

Report SCAR SWG AKIS 4 9th Meeting Warsaw, 26th & 27th of June 2018

The SCAR SWG AKIS4 meeting in Warsaw will be the ninth of the meetings proposed for the development of the mandate endorsed by the SCAR plenary in December 2015. This meeting looked at developing the following topics identified in the AKIS 4 mandate:

- 1. To improve the integrated approach within the European AKIS and the Implementation of the EIP**
Presentations of the 1 study Work plan:
 - ✓ Complementarity and synergies among funds
- 2. Monitoring interactive innovation policies and benchmarking for sustainability**
 - ✓ SCAR AKIS, ARCH, FOOD SYSTEMS Policy brief on ex-ante research impact
- 3. Further development of the EIP approach**
 - ✓ CASA study on Communication Best practices among EU AKISs
 - ✓ AKIS in CAP Post 2020
- 4. Other topics of interest**
 - ✓ Structuring AKIS Final Report
 - ✓ First reflections around AKIS 5 mandate
 - ✓ SCAR Foresight
 - ✓ Exchanges around upcoming AKIS related-events

All presentations and slides from the parallel sessions can be found on the SCAR-AKIS dropbox:
<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zxe01q1fbyyg9hb/AADODRkQ73UfMISNlzHUH1e8a?dl=0>

Annex 1 contains the minutes of the meeting regarding all presentations and discussions are added.
Annex 2 contains the participants' list.

CO-CHAIRS: Anikó JUHASZ & Adrien GUICHAOUA;

Representative EC: Inge VAN OOST (DG AGRI);

Facilitator: Floor GEERLING-EIFF (report).

Venue: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 30, Wspólna Str. Warsaw.



Day 1: Tuesday June 26th

The reports of the group discussions are described in Annex 1.

Welcome speech by Polish host (Under Secretary of State - Mr. Ryszard Zarudzki)

We consider the farm advice to be of great importance. We also know of its problems, its deficiencies and we will do everything we can to maintain the achievements of our agricultural advisory services, with respect to the changes that are taking place. The basic task for agriculture is to produce food. Feeding our increasing population will be most challenging. We still have a lot of stocks and there is not an immediate urgency but the future generation will face a problem. Politicians will have to step aside from their stakes and find solutions together to fight hunger. A second task is rural development, which also has many challenges that need to be taken into account. I am convinced that sustainable agriculture has a future, one which does not overexploit the environment in which we work and is respected by its biodiversity and efficient use of water, soils and natural resources. We have to pass on the world in a better condition to our children than the state it is in now. Regarding our rural areas, we face depopulation by people moving to cities. We want to reverse this by making rural areas more attractive (again) to live. This is changing. Many people do not want to live in cities anymore. They choose rural areas for fulfilling their life's aspirations. Another aspect is the comprehension of farmers for the role of nature and its symbiosis with agricultural practices. Now, where should farmers get their knowledge from to live up to these changing needs from society and increasing technological developments? How should they know all this? Good agricultural schools should give them proper knowledge. However, vocational education is still considered to be of lower quality than other types of education (for the less talented and not good enough for the refined professions). This is changing fortunately. It is of high standard and educates for different specialisations. A farmer who is not equipped with (schooled) knowledge will make mistakes. It is not possible anymore for the parents to help out alone. We do not longer live up to this traditional model. Of course we are grateful to our parents for their knowledge but the world is developing quickly. The pace of changing is fast, in particular for agriculture. Knowledge quickly becomes out of date. We are well educated but looking at a younger generation, our knowledge is no longer useful. Times are changing and changing the times. It makes our knowledge out of date.

So, in order to help our farmers we need to improve our farm advice and adapt its models to the needs of the country. Farm Advisory Services must continue. Without it, agriculture will make mistakes and this can then result in catastrophic effects for families and society. Therefore farm advisors are needed. How can we shape good services? I am really happy that the SCAR-AKIS group is reflecting on this with the Commission, representing the different MSs. Looking for solutions which will allow us to provide the needs of society without deteriorating our environment. We face many problems in agriculture and we should not hide them. To develop a proper knowledge base, we need to take into account research but also other actors and fields. We need to develop ways together to put knowledge to practice at all farms. If we do not improve our knowledge base it will become outdated. Therefore we need an efficient transfer system.

Presentation of Farm Advisory Services in Poland (Ewa Grodzka - Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development)

In Poland there are both public and private farm advisory services. The public system is based on the legal act and operates under the RDP. Each region also has a private advisory network. There are 16 agricultural advisory centres which employ about 4.000 people, among which 3.000 advisors. The law on agricultural advice units defines the tasks of these units which could be either free of charge or paid.

Farm advisory services co-operate with researchers and scientists on these tasks. The future law on support from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) provides additional tasks for agricultural advisory services within the Network on innovation in agriculture and rural areas (EIP) and additional tasks for the Agricultural Advisory Centre in Brwinów. Some of these tasks are: training for advisors (public and private), preparation of uniform ways of acting for the voivodship advisory centres, co-ordination of tasks connected with organic farming carried out by the voivodship advisory centres, dissemination of information on research results, co-ordination of tasks of the Network on innovation in agriculture and rural areas (EIP), certification and carrying out the lists of advisors and providing regular training for them (RDP) and acting as the Central Body in the National Rural Network (NRN). The centre also keeps the registration list of advisors.

With regard to innovation, objectives of the Innovation network (SIR) to support innovation in agriculture and rural areas are first of all, to facilitate networking among farmers, advisors, researchers, entrepreneurs and other stakeholders supporting implementation of innovation in agriculture and rural areas. Second, to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and good practices related to innovation in agriculture and rural areas. And third, to support the creation of the operational groups and preparation of projects by them. These are network activities which are financed by the RDP's technical assistance. The network organises activities on both national and regional level, such as conferences, trainings, study visits, meetings for brokers, films, information, publications and cooperation with the EIP-AGRI network. Additionally, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development organises the following activities to support innovation: meetings between the agricultural research institutes and advisors, meetings of advisors and researchers from institutes subordinated by the Minister (yearly), "Innovation Island" during the AGROTECH –International Fair of Agricultural Techniques, a publication about the institutes subordinated by the Minister, meetings with advisors and a conference, together with EUFRAS, on challenges for the agricultural advisory services after 2020.

