



Deliverable 8.6

Responsible Research & Innovation (RRI) Report Year 2, 2019-20

Project ref. no.	H2020-MG-2018-SingleStage-INEA N° 824326
Project title	Revealing fair and actionable knowledge from data to support women's inclusion in transport systems
Project duration	1 st November 2018 – 31 st October 2021 (36 months)
Website	www.diamond-project.eu
Related WP/Task	WP8 / D8.6
Dissemination level	CONFIDENTIAL
Document due date	30/10/2020 M24
Actual delivery date	13/11/2020 M25
Deliverable leader	STIR
Document status	Submitted

Revision History

Version	Date	Author	Document history/approvals
0.1		Ronald McQuaid and Yvonne Hail, University of Stirling	Draft version circulated to partners
1.0		Elena García AITEC	Reviewer
1.0		Andrea Gorrini SYS	Reviewer
1.0	Nov 2020	Ricard Barberà i Guillem IBV	Reviewer
1.0		Lucía Recio EURECAT	Reviewer
1.0		Paula Ciria Espinosa FGC	Reviewer
1.1	13/11/2020	Project Coordinator	Submission

Executive Summary

The focus of this report is on the operation of the DIAMOND project's ethical processes during year 2 (2019-2020) and any issues arising arising from them or from the empirical research carried out.

The main ethics processes for DIAMOND and accompanying Guidelines were set up in year one (see D8.2 and D8.4) and reported in the year 1 RRI annual report (D8.5). The current report refers to Year 2 (2019-2020) activities and mainly involved approval of remaining ethical decisions so that empirical research could be carried out. In year 2 there were no major ethical issues raised and all data collection instruments have now been given full ethical approval.

However, the impacts of Covid-19 greatly affected the project particularly from around April 2020. This resulted in: a) all meetings of the ethics board being held online; b) additional or revised ethics applications to allow changes in data gathering due to the effects of the pandemic. Both of these seemed to have operate effectively and did not delay the project significantly.

After the interduction, this report sets out the ethics management structure, applications and amendments dealt with during year 2, an audit of issues, if any, for each partner, a general dicussion of issues and conclusions.

Overall the ethical processes seem to have worked reasonably well for the project and partners.

I

Table of Contents

REVISION HISTORY	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
TERMINOLOGY AND ACRONYMS	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. DIAMOND 'S ETHICS MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	6
3. ETHICS APPLICATION DECISIONS & ETHICS BOARD MEETINGS MINUTES..	8
<i>ETHICS BOARD TELECONFERENCE NOVEMBER 7TH 2019 OBSERVATIONS FOR USE CASES II AND III</i>	8
<i>ETHICS BOARD TELECONFERENCE DECEMBER 11TH 2019 ADDITIONAL APPLICANTS TO DAD</i>	9
<i>ETHICS BOARD TELECONFERENCE DECEMBER 18TH 2019 STRUCTURED DATA APPLICATION AND OBSERVATIONS FOR USE CASE III</i>	10
<i>ETHICS BOARD TELECONFERENCE FEBRUARY 12TH 2020 UESI QUESTIONNAIRES</i>	11
<i>ETHICS BOARD TELECONFERENCE 16TH JULY 2020 UESI FOCUS GROUPS AND TELEPHONE/ONLINE INTERVIEWS</i>	11
<i>ETHICS BOARD 5TH OCTOBER 2020 EMAIL. AMENDMENT TO THE APPLICATION FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION THROUGH THE UESI QUESTIONNAIRE ALREADY APPROVED</i>	12
4. AUDIT OF EACH PARTNER	13
5. ISSUES ARISING	14
6. CONCLUSIONS	15

TERMINOLOGY AND ACRONYMS

<i>EC</i>	<i>European Commission</i>
<i>EU</i>	<i>European Union</i>
<i>FP</i>	<i>Framework Programme</i>
<i>PMB</i>	<i>Project Management Board</i>
<i>PMP</i>	<i>Project Management Plan</i>
<i>STAB</i>	<i>Scientific and Technical Advisory Board</i>
<i>WP</i>	<i>Work Package</i>
<i>GDPR</i>	<i>General Data Protection Regulation</i>
<i>RRI</i>	<i>Responsible Research & Innovation</i>

1. INTRODUCTION

The focus of this report is on the operation of the DIAMOND project's ethical processes during year 2 (2019-2020) and any issues arising from them or from the empirical research carried out. This report also sets out actions related to the ethics processes and approvals, and ethical and research integrity issues that have arisen during the year 2. The processes are described in other deliverables including the DIAMOND RRI and legal first year report (D8.5).

