

Log contributions [here](#)

# Panel on Open Science at #CSPC2020

## Canadian Science Policy Center 2020 conference

*Convening virtually on November 16-20th, 2020*

The initial goal of this doc was to propose a panel for the CSPC2020



- [See blog post about it](#)
- 30 Oct. Tim completed [the editorial](#) published [here](#)
- 28 Sept. the CSPC offered us the opportunity to **submit an editorial**  
*“Every year an online conference featured editorial is published in which panelists are provided an opportunity to discuss a topic of their choosing in writing. We are inviting your panelists to submit an editorial; editorials must be 600-1000 words and you may include up to two figures to complement your piece. Please note that editorials can have multiple authors.”* deadline is October 30<sup>th</sup>
- Panel **refused** by the CSPC selection committee.
- June 2020 Tibi, Fabio and Alena published this [publication](#).
- June 13 2020 Panel proposal submitted by Tim.

**Background:** see also [our presence at CSPC 2017](#).

## Table of contents

[Formal requirements](#)

[Candidate Panelists](#)

[Coordinating our Time and Attention](#)

[Editorial submission](#)

[Editorial preparation](#)

[Editorial Ideation, Dialogue & Deliberation](#)

[Images](#)

[Co-creating a common thread](#)

[Panel Submission](#)

[Panel Information](#)

[Panelist Information](#)

Log contributions [here](#)

## Formal requirements

- [For panel proposals](#)
- [For themes](#)

See also the Government's [Roadmap for Open Science](#)

Panels must fulfill the following criteria:

- Panelists must represent at least two of the following sectors: **Government**, **Academia**, Private/ Business, **Non-Profit**, and the **Media**.
- Panelists must represent at least **two different provinces**; more diverse geographical representation, including international panelists, will result in higher ranking.
- Panels must NOT include more than 2 individuals (including both speakers and moderators) from the same organization.

## Candidate Panelists

- **Tiberius**: Scaling Open Innovation + Experience and plans of the Open Climate Collabathon
- **Katie** - Open Innovation and maker culture - impact on climate, environment, consumption - hacking the economy
- **David Berlin**: The Global challenge of "securing and expanding/enriching democracy"  
**Alena V.**: Scaling Open innovation for global health challenges - respiratory health - and recently COVID-19 and exploration of ways to coordinate across many open innovation initiatives (with Fabio)

## Coordinating our Time and Attention

Use this table to coordinate joint/group discussion - we can meet in any combination, over the next few days to finalize the invited CSPC editorial submission.

Person	Tues. 27th	Wed. 28th	Thurs. 29th	Friday 30th
Katie				
David				
Tiberius				
Tim	Afternoon or evening	Flexible- thu evening	Afternoon/evening	Very little time

## Editorial submission

See final [Editorial](#)

## Editorial preparation

- Set the context as needed to understand the joint authorship and perhaps some shared observations, intention or motivations involved in coming together to participate in the proposed panel conversation (and concurrent community consultation).
  - Establish that this article hopes to convey, in editorial form, the essence of the panel discussion that we'd hoped to convene for the conference
  - Briefly orient the reader to some of the most central and important things (experiences, beliefs, ideas, concepts....) that brought our together panel in dialogue.
    - Is the panel's variety of experience and expertise itself a germane observation - in relation to the fruits of diverse and inclusive "democracy"/"participation" in thinking through these matters?
- Raise and illustrate several key science policy related matters - whether these are observations, recommendations, speculation, what have you (us) - that the authors wish to highlight in the article - ideally with a view to how these could be drawn together in some satisfying (or provocative) synthesis for the reader to complete. Some candidates:
  - Tim: Ross Ashby's, Law of Requisite variety - its relevance if his formulation of intuitions relevant to the complexity of negotiating and navigating our journey toward more equitable and efficacious science policy.
  - Tim: Enabling conditions for new kinds of networked open innovation collaborations - the exponential potential latent in the very idea of "network", should an evolving "networked society" prove, "*not only a transition from one proportion to another, but also a transition, by a sudden leap, into a ... qualitatively different thing*" - but a profound transformation of our joint imagination and industry, to match the complexity of the grand challenges and wicked problems facing us today. The seeming explosion of new capabilities of machine intelligence realized in the evolution of algorithms into a network-centric, "connectionist" formulation offering an object lesson - a *case in point*, perhaps.
    - Evidence of this very transition abounds today in the calls for regulation of social media platforms for their still unbridled capacity to sow confusion and conflict, as readily as clarity or consensus regarding even the most fundamental matters of social interest.
      - The wildfire-like virulence of disinformation movements regarding even the most basic public health science and policy questions speaks perhaps to the need for deeper engagement, inclusion, participation and