Session 1: Improve the integrated approach within the European AKIS and the Implementation of the EIP

Presentation and interaction on the study on synergies among EU funds (Stefan Kah – EPRC)

Stefan Kah presented the work plan and first results. Aim of the study is to provide a better understanding of the potential and the use of synergies among EU funds in the fields of research and innovation in the agri-food sector. Objectives are: to find and analyse good practices and to identify success factors and barriers. The focus is on Horizon 2020, EAFRD (incl. EIP-AGRI) and ERDF but it also includes other EU schemes where relevant (e.g. ESF, LIFE, etc.) and national / regional support schemes. The study will deliver a conceptualisation of a virtual case of optimal synergetic policy-making for R&I in the agri-food sector. The methodology is based on desk-based research (literature and project databases) and interviews (with fund/instrument managers and other policy-makers/enablers). Looking back at previous research results, a 2016 study (for the EP's REGIO Committee) on how to achieve maximisation of synergies between Regional Funds under ESIF and other EU instruments, came up with the following messages. Required are: 1) further harmonisation in the regulatory context, 2) enhanced coordination of governance arrangements, 3) better alignment of strategic frameworks and 4) practical solutions to encourage actors to work together in practical implementations.

The study will look at the following case studies:

- Lower Austria: RIS3 on agri-food;
- Scotland: leading in a joint demonstration case in Bio economy of agri-food waste;

- Tuscany: leading in agri-food high technology farming;
- North-East Romania: leading in sustainable development of production field crops;
- Slovenia: leading in agri-food sustainable food production;

Success factors to enhance synergies are assumed to be related to strategies, transparency, the funding itself, harmonisation and simplification, cultural and demographic factors and the enablers.

Obstacles are to do with the small size of farms and businesses, the lack of trust between actors, complex funding conditions and lack of connections between agriculture and the up- and down-streaming processing industry related to innovation support. Potential measures could be to enhance community building with trust as fundament, to enforce the role of the enablers as intermediaries, to simplify financial incentives for MAA projects, to develop a strategic approach and political consensus and finally, to better connect to the outside world.

Next steps in the study are: 1) to finalise the scoping interviews with DG ENV, JRC, the EIP-AGRI Service Point and ENRD, 2) to continue the case study research, 3) to identify and analyse good practices and 4) to synthesise findings and formulate recommendations.

Session 2: Monitoring interactive innovation policies and benchmarking for sustainability

Presentation and interaction on the SCAR AKIS, ARCH, FOOD SYSTEMS draft policy brief on Research Impact (Kevin Heanue - Teagasc)

A policy brief on Research Impact has been drafted in joint collaboration between the SCAR SWGs AKIS, ARCH and Food Systems, based on a workshop (April 6th 2018 in Rome). The brief is discussed in the different groups. Comments, corrections and additions should be sent in by 1st August 2018.

The brief is primarily targeted at policy-makers and funders in the European Commission and in national ministries and funding agencies. However, it is also intended to provide value to researchers and their institutions. Agriculture R&I systems are open and complex. There is an increasing demand for impact-orientation in which research performance is not just evaluated on the delivery of research outputs but on how those outputs are used, by whom, and to what effect. There is a long history of ex post impact assessment but relatively less attention has been paid to ex ante impact assessment (the likely effects of initiatives before activities actually start and trying to influence these likely effects). It is necessary to develop the rationale, frameworks, tools, methods and culture enabling and encouraging more attention to understanding, planning and assessing ex ante impact, while still continuing to carry out ex post impact assessment of research activities.

The brief comes up with the following recommendations for:

- Research institutions: develop an impact culture at institution level, as well as capacity for evaluation, in order to strengthen the impact of policies and programmes. Widen collaboration and communication to include all relevant stakeholders in the research and innovation pathways including transfer organisations.
- Funding agencies: adapt funding regulations to ensure impact is considered and included ex ante and incentives are provided for impact orientated research.
- Policy makers: foster the enabling environment for development and provide support for capacity development as well as innovation uptake. Ask for longer project periods from one to three years to five to ten years to allow time to include elements mentioned above such as capacity development and ensuring greater chance of impact etc.
- All: enable regular exchange between researchers, funding agencies and policy makers at the national and European level through regular meetings and the better use of the existing infrastructure such as SCAR and its working groups.

Session 3: Further development of the EIP approach

Presentation of EIP-AGRI, Moving Innovation in Agriculture Ahead (Inge Van Oost – DG AGRI)

The full presentation can be found on the dropbox:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zxe01q1fbyyg9hb/AADODRkQ73UfMISNlzHUH1e8a?dl=0>

All inspirational examples and upcoming events can be found on the EIP-website, some presented highlights:

- The positions of the national rural networks could be strengthened. They deliver good work but more can be done. One resolution would be to simplify the OG measure and to stimulate better dissemination of the project outcomes to build up an innovation ecosystem;
- An inventory is being conducted of relevant cases where OG projects are taking up action to create awareness about their own project and disseminate their results. To be used in the EIP seminar in Umbria October 2018;
- In preparation for the annual work programme for 2019, a cluster exercise took place for the following 4 areas: 1) innovation in agricultural products and practices, 2) natural resources and crop protection, 3) digitisation, 4) business models and digital transformation and 5) innovation networking and capacity building;
- The SFC, a database to report and collect information on Operational Groups, is obligatory. Currently it contains information from 414 OGs in 12 MSs (680 OGs in Oct 2018) + a number of H2020 multi-actor projects;
- An interesting new call is RUR-16-2019 – Fuelling the potential of advisors for innovation. Much of the existing research findings and best practices stays unused, therefore more intense cooperation is needed between research, advisors and farmers/foresters to stimulate knowledge exchange and take-up..
- There is a new OG study ongoing by IDEA, to better understand the actual implementation of EIP-AGRI Operational Group projects. The results may feed into the new AKIS plans in the CAP;
- Post 2020 R&I proposals “Horizon Europe”, synergies and complementarity CAP - R&I policies. The EIP-AGRI will continue to ensure the links and pool funding sources from Horizon Europe and rural development to foster competitive and sustainable farming and forestry. Researchers will have to become more multi-actor oriented.

Session 4: Practical example(s) of Erasmus+ projects supporting knowledge flows within the AKIS

Erasmus+ is a European Union program in the field of education, training, youth and sport for 2014-2020. Its total budget is 14.7 billion euros. Erasmus + is based on the achievements of European educational programs that have been functioning for 25 years and is the result of a combination of the following European initiatives implemented by the European Commission in 2007-2013: the Lifelong Learning Program, the Youth in Action program, Erasmus Mundus, Tempus, Alfa, Edulink, and cooperation programs with industrialized countries in the field of higher education.