As described in Deliverable 8.2 ethical guidelines for social research across Europe are based on the joint development of specific rules and norms within different disciplines which have been created in line with research integrity expectations, the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) Article 8 and current General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) regulations. Of course all research in the DIAMOND project should follow relevant Horizon 2020, EU, national and discipline-based ethical and research integrity guidelines.

Given that Diamond conducts both primary and secondary data collection across all empirical WPs, it is necessary that a strong governance and ethics framework is embedded within the project. An ethical framework is required in order that both researchers and especially the participants taking part in the project can be assured that good practice has been met by the DIAMOND project, thus promoting confidence in the research and ensuring that the findings adhere to the appropriate ethical restrictions.

In general, ethical research is built on trust and integrity, including avoiding potential conflicts of interest or causing harm to participants or researchers and ensuring all data collected is handled properly. It helps ensure that participants involved in the research are provided with sufficient information to decide on whether or not to take part in the research, and that they explicitly and voluntarily give their informed consent to take part. All information gathered is considered anonymous and confidential unless explicit consent is given otherwise. Ethical research also avoids interviewing vulnerable people, unless essential to the research and there are careful safeguards in place to support this.

This report now sets out the ethics management structure, followed by applications and amendments dealt with during year 2, an audit of issues, if any, for each partner, a general discussion of issues and conclusions.

2. DIAMOND 's ETHICS MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Project partners are aware of the ethical challenges facing an international and interdisciplinary project which not only collects primary data from participants across the partner countries but also involves analysing secondary data held by end user organisations. By utilising group work, maintaining open and honest dialogue and mutual exchange between partners, we seek to work towards maintaining an unbiased attitude, developing well-defined ideological standpoints in order to preserve a sense of criticality throughout the project. An external (non-partner) member of the DIAMOND Advisory Board was invited to the ethics board meetings as in all cases attempts were made to achieve an relatively independent view on ethics decisions. Where possible the ethics approval procedures of individual partners were used to gain approval, so as to have as independent a review of ethics applications as possible.

Where this was not possible (generally where partners did not have a suitable internal ethics process and committee), applications would be made only to the DIAMOND ethics Board. In year 1 the University of Stirling (STIR) developed a range of ethics guidance documents to support the ethical collection of data for the DIAMOND project (see D8.2 and D8.4).

2.1 Ethics Board Members

Name	Contact Details	Organisation	Secondary contact name	Contact Details
Francisco Santarremigia	fsantarremigia@aitec-intl.com	AITEC	Gemma Molero	gmolero@aitec-intl.com
Ludovico Boratto	ludovico.boratto@eurecat.org	EURECAT	Lucia Naranjo	Lucia.recio@eurecat.org
Piotr Załęcki	P.Zalecki@ztm.waw.pl	ZTM	Łukasz Filipczak	L.Filipczak@ztm.waw.pl
Elizabeth Young	elizabeth.young@waveautos.com	WAVE	Robin Young	robin.young@firstpointcommunications.com
Rawad Choubassi	r.choubassi@systematica.net	SYS	Andrea Gorrini	a.gorrini@systematica.net
Paula Ciria Espinosa	pciria@fgc.cat	FGC	J. Carles Terés Casals	jcteres@fgc.cat
Augustus Ababio-Donkor	a.ababio-donkor@napier.ac.uk	ENU	Prof. Wafaa Saleh	W.Saleh@napier.ac.uk
Milos Milenkovic	m.milenkovic@gmail.com	FTTE	Filip Filipović	f.filipovic@sf.bg.ac.rs
Chris Blache	chrisblache@genre-et-ville.org	GENRE ET VILLE	N/A	N/A
Alfonso Montella	alfonso.montella@unina.it	RINA	Katia Vosilla	katia.vosilla@rina.org
Ronald McQuaid	Ronald.mcquaid@stir.ac.uk	STIR	Yvonne Hail	yvonne.hail@stir.ac.uk
External Reviewers			Rachel Palman	rpalmen@uoc.edu
			Cristina Marolda	cristina@marolda.me