Log contributions [here](#)

integration of the greater citizenry in dialogue with science and science policy.

- The immense force for change evident from these early experiences of “social medias” is but an inkling the power latent in emerging forms of open governance, access and participation
- The question is apparently not of “whether”, but of “how” and “how fast” we can navigate the most desirable path toward more open and collaborative science, innovation and policy entrepreneurship for the transformation of the economy and the environment.
- Katie, Tiberius, David, Alena - Do you wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the attendees, some crucial ideas, motivation, observations, etc. about our selected panel subject matter?
  - Katie - your notes speak a lot to the intensity - the power of the present day web to incite dissention, misinformation, and conflict, at scale
  - David, per the notes below, you want to connect with the Economy -
- Express some productive synthesis of the insights or observations offered above - attempt to arrive at some convergence or result from the divergent panelist/co-author perspectives.
- Identify and motivate realization of related opportunities that this conference presents for the science policy community - ideally provoking some critical reflection of how the ideas presented might be applied in their scientific and /or policy endeavours.

## Editorial Ideation, Dialogue & Deliberation

KK looked at our notes and came up with a quick possible outline for an editorial. Cool with a different approach, though. It's a weak walk through at this point

- **Fractured information ecology** (Hensher et al. 2020) is particularly problematic in times of crisis – such as COVID-19
- We are likely to see more events and problems emerge that require changes in our ability to adapt and responds to pressures – resilience
- The monetization of knowledge within a hyper-connected world leads to grave issues regarding misinformation on multiple aspects of the pandemic (Santos Rutschman 2020)
- Interventions with little contestation within the scientific community become extreme points of contention within cyber-communities.
  - For example masks; clear scientific evidence that these slow the virus
  - And yes, people protested at the thought of losing an ounce of liberty and freedom from the sovereign individual
  - Quickly, one's stance on facemasks became highly associated with one's political orientation
- The information ecology of the internet is very efficient at taking advantage of crises – often in the name of growth economics.

Log contributions [here](#)

- User behaviour regarding COVID-19 is very similar to user behaviour to climate change. **Users seek out information to help alleviate anxiety or to further confirm existing biases to feel more in control (Solomon, Greenberg, other refs)**
- The algorithm then decides how best to exploit these weaknesses for the benefit of shareholders and customers; this is impacted by those with more money – major donors for political campaigns cannot donate all at once, or else the behaviour of the algorithms and politicians is less in their control. But by providing a slow and steady stream that increases when they like what they hear and decreases when they do not – **it puts political messaging into the hands of the elite (O’Neil 2016)** Civic life is impacted – fake videos and sensationalized news become more normalized and people are less able to engage with it
- This is reflective of our era of “information warfare” in which deliberate disinformation strategies are used by state and non-state actors (Prier 2017)
- Users end up experiencing tidal waves of information that they both do not trust and have to trust; the inability of public health officials and experts to sufficiently coordinate to combat disinformation during covid-19 points to major trouble; for the billions of people who use social media daily, their realities are no longer shaped by science but by algorithms with alternative motives and littler regard for impacts on the real world
- While the urgent need for regulating these largely unregulated networks of advertising and consumer manipulation – it can also be **counteracted by open knowledge commons as a form of knowledge democracy.**
- Knowledge shaped how different countries could respond to COVID-19 – knowledge withheld by countries experiencing higher numbers than reported and comments from national leaders that were perhaps not based in truth hampered humanity’s ability to control the virus
- Production of a vaccine and the creation of an international effort to further control the virus necessitates open knowledge commons and shared data (Rosnay and Musiani 2020)
- Decentralized knowledge and networks are opportunities of individuals and groups to take over spaces of knowledge online. Comprised of peer-to-peer networks, knowledge common are socio-technical institutions that help garner resilience in the face of uncertainty
  - During covid 19, makers and the open source community took charge – they shared printed files and they networked together to create personal protective equipment
- These models enhance participatory civil society globally and locally, while being founded on democratic principles
- Institutions and activists looking to address misinformation could
  - Move to open-source methods of work and knowledge generation
  - Implement decentralized democratic peer-to-peer networks that are linked with local and global logics