Presentation of the Association of the Regional Initiatives Development (Małgorzata Bogusz, PL)

ARID is an association working in the vocational education field. Their main goal is to strengthen enterprises through lifelong learning and rural development. ARID is involved in several Erasmus+ projects such as Beekeeping for European environmental sustainability: To bee or not to beezz, Apiterapia, URESA, DIACEN, Care-T-Farms, Clean Air, Sema and Top 10 skills. The projects fall under Action 2 of (KA 2) the Erasmus + program, for Strategic Partnership and exchanges of the good practices for Vocational Education Trainers and Adult Education. This Action 2 provides opportunities for

educational institutions to develop international cooperative partnerships with other VET stakeholders, including enterprises. Partnerships have to include a minimum of three entities from three different countries. They work on innovative results and exchange experience and good practices in a chosen field of education or vocational training.

Presentation of SKIFF: a multilingual e-platform for training (Gintarė Kučinskienė, LT)

SKIFF (www.future-farmer.eu) is an example of international cooperation based on projects from the past. It provides a new practical approach on relevant e-training programs and content. Partners conduct activities in promoting e-trainings after a project is finished and look for other possibilities for common activities. SKIFF works on advanced training, ICT tools, on-line training sessions and continuous dissemination. Results are: 1070 users (as of 4/6/2018), from 10 countries, the majority coming from GR, NL, LT, TR; 30% of the users reach a 'course completion certificate'. Most visited courses are: ICT – Precision Farming, Farming Management, Organic Farming, Rural Development Program 2014-2020, ICT in Agriculture, Agricultural Markets and Biobased Economy.

Presentation of Escola Agrària de Manresa (Jaume Sio, SP)

The school has 10 years of European involvement in Organic Agriculture. No school worked on organic farming before. Because of Erasmus+, different schools could be connected in Europe. The school was involved in different projects on Animal traction, Short circuits of commercialization, Professional training (orchard and fruit), Biodynamics, methods and training tools, social gardens and organic cuniculture. Based on these projects, the school could develop professional trainings. Teachers were taught new training skills, methods and educative material was developed. It is important to link these kind of projects to other systems and create synergy with e.g. research. We should better connect multiple projects in the system and involve more schools in the AKIS!

Closure Day 1



Day 2

Session 3 (continued): Further development of the EIP approach – CASA study on communication

Presentation of best practices in communication/dissemination experiences across EU AKISs (Jean-Marc Chourot – CASA project)

CASA is performing a study on communication. They look at any project, all over the EU, identifying what are best practices and what can be recommended from lessons learned. The SCAR-AKIS participants sent in examples from different member states. The results of the study will be presented in a next SCAR-AKIS meeting.

- *A communication example from Ireland: The Better Farm Beef Challenge (Mark Gibson, Teagasc)*

The Better Farm Beef Challenge aims at developing a road map for profitable beef production through improving technical efficiency within the farm gate. Partners in the project are: 27 farmers, a farm insurance company, a farm advisor organisation (Teagasc), farming media and beef processors. Communication tools are: social media posts, 8-9 'open farm walks', booklets, stakeholder meetings, scientific papers, monthly management meetings, a conference and national Beef events every two years. Stimulating peer-to-peer exchange works and is really helpful, the newsletter and magazine reached 45.000 clients, the open farm walks also provide good interaction between farmers and advisors. 15.000 farmers visited the national Beef event which is farmer led, telling their own story. The farmers need to do as much of the talking. They are the trusted voices within the AKIS. These farmers are not forerunning farmers. They are farmers that relate to peers. There is also a lot of effort put into the quality of the presentation material. Finally, the process is monitored through research.

- *Three communication examples from Slovenia (Meta Candek Potokar, Agricultural Institute of Slovenia)*

The first example is a national research project: Raising entire males or immunocastration? It involved research of measures for boar taint reduction and emerging problems of meat quality. Target groups for communication were the scientific community, farmers and meat industry, policy makers and advisors. Communication means were: papers, articles, conferences and workshops during the project life time and after the project was finished. Results are still being disseminated. Communication means within the consortium were email, telephone and regular meetings with end-users. The communication was excellent towards the scientific community (through publications) at international level. However, it was less succesful towards other end-users due to the lack of interest for the topic in the sector (at national level). More attention should be raised on the urgency of the topic amongst farmers and the meat industry.

The second example is the national project, similar to EIP: V4-1417 on pig production technologies and use of alternative feeds, natural additives for products of higher quality in conventional and organic farming. Target groups for communication were advisory services, farmers and students. Communication means were: printed materials, workshops, events and a webpage which were used continuously during the project. Communication means within the consortium were email, telephone and several meetings. The communication worked and was highly efficient. The lesson learned is to prepare materials that are adapted to end-users and which are easily accessible (e.g. a web page repository).

The third example is the H2020 multi-actor project TREASURE (Diversity of local pig breeds and production systems for high quality traditional products and sustainable pork chains). The target group for communication were all of the relevant sectors. Communication means were: various types of

scientific papers, conferences, public events, workshops, school training, printed materials and social media, which were constantly utilised during the project. Communication within the consortium went through emails, skype meetings, annual project meetings, telephone and democratic, general assembly votes. The communication in the project seems to be working and efficient. A lesson learned is to take every opportunity offered to promote the project, use different channels/media and organise diverse types of promotional and dissemination activities for different audiences.

Lessons learned:

- on difficult subjects, do not hide the problem but discuss it in the open;
- telephone works better as communication medium than email;
- address target groups in a (form of) language that is understandable (no English nor scientific jargon);
- dissemination should be a topic from the start of a project, do not leave it until the end of the project.

Comment: with so many different communication media nowadays, we have to analyse properly what works and what not.