3. ETHICS APPLICATION DECISIONS & ETHICS BOARD MEETINGS MINUTES

In D8.5 (RRI Year I Report) dated 31 October 2019 we detailed ethics applications still to be decided as:

Collection Technique	Use case
Structured Data	All (users and employees)
Focus Groups	All (users and employees)
Employee satisfactions Surveys	Use Case 4
User Satisfaction Surveys	Use case 1, 2 and 3
Observations	Use case 2 and 3

These applications were given full approval and data collection begun.

New Applications

Ethics Board Teleconference November 7th 2019 Observations for Use Cases II and III

In Attendance at Meetings - Contributors to Report:

(Yvonne, Ronald) STIR, August (ENU), Lucia (EURECAT) Elena (AITEC), Milos (FTTE)

Main Applicant: SYS

Actions Completed:

Consider application for 'Observations for Use Cases II and III'

Decisions taken:

Ethics Board Recommendations: Approved subject to conditions below:

Information given:

- It states in the application a “maximum” of two people conducting observations, it was recommended that this should say “minimum” of two people in order to meet with risk assessment.
- That the application should have an additional statement added that states explicitly that each organisation will conduct risk assessments in the areas before the observations are conducted.
- Although not directly an ethical issue, it was highlighted that in appendix I there is comment regarding “paratransit”, no one on the ethics board was able to define the meaning of this terms which is required to be translated into multiple languages for partners, therefore we ask that an explanation or definition is added to the observation protocol that all partners can translate the concept accurately.

Next Steps:

The ethics board members then discussed how to plan the next application meeting as most of the ethics board are also applicants. It was agreed with Lucia (DIAMOND project manager) that STIR would draft an email to be sent to all ethics board members to explore suggestions on how best to take forward the application process for structured data collection.

Actions on Whom:

Yvonne and Ron STIR design draft email

Augustus ENU to send his suggestion in writing

Lucia EUT will then edit and send email to ethics board members

Ethics Board Teleconference December 11th 2019 Additional Applicants to DAD

In Attendance at Meetings - Contributors to Report:

Augustus (ENU) Milos (FTTE) Ron and Yvonne (STIR)

Main Applicant: AITEC

Actions Completed:

The addition of the following partners to the ethics approval previously given for DAD survey. Additional applicants include: EURECAT, Genre et Ville (G&V), RINA, TUDublin, WAVE and ZTM.

Decisions taken:

Ethics Board Recommendations: Approved subject to conditions.

Information given:

Conditions: that EURECAT (Lucia) agree to and respond accordingly to the following points:

- The accompanying material for the DAD (surveys, participant information and consent etc.) have not changed significantly from the previous approved AITEC DAD application (approved 25/10/19).
- Each partner should ensure that the DAD complies with relevant legislation in their country. Some countries may have to remove some questions in order to meet their national legislation (e.g. France).
- For those DADs issued in the language of partners: each partner must ensure that any language translation are carried out to a high standard and checked by a native speaker of the relevant language.
- It is noted that FGC and VEHLIB are not part of this application and that they will not be collecting or analysing the data (so Q B1d and C1b exclude 'FGC', despite the typo stating that they would).
- It is noted that in C9 on dissemination, 'reports' includes public DIAMOND project reports to the European Commission.

Next Steps:

Actions on Whom:

That EURECAT agree to and respond accordingly to the following points.

Ethics Board Teleconference December 18th 2019 Structured Data Application and Observations for Use Case III

In Attendance at Meetings - Contributors to Report:

Augustus (ENU – left during meeting but left when the two applications were being discussed as they involved ENU) Elizabeth (WAVE), Lucia (EURECAT), Mary (TUDublin) and Ron and Yvonne (STIR)

Main Applicant: SYS

Actions Completed:

Structured Data Application and Observations for Use Case III

Approved with conditions. Chair's action - The chair (Ron) was delegated to approve the minor amendments on behalf of the Ethics Board.

Decisions taken:

Structure data application by SYS; ENU and VELIB Approved.

Observations Use Case III by SYS; ENU and VELIB Approved subject to conditions.