Log contributions [here](#)


- In ecological economic participatory planning, resilience, and reproduction help to contribute to holistic economic approach to addressing these failures
- Plan through multiple perspectives within democratic institution
- Resilience by placing justice as a core value for policy creation
- All that is taken is to improve the well-being of the community

## Images

We can include 1 or 2 figures with which to illuminate the text - we can use this section to paste, draw or describe suggested imagery

### Help me 3D Print face shields for Ysbyty Gwynedd



 Dafydd Brown is organizing this fundraiser.

Created April 1, 2020 |  Community & Neighbors

I'm currently dedicating my 3D Printers to help produce face shields for my local district hospital Ysbyty Gwynedd, local health service, local GPs and care homes.


For clarity, I incorrectly used the term PPE when setting up the details. This is NOT rated as PPE in any way, they are simply 3D printed face shields.

**£7,218** raised of £200 goal

**80** donors   **375** shares   **80** followers


 **Share**

 **Donate now**

 GoFundMe.org  
**£405** • 6 mos

 Emma Haque  
**£20** • 6 mos

 James Gibson  
**£10** • 6 mos

 E Syska  
**£20** • 6 mos

 Jane Kelman  
**£20** • 6 mos

[See all](#)

 [See top donations](#)

Log contributions [here](#)

# Sensorica Panel Proposal

---

This document served for the design of a panel for the CSPC 2020 conference scheduled on June 12th, 2020, 23:59 ET. This initiative was led by [Sensorica](#), which already run [a similar panel on open science](#) at CSPC 2017

[Panel Proposal Criteria](#)

[Panel Proposal Submission Site](#)

**Main facilitators:** TimX and [Tibi](#)

## **IMPORTANT NOTE**

Everyone who contributes to this initiative donates their time for a common cause, and together we create an opportunity for us as individuals, to project our ideas, to enlarge our network, to be seen and to enrich our experience. Please respect your colleagues' time by respecting your commitments. Not doing so leads to bad reputation and loss of future opportunities.

## Co-creating a common thread



Let's engage in discussions to expose our interests / motivations, our ideas and opinions about how this panel should go. The goal is to find a common thread to the panel and a format.

Use the section below to revise your standing. Use the following section to capture / harvest from our live discussions.



ideas

Thoughts, perception,  
references, experiences,

**Communicate your thoughts. To develop your understanding of others and find common ground engage in conversations with others - see below. Update your thoughts based on how your perception changed in time.**

Name	Your stand
Katie	
Alena	
Tiberius	<p>CSPC has been created to gather feedback for the Government, to inform science policy. It is a platform through which various interest groups exert their influence and contribute with ideas. Our main goal should be to <b>influence science policy</b>. We don't go there to present a scientific study. We don't take a cautious stand. We are loud, bold, determinate, certain, clear, focused and push our ideas and vision of the future. We will be in competition with so many interest groups, some of which push in the opposite direction.</p> <p>I resonate with David's idea to speak to people not to power. This requires putting in place mechanisms to allow those who listen to immediately fall into action.</p>
David	<p>Trump is badmouthing mail-in ballots. This does not make e-voting any more secure except relative to options. I should like to further explore e-voting option. It is not the panacea but it en-route. It is only when we can establish the medium that we can move towards collective-decision making and collective governance which is the idea of democracy.</p>