- *A communication example from Poland: a cluster platform for organic production and consumption (Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation – State Research Institute in Pulawy, IUNG-PIB)*

The Polish communication example involves a cluster platform project. Developing the organic food valley cluster, to stimulate organic production and consumption (2010-2014). The idea was born in 2004. The project was EU funded under the superregional programme (2 regions). Consumers became more and more interested in organic farming. The aim was to create the will to implement organic farming in a trans-regional programme. The project's communication activities aimed at: a) the creation and reinforcement of the Cluster's brand, b) increasing brand awareness among consumers (especially in Poland) and among wholesale traders and 3) increasing general awareness of the advantages of organic foods. The communication work involved the creation of a web platform presenting the Cluster's members and their products and allowing for knowledge exchange. 33 marketing events (Ekoforum) were held during the project to promote the brand, its members and products. Support was given to members to participate in trade fairs. The communication work involved considerable cooperation with media – print, radio and visual media, in particular through their reporting of fairs and other events at which the Cluster's products were being promoted and sold (www.dolinaeko.pl). Key effects of the communication were to build a recognizable brand, increase the number of members of the cluster to 21 companies and institutions and the initiation of international cooperation, cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and local governments. Additional achievements were reaching: up to over 82% of recipients from target groups, almost 500 media publications about the cluster, over 900 participants in organic forums and awards won in two competitions for communication.

One important result was that collaborating under one brand made the participation stronger. Consumers were seduced for organic consumption by organising a food valley. An attractive logo was designed so people would recognise the product and a portal was created to present services and a platform to exchange knowledge. It was primarily used for attracting other entities outside of the cluster. Regarding dissemination, the brand name was promoted through marketing measures, supported in specialised events, organised seminars and press conferences. The project managed to develop a recognisable brand which is still highly recognised. The number of cluster members was increased and the cluster reached over 50.000 people (both from industry and potential customers) of which 900 people participated in events/activities. The project created Eco Bazar where members can sell and exhibit their products. From

the participants, 6 entities declared that they had created 23 new products, 5 declared 15 new products and 10 declared measurable benefits because of the cluster platform promotional activities.

Q&A:

- Q: did you advertise in social media?
- A: there were some budgetary means for that purpose. The project was very successful. It was not only an example of using different media but also of cooperation between the different entities involved, such as farm advisors. We produced brief films and other communication means such as printed leaflets, various presentations, arranging a fair, open days for partners of the project and a press conferences. It initiated cooperation on innovative solutions. Farmers also discussed the possibilities for setting up producer groups.
- *Two communication examples from Italy (Mara Lai and Simona Cristiano)*

The first project InnovaMarche: joining communication and innovation brokerage at regional level, aims at the creation of an on-line platform, with a wide range of information available to set up and run an OG. It sets up and runs an “animation” process in the whole territory of the region, which is run by organising info days and open days. This animation process aims to reverse the traditional approach that sees farmers as simple final recipients of innovative solutions identified and developed by other actors. Farmers must be the initiators of the process and express their innovation needs, based on their businesses. Info days are meant to identify innovative ideas, issues and opportunities that can be the starting point for the innovation process. Open days are based on the topics identified during the info days. They aim to create networks of actors interested to address a specific topics, that might be the basis to create a partnership and develop a project. Communication is key in all phases of the project. It is crucial in the first phases of the animation process to reach all relevant actors in the intermediate phases – the organization of the open days, the assistance to the creation of project partnerships, the monitoring of projects – to help finding the most appropriate actors on specific topics and the most relevant information and knowledge and to assist during the project implementation, including supporting adjustments when needed in the final phase for the dissemination of projects’ results. Communication with target groups is based on a bottom-up approach, being the identification of farmers’ needs in relation to innovation, directly from farmers and the creation of partnership where all members have equal positions. This is central in the project. A combination of participatory approaches are used to run the meetings.

The second project is the EIP Operational Group Filos in Bus. The project aims to demonstrate the crucial role that stable meadows play in the environmental sustainability of the production of Parmigiano-Reggiano and to quantify the carbon footprint throughout the production of Parmigiano Reggiano process, in order to define the "guidelines aimed at better management of land to maintenance of organic matter and carbon sequestration. Partners travel together by a bus during a one-day-visits to the farms which are partner of the OG. The travel to the farms provides the occasion to share knowledge on territories, local products and other local actors which are implied in the supply chain of Parmigiano Reggiano. During the travel on the bus, the partners of the OG discuss project activities and results, by focusing on common matters of interests (such as soil fertility, carbon footprint, carbon sequestration, etc.) around which they share practical and scientific knowledge. This process of communication helps the partners to interact one-on-one with each other. It is democratic and iterative, during the project implementation. It supports team building within the OG, through a major coordination and interaction among the partners, the development of collective knowledge and common understanding of on-going achievements of the project and of its results. The cross-visits on farms support the peer-to-peer

processes among the farmers. This type of tool helps to overcome barriers/hesitations/regrets in dialogue and it allows open discussion among the multitude of actors (researchers, farmers, others).

Comment: a comparable example is Innovation Support Service Flanders (<http://www.innovatiesteunpunt.be/en/projects/agrispin-innovation-brokership>). They organise exchange tours with the UK. It is strongly guided but works well. You can find a youtube video from the Agrispin project on this example: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J1nVxDdT Lk>.

Communication example from Spain, Rocio Wojski

The VITICAST Operational Group aims at finding innovative solutions for the prediction of fungal diseases in grapevine. The communication instruments were designed to communicate and disseminate the objectives of the group, its motivation and composition. The actions designed for that purpose are the following: 1) design of a logo to be used as “brand” 2) design and elaboration of a brochure, both in Spanish and English, 3) tailor-made information for the websites of the partners and collaborators, 4) banners in the emails of the operational Group members, 5) posters to be exhibited in the main locations of the group members, 6) elaboration of a presentation with information and objectives of the group, 7) press releases, 8) social networks and 9) assistance at events, conferences, fairs, etc. such as Enoforum 2018. The results conveniently reach the main stakeholders of the sector. Various entities (SMEs of the sector, research groups, etc.) contacted the Operational Group being interested in the innovation project and expressing the interest of joining the initiative. It would be interesting to create initiatives/funding calls to promote the co-relation and joint activities among Operational Groups in similar fields in order to increase the impact of the results, create channels for knowledge transfer and share experiences, etc.