Information given:

- Conditions: Annex I of the application should be changed to reflect:
- 'Participant Observation' should be changed to 'Non-participant observation' (or a note included stating that Participants in the observation would not engage or interact directly with the researchers).
- Focus groups are taking place after the observations not before.
- There should be no interviews carried out as part of the observations. If interviews are to be carried out then a further ethics application is required with the standard information (e.g. Consent forms, questionnaire etc.).
- Clarify or delete: "Activities that are important to understanding use case III should be focussed on, while extraneous and unimportant activities should not receive much attention in the field notes".
- Clarify what data in the 'Use-case III Observation check list' is gathered by observation and what from secondary sources (e.g. 'Is it a low-income or minority neighbourhood?'; 'Does the station have female membership?').
- Q 5.3 Not all minorities can be observed visually, so this questions should be deleted.

Next Steps:

In addition the Ethics Board noted a number of research issues which, while not raising major ethical issues, should be considered by the researchers: There should be a protocol so that all

researchers score similar stations in the same way (Q 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 2.10, 4.1 – e.g. ‘Does the station have adequate lighting?’).
Q 1.3 and 1.13 are duplicates.

Actions on Whom:

ENU to make the required revisions and then pass the revised document to the ethics chair (Ron McQuaid).

Ethics Board Teleconference February 12th 2020 UESI questionnaires

In Attendance at Meetings - Contributors to Report:

Lucía (Eurecat), Rachel (External Advisor) and Milos (FTTE)

Main Applicant: All partners

Actions Completed:

UESI questionnaires All partners together reviewed application forms, discussed potential issues and made a conclusion. The details are provided below:

Section A: No applicant issues identified.

Section B: No ethical issues identified. Some clarifications are needed.

Section C: No ethical issues identified.

Decisions taken:

Approved. Members of the DIAMOND ethics board agreed that application could be passed without conditions. Pending to receive approval from ZTM (out of office this week), who has revised application but not yet given their approval.

Information given:

Ask to clarify the sample size which is confusing in sections B and C.

NO DIAMOND risk assessment is included in the application. This should it be carried out.

In case of subcontracting interviewers for conducting questionnaires in stations, organizations need to guarantee that external companies follow ethical rules.

Next Steps: n/a

Actions on whom: n/a

Ethics Board Teleconference 16th July 2020 UESI Focus Groups and Telephone/Online Interviews

In Attendance at Meetings - Contributors to Report:

Carlos (FGC), Lucasz (ZTM), Piotr (ZTM), Lucia (EURECAT) – not-available online due to health issues, however, she has reviewed the documents without any objection on present form. Milos (FTTE).

Main Applicant: TUDublin

Actions Completed:

The documents reviewed are as follows:

1. Ethical approval form: UESI Focus Groups and Telephone/Online Interviews – UC I, III, IV
2. COVID19 Questions
3. DIAMOND Project Participant Information Sheet
4. Process Document for qualitative data collection for UC1 and UC4.
5. Telephone/Online interview UC4
6. Online focus group for UC1
7. HR Interviews for UC4

Decisions taken:

Approved. All the members of the DIAMOND ethics board (and Lucia (EURECAT)) agreed that the application forms do not contain potential issues from an ethical point of view.

Information given: -

Next Steps: -

Actions on Whom: -

Ethics Board 5th October 2020 Email. Amendment to the application form for data collection through the UESI questionnaire already approved

Actions Completed:

For use case III it is foreseen that of a multi-store gift vouchers (10€ face value) may be used to get participants response

Addition of the following sentence “For use case III it is foreseen that of a multi-store gift vouchers (10€ face value) may be used to help participants buy rain cape, hi-vis jacket etc. (or something connected with riding a bike) to gain a better chance of achieving a higher response rate in a relative short time”.

Decisions taken: by email

Prof. R McQuaid Ethics Chair Fri 02/10/2020 14:44

I am happy to take chair’s action and approve it. My reasons are:

It should not harm the participants in any way and should not affect their specific answers to questions or otherwise bias the results. It should, however, increase the response rate and the range of respondents, especially from those who may be influenced by the token award including perhaps those on lower incomes etc. and so improve the representativeness of the findings among under- represented groups.