<b>Tim</b>	<p>I thought that the idea/strategy/suitability of centering the “Economics” theme - as proposed by David in our discussion - is very well suited to the composition of the panel, as well as to the forum in which we convene.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● In the CSPC strategic plan, they define their mandate “Science policy can be considered from three separate, but intersecting, perspectives:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ #1 - <b>Policy for science</b>: <u>strategies for optimizing the <b>social and economic returns on Canada’s science, technology, and innovation (STI) investments.</b></u></li><li>○ #2 - <b>Science for policy</b>: the use of scientific knowledge, methods, and capabilities to ensure the <u>well-being of citizens and the nation’s goals</u></li><li>○ #3 - <b>Science of science policy</b>: a more recent development that is closely related to the first two perspectives. It is an interdisciplinary area of research that seeks to develop theoretical and empirical models of the scientific enterprise and its interface with society.</li></ul></li><li>● <i>David - # 2 and #3 both seems to connect with advancement in democratic participation</i></li></ul> <p>In the submission form, there is a category of panel that is something like “novel format” - I’d like to explore what that might be like for us... Does anyone have any experience of ways to make such a panel discussion more enjoyable and “productive”?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● We developed this idea a bit when we met on June 2nd - I proposed using Ethelo software to convene a stakeholder consultation during the course of our panel discussion - perhaps beginning in advance and continuing afterward, but forming an integral part of the panel format.</li><li>● Thinking about this later, and hearing Tiberius’ impetus to advocate for something specific - contrasted with only describing things - positing theories, etc. I thought we could pose some specific and relevant Science policy questions:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Pose a policy exploration regarding open access and open Science - access to the results and processes of publicly funded science<sup>1</sup></li></ul></li></ul>
------------	--

1

<https://en.ccunesco.ca/-/media/Files/Unesco/Resources/2020/04/UNESCORecommendationOpenScienceCanadianPerspectives.pdf>  
<https://open.canada.ca/en/content/canadas-2018-2020-national-action-plan-open-government>  
[http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h\\_F6765465.html?OpenDocument](http://www.science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_F6765465.html?OpenDocument)  
<https://sciencepolicy.ca/news/future-science-and-knowledge-engagement-and-canadians>  
<https://sciencepolicy.ca/news/open-access-scholarly-publishing-call-action>  
[http://science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h\\_97992.html](http://science.gc.ca/eic/site/063.nsf/eng/h_97992.html)  
<http://blog.cdnsiencepub.com/open-science-now-is-the-time-for-canadians-to-speak-up/>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● A google search: [("open access" OR "open-access") AND site:nrc.canada.ca] executed June, 2020 yields only 4 results; while the search on site:nrc.canada.ca alone yields 4400 pages.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The most salient result is: <a href="https://nrc.canada.ca/en/corporate/values-ethics/research-scientific-integrity-policy">https://nrc.canada.ca/en/corporate/values-ethics/research-scientific-integrity-policy</a> which states that: The responsible author(s) of any research or scientific communication must ensure that... "<i>The possibility of publishing in Open Access journals for scientific and technical papers has been explored</i>;</li></ul></li><li>● We do not need to frame the precise structure and content of the Ethelo-enabled consultation in advance of submitting the panel proposal - but we will need to say something about it in the proposal - enough to make the format, scope, intention and subject-matter clear.</li><li>● The connection with economic development and impact of public research on innovation potential speaks to the *economic* thread that we identified as a unifying theme.</li><li>● Are there directions, other than open science and access to publicly funded research and related policies that we can consider?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Ecological Economics - does the Canadian Science Policy (includes SSHRC) acknowledge the field? [Google search site:sshrc-crsh.gc.ca "ecological economics" returns 5 results - and without the term, 6,880 results] - a few of the results are from 2009 and the others are to publicize that Peter Brown won the 2017 Herman Daly Award. [site:nrc.canada.ca "ecological economics"] returns no hits. Zero. So, basically Katie's field does not exist in Canadian Science Policy.</li><li>○ At the organization we wish to convene a panel, again: ["ecological economics" AND site:sciencepolicy.ca] - <u>Zero hits</u>. "Economics" - 160 hits, "ecological" - 45 hits - the two just don't mix. C'est dommage.</li></ul></li></ul>