The WINETWORK (H2020 Thematic network) aims at fostering the exchange of innovative knowledge between European wine-growing regions to increase the productivity and sustainability of the wine sector. The participatory approach of WINETWORK is allowing to transfer results from science and practical knowledge to materials adapted to end-users by facilitator agents. The main materials are Technical Data Sheets (TDS) and End-Users Flyers (EUF), both describing either good or atypical practices identified after 219 interviews with winegrowers, technicians, advisors and cooperatives from 10 European regions. Other items are Web seminars, Technical articles and Video clips. Materials for Innovation Support Services are: technical Data Sheets (TDS), video-seminars, technical articles, slide shows, training material for winegrowers, end-user flyers (EUF), video-clips and training modules. All those materials were uploaded in the Knowledge Reservoir (www.winetwork-data.eu), available for everyone. Besides different workshops, training sessions for winegrowers and ISS were developed in the 10 regions involved. The success of the projects came from the communication activities addressed in collaboration with the sector. From the beginning, Facilitator Agents worked very closely with the winegrowers and their associations. This allowed them to be updated about the progress of the project and to be interested about its results. Thematic networks have to work from the beginning in the creation of trustworthy relationships within the network and with the sector they address. Face-to-face interviews and meetings are the most successful tool. An ongoing contact throughout the life of the project is also essential. For that, the first action of a thematic network must be the production of an action plan (or road map) that defines how and when to keep in contact with the different members of the network and agents of the sector for the whole duration of the project. This action plan would be an internal communication plan of the network that would complement its communication plan.

Parallel sessions: exchanges on best practices in communication and reflections on the CASA study

Moderated by: Luis Mira da Silva, Jean-Marc Chourot and Floor Geerling-Eiff.

Each group addressed 3 questions.

Which specific communication channels/pathways are most impactful and most used for interactive innovation projects and AKIS?

- Communication is a mean, not an aim and serves 2 different purposes: 1) co-creation and 2) dissemination (more linear);
- It is also about the scale and types of target groups who you want to address: what is your reach?
- The target groups need to be identified before the start of the project and involved from the beginning of the project;
- Communication methods depend on the aim, purpose and the pathways;
- We need open innovation models and feedback to create constructive dialogues;
- Face-to-face meetings and cross-visits which involve farmers are very effective;
- You need to show something, visualise innovation in practice (by going to the field) when involving farmers;
- The message how you communicate about results is very important and the enabling environment to do so;
- Printed material such as infographics and technical magazines are still really effective. An important question is if it makes sense to make a flyer;
- To answer this question properly, also look at other studies such as an EU project how young farmers get their information, such as: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/young-farmers_en);
- Clearly identifying the smart and adapted communication pathways is key but involving the audience in choosing / selecting the best/most adapted communication channel, is equally important.

Are there any channels/methods/means adapted to some specific targets (farmers, citizens, industry, advisory services, etc.)?

- First look at the target groups and best ways how to reach them. There are different channels to reach different target groups. Hiring a specialised communication agent could be effective. Communication is a professional job;
- Intimacy and trust are key elements as well as peer-to-peer exchange and demonstration (such as demo farms);
- There has to be trust in the partner who takes the lead, who coordinates the communication, as well as the credibility and trustworthiness of the sources of information;
- Speak and communicate in the national language;
- You need to address the level of IT literacy and analyse which media the end users utilise. There is no point in using social media if the farmers are not on the respective medium;
- Pictures and video, visuals, are better absorbed than text (this counts for all generations but in particular for the young). A good picture is better than a long speech;
- Different groups need different channels (young versus parents). Choosing the right channel is equally important as the message;
- Organise Farminars (face-to-face seminar) and webinars complementary. You can use IT tools but for other settings the communication has to be face-to-face;

- If it is about changing behaviours. Therefore farmers need trusted sources, guidance, demofarms and early adopters to demonstrate that it works;
- Implement innovation and knowledge results on the farms. Therefore farmers need support to implement and adapt innovation to their local factors/condition and social context;
- Newsletters are (still) efficient communication means and paid advertising/public messages, namely for mass communication;
- Assess the possibilities to use serious gaming tools and simulator tools on its benefits for communication. Organise cross connections (projects) with the serious gaming industry;
- We should also focus on innovation in communication methods such as augmented reality;
- Social media are changing very quickly, hence opting for variable communication means and strategies might be necessary;
- Bring in good examples and choose clear/simple (but not simplified) key and relevant messages to address the target group. Be creative and innovative in your message. Too much information kills the message;
- Organise cross-connections in which different sectors can learn from each other; this will be very inspirational;
- Do not only focus on (young) farmers as end-users of communication. Advisors also rarely talk to advisors in other countries; we should establish a method to stimulate this.

Which channels or methods could be easily replicated to other sectors, target groups, EU AKIS, policy makers, SCAR SWGs (fish forest, food systems, ARCH, etc.)?

- The concept of the Irish Better Beef project could be translated to other countries and contexts. It is very inspirational. The same goes for the Italian bus trip to get advisors, researchers and farmers together to communicate. Trust is easily created if you are in a closed room, heading towards the same destination;
- Organising informal events or side programme topics are very important to get to know each other better and further explain backgrounds of results and/or messages. 'Drink a beer together in multi-actor agro cafe's';
- In particular local policy makers need to become more open, stimulate open dialogues and participate in rural networks;
- Hence, set up the relevant, open and inviting environment to facilitate communication in a way it best reaches the target group(s);
- This CASA study should come up with a toolbox for communication strategies, based on good examples that can be transferred to other sectors. Transferability should also address the social context. CASA could develop guidelines and should share the results of the project and good communication examples, among the SWGs. Analyse what is context related and which methodologies can be broader used in different regions. What works for larger and what works for smaller farms?
- Learn from communication caused by crises: 'never let a good crisis go to waste'!

Questions

- How can we influence behaviour; how can we achieve more with less; how can we steer a good communication process and how can we influence co-creation?
- There should be more interaction of good results and prolongation of successful projects;
- The problem is the sustainability of good projects. Once the project ends, the communication (and the network) stops. That is an important problem;

- How do we measure results of communication? How do we come up with hard figures and proof of impact such as: how many farmers used the results to change their behaviour?
- What are the possibilities for advertising in social media?
- Are there 'local' pools for collecting communication outputs? If so, how are they structured/organised; is there an optimal size?
- Develop synergies in communication in related/similar projects. Is this feasible? Who, how?
- What are the main challenges for efficient communication?
- What are long term effects of communication?
- What is the difference in effects of on-on-one communication versus networking events versus mass communication?
- How can we better capitalize communication activities and practices?

Follow-up:

We will come back at you for email exchanges. This exercise was the beginning of the CASA study, with input by AKIS. If you have other ideas, please bring them forward to Jean Marc Chourrot.

COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY post-2020 Legislative proposals related to knowledge and innovation (Inge van Oost – DG AGRI)

Key elements in the CAP reform are: 1) rebalancing responsibilities between Brussels and the Member States (more subsidiarity), 2) more targeted, results and performance based support, 3) fairer distribution of direct payments, 4) enhancing environmental and climate ambitions and 5) simplifying and modernising the policy. The three challenges to overcome are: compliance vs performance, characteristics of farming in EU27 and overlaps and complexity. Regarding the objectives of the improved CAP, if we zoom in specifically on improved structuring and functioning of AKIS, the CAP will work towards smart, resilient and diversified agriculture ensuring food security and modernisation of the sector by fostering knowledge, innovation and digitalisation of agriculture and rural areas as a cross-cutting objective. A.o. by enhancing market orientation and increasing competitiveness, including greater focus on research, technology and digitisation. The impact indicator for the assessment of policy performance, multi-annual will be the share of CAP budget for knowledge sharing and innovation. Result indicators will focus on the enhancement of performance through knowledge and innovation, the share of farmers receiving support for advice and knowledge exchange and linking advice and knowledge systems. Output indicators are: the numbers of EIP operational groups, advisors setting up or participating in EIP operational groups, farmers trained/given advice to and numbers of non-farmers trained/given advice

The CAP Strategic AKIS Plans shall describe (1) the organisational set-up of the Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation System, and (2) after a SWOT analysis describe how a better-functioning AKIS will look like including (a) how advisors, researchers and CAP networks will work together within the framework of the AKIS and (b) how advice and innovation support services will be provided. The CAP Strategic Plans will foster knowledge, innovation and digitisation in agriculture and rural areas. €10bn is proposed within the Horizon Europe programme to support research and innovation in food, agriculture, rural development and the bio-economy. Farm advisors are to be integrated within the improved AKIS in an inclusive way, to be able to cover economic, environmental and social dimensions and to deliver up-to-date technological and scientific information developed by R&I. Advisors must be impartial and focus a.o. on innovation support for preparing and implementing EIP operational groups. EIP-AGRI Operational Groups' innovative projects shall develop innovative solutions based on the interactive innovation model. EIP AGRI shall contribute to all specific objectives of the CAP by stimulating innovation and knowledge

exchange and make use of the 'cooperation intervention'. Interestingly, the maximum EAFRD contribution rate for EIP OGs may be up to 80 % instead of the normal 43%. Moreover, Member States may now pay advances of up to 50%. The envisaged innovation may be based on new but also on traditional practices in a new geographical or environmental context. Operational Groups shall disseminate their plans and the results of their projects, in particular through the CAP networks. EU and national CAP networks will foster innovation and support the inclusion of all stakeholders in the knowledge-building and knowledge-exchange process a.o. by facilitating networking of EIP Operational Groups, LAGs, etc.

For SWG SCAR-AKIS exchange of views on how to improve MSs' Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems, see: <https://scar-europe.org/index.php/akis-documents>.

Session 4: Other topics of interest

The SCAR AKIS final report

The next SCAR-AKIS meeting will be dedicated to the final report, in which we integrate all that we did in the 3 years of the mandate in a structured way. We have to agree on the features, draft structure and share responsibilities. There is a lot of material already to build an interesting report. The aim is to have the report finished by beginning 2019 (in the 1st quarter of 2019). The quality of the report has priority over the time limit.

Practical info:

- Keep it a simple document and make use of the information on the drop-box;
- Adrien, Anikó, Floor will assist with writing the chapters;
- Starting date: September - February. By December we want to have the draft ready.

Next meeting: 30/31st October, meeting in Brussels.

- 30 October will be dedicated to the presentation of the external studies: to present their work and ask for feedback and exchanges for the final report;
- 31 October, programme organised together with ARCH and Food Systems on the policy brief;
- January: another meeting on the progress of the report.

Input for the next mandate:

- Lessons learned from Interactive Innovation Approaches;
 - o AKIS and the multi-actor approach;
- Food: follow-up of the AKIS and integrated approach with food systems, towards a more integrated approach in the agri-food value chain;
 - o Comment on possibilities for integrating SCAR-AKIS and Food systems;
- Further emphasis on network approaches;
- Include companies and SMEs in the mandate;
- Linkages between interactive innovation and (Horizon Europe) research;
- The CAP, AKIS and Horizon Europe/2020 (Framework Programme);
- Climate issues are very important; how can we address this better in the group?
 - o C: it is included in the CAP.

- We are more oriented on a system approach than particular topics/themes;
- Maybe we can organise a meeting with experts such as JPI FACCE;
- Issue of dynamics of knowledge production and demand; there is often more demand for knowledge than it is being produced;
- Inclusiveness, social innovation and responsible research and innovation;
 - Related to the multi-actor approach.

We have to pay attention not to duplicate items.

The SCAR Foresight

The SCAR Foresight process adapts to new challenges continuously, takes up cross-cutting issues, feeds the strategic planning process of research policy making, provides “Food for thought” and gives advice to political decision makers (MS, COM). HORIZON SCANNING. The SCAR foresight exercises highlight weak signals as well as future opportunities (e.g. mid- to long-term priority setting) to provide input for a more integrated research system for primary production and the broader Bioeconomy in Europe. Its reports have resulted in a high number of joint activities between Member States, such as the implementation of working groups (SWGs & CWGs, ERA-Nets and Joint Programming Initiatives with a wide scope (e.g. Climate Change, Food security). The results from the Foresight exercises build the basis for the advisory functions of SCAR for MS, the EU and for innovative research activities.

The overall objective of the 5th SCAR Foresight is to focus on new challenges for agri-food systems which meet the goals of COP 21 and of the UN Agenda 2030. This requires a bold transition to production and a use of systems that is sustainable in the long term. This transition should focus on:

- the use of natural resources (shifting from a linear to a circular model and considering unavoidable waste as resources);
- agriculture, marine sector and forestry combining innovation tools from different origins (digitisation, big data, precision farming) with minimal need for climate- or environment-harming inputs
- food and nutrition systems (modifying diets and consumption including retail patterns)
- lifestyles and human behaviour (less sedentary lives) as well as working models (less physical displacement).

The 5th Foresight will explore possible approaches to the transformations that will make the “transitions towards a safe and just operating space” possible (alternatives analysis).