I think the amendment to the original application of adding the possibility a token (10 euro) incentive is minor in these circumstances. Hence it is acceptable to use chair's action rather than reconvene the entire committee to agree it.

- However, before finalising the decision can you please send this email to those on the committee (not the applicants) so they can object to this approval if they wish (in which case we will happily convene a full committee meeting to discuss it). Perhaps give them until the middle of next week to reply if they want.

Best regards Professor Ronald McQuaid

Project Coordinator Lucia Recio Naranjo Mon 05/10/2020 09:21

After discussion with Ronald McQuaid, DIAMOND's Ethic Board and as there are no likely negative impacts (to participants or the quality of results etc.) from offering the small incentive to participate. We agreed the following:

Due to it should not harm the participants in any way and should not affect their specific answers to questions or otherwise bias the results. It should, however, increase the response rate and the range of respondents, especially from those who may be influenced by the token award including perhaps those on lower incomes etc. and so improve the representativeness of the findings among under- represented groups.

I think the amendment to the original application of adding the possibility a token (10 euro) incentive is minor in these circumstances. Hence it is acceptable to use chair's action rather than reconvene the entire committee to agree it.

However, before finalising the decision we'll be happy to receive your comments in case you want to object this approval (in which case we will happily convene a full committee meeting to discuss it). Please, let us know your thoughts before Wednesday EOB.

Best Regards, Lucía

Decision taken: [Approved](#).

There have been no major ethical issues found during the approval meetings.

All ethics applications for data collection and any amendments in relation to the impact of COVID-19 have now been completed.

4. Audit of Each Partner

AITEC

On November 2019, the ethics application for the DAD was approved after all of the conditions were addressed

ENU

UESI data collection for Use Case III approved

EURECAT

Data Collection through Focus groups, social media and DAD survey all approved

FGC

Sociodemographic questions were reviewed by FGC ethics committee and some were identified as non compliant with FGC ethics

FTTE

No ethical issues or considerations

G&V

Observation, Focus Group and Individual Interviews all approved

IBV

All ethics approval for data collection approved by Comité de ética en investigación de la Universitat Politecnica de Valencia. 31/10/2019

RINA

No reply from partners

SYS

Structure Proprietary Data (Use Case I and Use Case III) all approved.

TUDublin

No reply received

WAVE

No ethical issues or concerns

ZTM

Data collection focus groups, structured data, observations, UESI questionnaires, social media data and DAD survey all ethics approval granted.

5. Issues Arising

COVID-19 and the subsequent roll out of social restrictions across Europe impacted on the project's data collection process, especially in terms of conducting focus groups and face to face interviews. In the majority of cases all data collection was moved to online platforms which required a review of ethics applications and approvals. This was completed and, where appropriate, approval given.

Amendments were made to the ethics application for Use Case III to add an incentive of a 10Euro voucher to encourage people to take part in the process. The voucher was designed to be used to help purchase biking equipment such as water proof clothes or high visibility jackets. The addition of this incentive was discussed by the ethics committee members and no major ethical issues identified. It was decided that a chair's action would be used to agree the amendment (instead of calling a new Ethics Board meeting) as no major issues were raised by members of the Board.

Due to local decisions and legal or other requirements, not all partners used the same demographic question sheet developed by the project. This meant that not all demographic questions can be completely compared across all data.

Ethics Work Package co-ordinators (WP8 STIR) also provided ongoing and regular reminders to partners to be cognisant of ethics principles in all data collection, storage and analysis processes. The responsibility for applying for, and following ethical and data management issues remained fully with each individual partner of course.

There was a bigger work load than initially expected due to COVID-19 and changes made to research instruments. In general the ethics process developed for the DIAMOND project has worked well.

6. Conclusions

The main ethics processes for DIAMOND, and accompanying Guidelines, were completed in year 1 (D8.2 and D8.4). Year 2's activities mainly involved approval of remaining ethical decisions so that empirical research could be carried out, providing ongoing advice and discussion and resolving any ethic issue that arose.

However, the impacts of Covid-19 greatly affected the project particularly from around April 2020. This resulted in: a) the meetings of the ethics board being held online; b) additional applications to allow changes in data gathering methods due to the effects of the pandemic. Both of these seemed to have been amended and operate effectively and did not delay the project significantly.