## Notes from our discussions

**Build a deeper understanding of each others and negotiate. Go back and update your own thoughts, based on your new understanding and positioning.**

Log contributions [here](#)

**David** - open democracy.

**Katie** - economic policies, open source, socio-ecological systems. Economics for the anthropocene program, ecological economics: take into account energy flows, energy systems, the economy has to be within the ecological boundaries.

**Tibi** - Sensorica, experience + Covid, shows that these new types of organisations are promising a lot in terms of solving wicked problems.

**David:** People get co-opted into the status quo. Going from high idealism to corruption. We need to have all our ducks in the row. The main duck is the economy. Definition of money: seen as a way of managing ourselves. It functions as a management system. The allocation of money in society affects which things are developed or not. Huge protocol of national agreements, gold standard replaced by the USD. What if we think about what we want first, make a plan, in an open source way, and after we think about money. Flip the whole thing around, consider money as a tool (Sensorica would say, a tool among many others).

**Katie:** Economy = the well being of people, the home and the economy of the home. We need to reevaluate ecosystem services. Money is different in different contexts.

**Tibi:** generalize David's proposal - put in place the conditions for something to be achieved.

**David:** Perhaps we should not address the Government, but the people: "we have a plan, come to us, the train is leaving".

Log contributions [here](#)

## Panel Submission

NOTE: Panel has been rejected. We were asked to submit an editorial instead.

**Support contact:**

Daniela Nogueira, CSPC 2020 Secretariat, [daniela@bayelygroup.com](mailto:daniela@bayelygroup.com)

Telephone: 1.888.527.3434 (toll free)/ +1.519.263.5050 (office) / +1.519.263.6003 (direct)

**Submission ID:** 7

**Submission Title:** Scaling Open Innovation Networks to Address Global Challenges

## Panel Information

**Theme (Please select the overarching theme):**

[CSPC 2020 Special Theme: Grand Challenges](#)

**Topic (Please select the overarching topic):**

[Climate Change, Net Zero Plan](#)

**If your panel is directly related to any other specified topics within the selected theme, please list them here (no more than 2 additional topics):**

[Disruptive Technologies, Global Health: Pandemics, Aging, AMR](#)

**Panel format (Please select one):**

[An original, interactive format](#)

**Title of Panel in English:**

[Scaling Open Innovation Networks to Address Global Grand Challenges](#)

**Please briefly describe your panel proposal, detailing the topic of the panel and the various areas/ issues that it would cover. (In English, 400 words maximum):**

We wish to draw attention to the immense impact of open innovation - recently demonstrated through the rapid scaling-up of the global response to COVID-19 pandemic - and its broad applicability in addressing many grand challenges today and in the years ahead. We provoke reflection on the question: "is radically open and transparent science and innovation necessary in effecting sufficiently adaptive responses to grand challenges?" Put another way, is the ongoing policy dismissal - practically speaking - of this mode of innovation and production the very definition of a formula for continued failure.

Log contributions [here](#)

Reflecting the motivating themes, we propose to convene a massive-scale online multi-stakeholder consultation - in parallel with the panel discussion and forming an integral component of the dialogue, so convened. The interactive online consultation will facilitate stakeholder deliberation regarding questions of direct relevance to the promise, capacity and pathways for implementing Canadian science policy capable of realizing this now clearly demonstrated, but woefully undervalued mode of discovery, innovation and economic viability, growth and sustainability.