The timeframe is as follows (duration of 22 months):

- July 2018: Proposals for experts of “Core Group” collected (deadline 6th July 2018)
- October 2018: Experts of “Core” Group selected
- November 2018: Expert contract signed by the Commission
- March 2019: Conclusion of phase 1 (Definition of scope and structure)
- April 2019: Short term experts selected
- April 2019 to March 2020: Working group workshop and consultations
- March 2020: end of phase 2 (analysis of specific sectors)
- May 2020: Draft report available to SCAR SG
- June 2020: Final report delivered to SCAR Plenary

- September-December 2020: National events (organised by MS for dissemination)
- December 2020: Stakeholders' conference and dissemination

Further explanation

The title of the Foresight study is likely to be adapted. The SCAR-AKIS group is asked to introduce someone in the Foresight Task Force. We would like to be represented with an expert in the core group or at least in the target group. It is important that we provide our input regarding future expectations in agriculture and interesting to be involved in scenarios. A balance in MSs will also be valuable for the study. The experts in the group will be paid. Adrien will get back at the group with more info and the request to participate.

Closure of the meeting



Annex 1: Group discussions per agenda item

Session 1: Improve the integrated approach within the European AKIS and the Implementation of the EIP

Presentation and interaction on the study on synergies among EU funds (Stefan Kah – EPRC)

- Q: the transdisciplinary approach, e.g. by mixing social and demographic aspects is interesting;
 - o A: the demographic and social aspects came up in discussions. It is challenging yet refreshing;
- Q: do you also look at cross-border cooperation?
 - o A: no, we don't look at that particularly;
- Q: do you look at double funding aspects?
 - o A: synergy is the aim, e.g. reduction of administrative burdens; it is not so much about double funding;
- C: the comparable the different funds are, the more likely you will have conflicting objectives. The main concern of policy makers is to implement the programmes with as little problems as possible. Synergy is not something they look at and some of them might also think: why do we need this? That's triggering.
- Q: you focus your study on regional levels, do you also look at the links between the regional and national level?
 - o A: we would like to look at different policy measures and I think we address a good mix. There are situations which address the national level and others where it concerns regional programmes. We will look into it where relevant. However, to (further) extend out study is beyond what we plan to do;
- Q: the case studies seem to be focused on RIS3, what about other strategies and instruments such as H2020 and Leader? Strategies start from thematic partnerships.
 - o A: not all cases are oriented on smart specialisation. Maybe my presentation might give the impression that it looks S3 driven but it is not the core of our study;
- Q: do you address the changes in the structure of the funding by EAFRD, ESIF and the CAP?
 - o A: it will likely not be very influential for our study;
- Q: I liked your overview on the assumed success factors. Harmonisation is very important. Regarding the CAP strategic plans, regional funds also include multi-actor projects. These application forms could also easily be used for operational groups. That could be a possibility to be developed in the future. It is interesting to look at what we can enable with a more flexible approach. Towards a one-stop-shop. We would also like innovation support services to address Horizon projects. That is the way the CAP wants to proceed;
- Q: what are synergies in supporting different types of funds? What are good practices that both support farmers and the food industry (as value chain partners)? There is little synergy with respect to public support.

- A: so far we asked actors for interesting cases. In the SCAR-AKIS meeting in Barcelona, there were interesting examples presented. EuroDairy is one example. We hope to find more recent examples of synergy.
- Q: in Scotland the Innovation support service hub covers regional funds along the food chain. That is worthwhile to look at. They want to enhance enduring processes;
 - A: we spoke to the director of that initiative, so we take it into account;
- C: we also asked this study to look beyond the usual suspects. We are in particular interested in EIPs and involving agri-food SMEs and small cooperatives. How to get information on different funds and synergies so that they can benefit better because now there are not enough advisors informed about the possibilities. The results of this study can have real impact;
- C: any indicators which can measure synergy effects, are welcome;
 - A: to come up with concrete indicators to measure effects of synergies is quite complex;
- C: the challenge however, is to come from principles to practices. We talked about the innovation hub in Scotland which is funded through the EARDF funds. In Spain innovation communities were built by regional funds. It will be interesting to find out which mechanisms work related to your results and formulate these as recommendations. Please, illustrate your results, directly linked to practical examples and measures.
 - A: what works is very context depending though. In one context measures work hand-in-hand, in other contexts they might work contradictory;
- C: maybe you can indicate and explain these contexts? In this case regional funds helped, in other cases funds from the EU suited better, etc.;
- Q: do you take into account the size of projects and activities (interventions)? Scale could be important to take into account.
 - A: yes, it is a plausible assumption;
- C: and it will be good to look at the evolution of actions. A good idea might start with seed money but what matters is the impact. A small project can grow into something large.

Session 2: Monitoring interactive innovation policies and benchmarking for sustainability

Presentation of the SCAR AKIS, ARCH, FOOD SYSTEMS draft policy brief on Research Impact (Kevin Heanue, Teagasc)

- Q: how do you address the impact related to different time spans of projects (short term versus long term effects). In 10 years' time much can change. How do you deal with reflexivity and feedback loops?
 - A: shorter projects can also have impact. We have to be aware of the different durations of projects and different starting points e.g. more radical versus more practical oriented research. The Technology Readiness Level can support the identification of the innovation process;
 - We address R&I projects in our brief, not (basic) research. Hence it addresses later TRL levels;

- Q: what would be the purpose of a new SWG, why does the SCAR need a new group and can't this topic not be addressed in other SWGs or preferably at SCAR plenary level?
- Q: the brief is not really clear in stating the problem what needs to be solved; could you make that more explicit?
- C: we wonder if a project of 10 years will be feasible;
- C: we do support the multi-actor approach, to formulate interactive innovation programmes with multiple stakeholders;
- C: thinking how to improve research impact is good, however, the implementation in practice is more complex. It is difficult to change the mind-set of researchers and other research supporting actors;
- Q: how does basic curiosity-driven research feed into the loop of knowledge and innovation, as the essential source of curiosity driven development of new knowledge and inventions? Basic research needs to be linked with R&I. If not, the source of new knowledge will dry up and it won't be about innovation anymore but about optimising existing knowledge results and technology;
 - o A: focus in the brief was on R&I, not basic research;
- C: it would also be good to identify the risks of unforeseen impact of research, the potential negative effects, in advance. By doing so, we might be able to avoid unwanted impact;
 - o A: there are a lot of different shades in R&I projects and how to measure impact. We focus on achieving the dots on the horizon;
- C: it's good to focus on impact and evaluate the process what went right, what went wrong and what went differently. It is important to learn from these R&I practices;
- C: it is a good approach to think forward and to discuss with the different actors involved how the innovation process is going and where it is leading, along the process;
- C: we should also identify best practices;
- C: it is important how to reach impact, not by the timing but because of a shift in the researchers' minds. We should advocate for more participatory approaches which also need to be reflected upon (by means of reflexive evaluation);
- C: when we talk about impact indicators, it should not only be about knowledge valorisation. The creativity of the researchers should also be rewarded and stimulated. Science is about creating knowledge;
- C: the brief expresses well on what the SCAR AKIS SWG has been working in the past years, to go from a linear model to multi-actor driven research. The question is if we need another SWG to address this topic, more likely we need to do better communication with the SCAR Steering Group and plenary about the uptake of these messages. We should enhance better connections. Thematic networks are a good instrument and already form a solution to disseminate knowledge and to build knowledge reservoirs. This principal could be broadened. We should also establish better connections between regional, national and EU level;

