

# Notes from meetings with the Executive Board on 7, 10 and 11 July 2023

As was to be expected, some of those joining the EB-meetings were disappointed the EB did not radically cut all ties with the fossil industry. But also people were happy that the AB has taken up the task to come to a good procedure to assess collaborations in a more complete way. Board members Rens Buchwaldt and Sjoukje Heimovaara personally explained the rationale behind the decision. Other remarks included:

- Good to start with fossil, but important to also make it workable for other industries. Focus on all transitions we're aiming at. Also decide 'what are fossil fuel companies', how broad will you make it at the start?
- Good to start with research, but also think of society based education assignments, career events, study associations, guest lectures within courses. Take student's hesitations into account.
- Good to think of white, grey and black organisations. Though, depending on the glasses you have on, the shade of grey may differ. Can we be clear on what 'black' is?
- Make it a holistic framework: Don't only focus on the numbers. Make it more a behavioral policy/framework than a legal framework.
- Make it something that let's researcher think about the potential effects and implications of their research and collaboration partner. Let researchers become more reflexive.
- Make it clear what WUR really stands for, and make it something everyone at WUR really embodies.
- Make it something practical / workable. Bureaucracy/due diligence might be needed but can easily be seen as a burden. Think of ways that people really 'embody' this way of decision making.
  - o Suggestion: Have every collaborating party sign a document with our principles/demands (like suppliers often have to do) to show that they are a reliable partner. Only test if they really live up to on request or when in doubt to save bureaucratic burden.
  - o Think of ways to exchange experiences / a place where people can go to in case of doubt. CSA is also working on starting an advisory office to go to in case of doubt.
- Difficult to decide *who* should make the decision. Be clear about this and make it normal and transparent to talk about difficult decisions.
- There is a lot of momentum now. Pity if the thorough advise causes delay. Use momentum to get the 'principle decision' of the EB (include reliability of collaboration partner in the decision making) into the heads of employees and students.

- There are already many assessment criteria (both formal and informal ones), make use of these.
- There are people who often make collaboration decisions and people who don't do that often. Different ways of assessment might be needed for these different groups.
- There is the possibility to assess at the start of a project, but this assessment might change over the course of the project. Give an opportunity to re-assess.
- Different views on blacklisting remain present
- Different views on 'getting political' remain present
  
- You have a nice and diverse working group, but might miss some minority groups. People really affected by climate change. Keep these in mind / include them.
- Important for the advisory group to be transparent about their task and progress. Maybe open a subscription list for people who want to stay updated.