The convened panelists serve as a focal point for this interactive dialogue and community consultation and all have significant, direct experience in applying and scaling radically open and transparent open science and innovation to important grand challenges of our day. Briefly, these include: open science hardware for cost-effective access to bench science - including recent design of ventilators and other critical PPE and coping innovations; the application of blockchain technologies for scaling climate change mitigation and adaptation, globally, among non-state actors; the transformation toward an “ecological economics” that begins with a realistic conception of human life on planet earth, as a basis for economic theory and practice; and, finally, the revitalization of democracy using Web 3.0 technologies to catalyze more direct citizen participation in critical decision-making - on questions of policy, major infrastructure investment and much more.

Questions raised by informed, experience-led consideration of large-scale, open, more participatory science and innovation and policy development, will offer valuable insights for cities, provinces, nations and international collaborations. By discovering and sharing effective norms, practices, policies, standards and regulations we aim to accelerate and advance successful application of this proven - we propose also, necessary - capability for massive, radically open innovation collaboration in overcoming humanity’s grand challenges.

**Optional - Please briefly describe your panel proposal in French. (400 words maximum):**

Nous souhaitons attirer l'attention sur l'immense potentiel que l'innovation ouverte a récemment démontré par la réponse rapide à la pandémie de COVID-19 et sur sa pertinence pour relever de nombreux grands défis dans les années à venir. En outre, nous souhaitons provoquer une réflexion à savoir si la science et l'innovation radicalement ouvertes et transparentes sont nécessaires pour apporter des réponses suffisamment adaptatives aux grands défis. Est-ce que le rejet politique continu de ce mode ouvert d'innovation constitue une formule d'échec?

Nous proposons de convoquer une consultation multipartite en ligne, à grande échelle, en parallèle avec le panel - faisant partie intégrante du dialogue. La consultation interactive en ligne facilitera les délibérations sur la capacité et les voies de mise en œuvre d'une politique scientifique canadienne capable de stimuler ce mode de découverte terriblement sous-évaluée, la viabilité économique, la croissance et la durabilité.

Les panélistes convoqués pour ce dialogue interactif et cette consultation communautaire, ont tous de l'expérience directe dans la mise à l'échelle de la science et de l'innovation radicalement ouvertes et transparentes et leur l'application aux grands défis majeurs de notre époque. En bref, leurs expérience réuni: l'équipement scientifique open source pour réduire les coûts des laboratoire scientifiques (récemment appliquée à la conception de ventilateurs et d'autres innovations essentielles en matière d'EPI et d'adaptation); l'application des

Log contributions [here](#)

technologies de la chaîne de blocs pour étendre l'atténuation et l'adaptation au changement climatique, à l'échelle mondiale, parmi les acteurs non étatiques; la transformation vers une «économie écologique» qui commence par une conception réaliste de la vie humaine sur la planète Terre, comme base de la théorie et de la pratique économiques; et, enfin, la revitalisation de la démocratie en utilisant les technologies du Web 3.0 pour catalyser une participation plus directe des citoyens aux prises de décisions critiques.

Les questions de politique scientifique soulevées par ce panel expérimente en innovation ouverte à grande échelle offriront des informations précieuses aux villes, aux provinces et aux États, aux nations ou aux collaborations internationales. Nous découvrirons les normes, les standards et les réglementations qui font avancer avec succès les applications de cette capacité éprouvée d'une innovation ouverte à grande échelle, pour surmonter les grands défis de l'humanité.

**Please justify how your panel fits into the selected theme for your proposal. (200 words maximum):**

**All**

It's readily apparent that large-scale collaboration and cooperative action continues to represent the contents behind the label - "*In case of Emergency, break glass*" - where humanity's shared, "go to" response to urgent existential threat is concerned. Notwithstanding a few notable, "moon shots", we every day reproduce a society determined to delude itself with self-aggrandizing narratives of uncommon genius, heroic inventors, inspired entrepreneurs, caring saints... and gentleman scientists. Does anyone really believe that any of the grand challenges facing us, today, will yield to such outmoded conceptions or measures? Further, the wide-scale and growing dissatisfaction with short-sighted, myopic "progress", driven by scientific and technocratic perspectives, subject only to requirements of anti-ecological economics, demands deep reflection among the science and science policy community regarding their continued relevance in a world being called to transcend the confines of a tired, solipsistic imagination. Our panel brings together knowledgeable and experienced interlocutors to facilitate and scale-up well-informed inquiry and deliberation regarding crucial questions of how, what has proven time and time again the only successful response to grand challenges - large-scale collaboration and cooperative action - can revivify our collective imagination for a more natural, realistic and ecologically sound science, innovation and economic policy.

