitting a list that deviates from their true preferences and were thus advised to report their true preferences.

Within hours after the release of the results of the assignment in May 2015, students who were not assigned to their most-preferred school (or their parents) started to post “wanted-offer” requests on a forum for parents on the internet. This made the ex-post inefficiency of DA-MTB very salient. For many parents it turned out to be rather difficult to understand that such exchanges could not be allowed. Allowing such exchanges would invalidate the advice to report true preferences and would harm the viability of DA-MTB for the future. Protests of disappointed students/parents even led to a court case, where the judge ruled against the plaintiffs. In the aftermath of the turmoil the organization of schools, nevertheless, felt obliged to reconsider its choice of assignment mechanism. After delivering several reports (in Dutch) [C1]-[C4] and discussions with representatives from parents, local politicians and the authors, reflected in media [C5] - [C7], it has been decided to switch in 2016 to DA-STB.
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If relevant: External references (external users or others who have witnessed the impact and could be contacted to corroborate the claims made in the reported research cases).