**Please list 5-10 keywords that describe your panel:**

climate, pandemic, democratic, open, collaborative, participatory, innovation, sustainable, ecological economic

Log contributions [here](#)

**Please explain the novelty and importance of this issue in particular, in the context of the new realities of the next decade, for Canada or for the world. (200 words maximum):**

Theoretical musings about “wicked problems” once seemed a novelty. Genuine novelty now lies in devising approaches capable of overcoming the wicked problems now threatening our well-being and peaceful coexistence on planet Earth; climate change, pandemic, erosion of democracy with campaigns of disinformation, automated psychological and social manipulation and an equitable transition to economies of near-fully automated production and service delivery. The importance and the urgency of effectively addressing such grand challenges can not be overstated - and should be readily apparent, especially under the present pandemic condition. As for novelty, it seems that much of the world was surprised by the immense productive capacity of formerly unaffiliated individuals, coming together to collaborate from all parts of the globe. It is therefore doubly novel, we believe, to convene a panel consisting of practitioners having extensive experience and practice in developing systems for fostering and scaling such productive capacity..

**Explain how your panel would address any or all of the following questions (Please provide your response below, 200 words maximum):**

- How and what kind of scientific and/or traditional knowledge can help address the issue?
- How and what kind of policy or policy modification can help address the challenge?
- How do we strengthen the Canadian institutions and policies that support the production, integration, and use of knowledge in tackling this challenge?
- How do we more effectively link the public, private, and academic sectors in tackling this challenge?
- How could the public be engaged in addressing this challenge?
- How could CSPC play a role in helping to find solutions to this priority challenge?

**Explain how your panel would address any or all of the questions listed above (200 words maximum):**

Current knowledge of the state of the science in ecological economics as well as extensive individual and collaborative study regarding practices of open science and innovation and movements toward new modes of massive-scale ICT-enabled commons-based peer-production. Ecological economics offers insights essential for ecologically and socially sustainable economies. We combine this discipline with our experience inventing, operating and refining open and collaborative economic and democratic systems and collaborations within existing socio-economic categories and associated policy frameworks. We use the term, the “Fourth Sector” to refer to the proponent or agent created through large-scale, ICT-enabled peer-to-peer collaboration among individuals.

Policies supporting open publication for replication of publicly funded science is a small step toward the enfranchisement of fourth sector actors. This new fourth sector actor also lacks political franchise commensurate to its capacity to constructively inform democratic processes. Massively scaled democratic consultation and deliberation using available information and communications technology serves to more fully inform society regarding urgent and important policy matters and - as the recent tsunami of creative ventilator designs demonstrates - also

Log contributions [here](#)

unleashes immense, untapped creativity and industry. Canada's nexus of science, policy and economics, CSPC can accelerate access to this latent individual and socio-technical capacity.

**Why are the proposed panelists the best to discuss this topic? Additionally, explain if the moderator has the qualifications requested in criteria page (see link to criteria page below) (100 words maximum):**

Custodian of longest sustained open value network for open science and innovation across sectors. European Commission expert on, Future of the Internet, Co-organized global collabathon for blockchain carbon accounting.

Healthcare professional, practice-based research on open science and innovation collaborations in respiratory health and pandemic response.

Post-doc in Ecological Economics (Ph.D., McGill University) studying "maker" culture, commons-based peer production for potential in socio-ecological-economic transformation.

Founding editor of the Walrus and federal bridge party of Canada leading movement for participatory policy and economic decision making. Educated in social and political thought, and taught at several universities.

**How does your panel fulfill the diversity criteria? Explain how this panel is gender-balanced and features sectoral, provincial, generational, and other elements of diversity. (100 words maximum):**

Panel, comprised of two women and two men, includes early career researchers, a mid-career practitioner and a senior professional, collectively embodying significant internationally recognized credentials and experience across a wide array of industries, sectors scientific and technological fields (ecological economics, respiratory care and public health, photonics, open hardware, sociology, journalism, policy, political theory, medicine).

Two panelists reside and work in Quebec and the others in Ontario. First languages representing both official languages of Canada are represented, as are other first languages - two of the panelists having immigrated to Canada.

**Explain based on the format you have chosen for the panel, how you would ensure the interactivity of the session. (150 words maximum):**

Interactivity and, further, the facilitation of large-scale online, internet and ICT enabled stakeholder consultation and deliberation represents a central element of the novel panel format being proposed. Leading up to the panel discussions and continuing in some interactive form, during the panel discussion, we will engage the interested public in evaluation of the relevant issues and concerns and explore various policy alternatives and economic trade-offs associated with more open and collaborative science and innovation in addressing grand challenges. We anticipate that, in addition to the direct moderation of panel dialog, the panelists will also observe and respond to feedback from online deliberations - in which we will take steps to engage a large number of participants, globally. And, a subsequent Q & A session will nevertheless be reserved for registered attendees to the CSPC event.

Log contributions [here](#)

## Panelist Information

**Each panel proposal is allowed a maximum of 5 speakers INCLUDING the moderator. In exceptional cases where the panel format requires it (such as roundtable), a 6th speaker will be allowed.**

**Number of panelists (excluding the moderator) - 5 panelists is only for exceptional cases where the panel format requires it, such as roundtable)**

### **Tiberius Brastaviceanu**

Co-Founder of Sensorica

Montreal, Canada

Ms in Nuclear Medicine and Radiobiology (Sherbrooke University) and Epistemology / Philosophy of Science (UQAM), currently with Sensorica.

One of the main architects of the Open Value Network model, an economic model for commons-based peer production. Developing sustainable, self-organizing ecosystems based on open innovation.

Presentations

- \* Deep Dive: Rethinking value, Berlin, 2016
- \* p2pValue International conference, Amsterdam, 2016
- \* Invitation to private meeting in Ottawa, Ministry of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development (2016),
- \* Invitation to private meeting at the White House (2015),
- \* Impact Economy Summit (2015),
- \* OuiShare Paris (2014),
- \* TEDx Montréal (2013),
- + numerous presentations in academic forums

In the press

- \* SENSORICA ou quand l'accès libre se met au service du bien commun [Hinnovic 12, Mov, 2015]
- \* SENSORICA, nouveau modele d'affaire ou mode passagere? [Revue Gestion, HEC Montreal, 2014]
- \* Économie peer-to-peer : témoignage d'un entrepreneur [SAJE Montreal]
- \* Owing Together Is the New Sharing [Yes Magazine, 2015]
- \* Owing is the new sharing [Shareable, 2014]

Scientific publications

- \* OSH Start-ups' Business Development Challenges: The Case of SENSORICA from a Total Integrated Marketing Perspective

Documentaries

- \* A New Economy, by Trevor Mayer, 2016

Log contributions [here](#)

URL: <http://www.sensorica.co/home/about-us/tiberius-brastaviceanu>

**David**, Last Name, Title/designation (helpful for email greetings),  
Province/State....Biography...

**Alena**, Last Name, Title/designation (helpful for email greetings),  
Province/State....Biography...

**Katie**, Last Name, Title/designation (helpful for email greetings),  
Province/State....Biography...

**THEY REORDERED SOME THINGS, IT SEEMS - SO THE ABOVE IS THE MASTER/FINAL ORDER AND TEXT - below is older text, that may be utilized in completing the parts above (*I didn't want to delete anything, at this point*).**