- C: why not start by getting all actors involved from the beginning of the R&I project by introducing a circular approach. This means more emphasis on formulating new R&I questions and challenges at the end of projects in the dissemination and practical implementation phase;
- C: ex-ante impact is measured in operational groups. They identify the needs for knowledge at the start and monitor after e.g. half a year where the process is going and how it can be adjusted. This could also be introduced for Horizon projects. The EC is looking for new concepts. We could take that up in this SWG, a separate preparation phase in which the actors involved can better express what impact can or should be. Seed funding for e.g. feasibility studies could be utilised to better foresee and analyse impact.
- Short summary of the discussion. 1) Clarify the problem in the brief and the main message(s). 2) How can project still motivate after 10 years, build in room for reflexive moments. 3) Do not organise another SWG. For one, AKIS can work on it and this topics should be on the agenda of the SCAR Plenary. 4) The essential role and function of basic, curiosity-driven research/science and research creativity should be taken into account. 5) Connect between different regional, national and EU levels. 6) Enhance multi-actor projects for more impactful research. 7) Address spin-overs. 8) The time frame of projects is an important element. Please bear in mind that we cannot be too detailed. It has to be an interesting brief which can be flexibly read by 28 MSs.
- C: it is also about synergising different types of research aims and instruments, for example the link between mission oriented research and the SME instrument.

Action: all participants are asked to send their comments to Adrien, Anikó and Floor before the end of July.

Session 3: Further development of the EIP approach

The European Innovation Partnership (EIP) „Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability“: Moving Innovation in Agriculture Ahead (Inge Van Oost – DG AGRI)

For information only, no discussion followed.

Session 4: Practical example(s) of Erasmus+ projects supporting knowledge flows within the AKIS

Discussion:

- Q: what is the range of budget of the projects and is there a knowledge platform?
- For Skiff the budget amounted 275.000 euro for the total project. It was an e-commercial project. Our visitors find us via google;
- A platform is lacking. For instance, there is no Cordis for Erasmus+.
- The issue in Erasmus+ programme is the sustainability;
- It would be interesting to link different institutions;
- One examples of e-learning platform is Moodle (Teagasc). There are webinars for students as well;
- Q: can you elaborate on the dissemination aspect of SKIFF?

- A: we discussed the demands with end users and then started developing the programmes. There was quite a demand for it. We already had experience with remote training which we work with every day. It was very important to make the programmes attractive. The target groups were young farmers. We focused on visuals by video. Even if you have a practical approach, you must find an attractive way that people will use it.
- C: it is odd that there is not a lot of information available on Erasmus+ projects. First question would be: where to find this? Second question would be, how can the tools and results become available for advisory services. Hence, how can we organise a more efficient way to exchange this knowledge? Could it be connected to EIP? It is tricky to connect policies from different DGs, yet, how can we better connect dynamic projects? It is food for thought. Better connections with Erasmus+ could be valuable for EIP.
- C: there are bilateral contacts between DG AGRI and DG EAC. It would be interesting to invite the EAC policy officers at a next SCAR-AKIS meeting on this topics, for discussion;
- C: education should be part of our AKIS activities. It is challenging, however, if we do not start from the educational level, we are not on the right track.
- C: actors from education should be included in the CAP AKIS plans in the different MSs. It should be integrated in the MS's AKIS. Schools should be mandatory target groups.
- C: we should make an inventory of all ideas. If we make a list and we disperse that to the Commission. By sharing these ideas this will also support the political acts in the MSs.

Closure Day 1

Day 2

Session 3 (continued): Further development of the EIP approach – CASA study on communication

Presentation of best practice communication/dissemination experiences across EU AKISs, Jean-Marc Chourot (CASA)

Discussion

- One aim of the study would be to benchmark strategies on communication, based on the examples;
- It is about showing best practices. It is not about theories of communication. Best practices should lead to good communication strategies;
- We heard a lot of good examples today but we also need good measures and guidelines to support communication (strategies);
- E.g. how to develop suitable payment applications? How to put it in practice? We are dealing with a lot of (different types of) invoices and that can be quite problematic. So we also need some good practices and advice on procurement;
- How to deal with different funding sources? There need to be practical guidelines how to proceed. This is (still) quite challenging;
- Organising workshops via national networks to exchange experience about communication forms and strategies might be effective;

- The managing authorities play an important role coordinating and organising the costs and measures and providing guidelines for simplifying administration around the costs;
- A study like this should not just scratch the surface and come up with good examples. It should also look at the practical implementation and administrative burdens. If we collect what was said today, the study could already nearly be finished. The practical approach how to best integrate communication strategies into calls and selection criteria, is very important and could be the added value of this study. That requires a different kind of expertise;
- We should look at a shared solution. It's certainly a good point but the study cannot address too many details. There are some good guidelines at EU level already. In general they are available for any project. This study focuses on the specific needs of end-users. Ways how to communicate to live up to these needs. That should be the added value of this study;
- The role of advisory services and paying agencies should be included in the study. It would be very helpful to add, in half a page, the logic of funding rules so that funding agencies can follow this logic;
- Simplification of the procurement and reducing administrative burdens should be an important topic.
- As well as indicators to measure impact of communication, tips and tricks;
- A critical note is that nowadays it seems necessary to involve certain (big) communication partners with a proven track record to have your project granted;
- C: evaluators do or should not be led by the partners involved in multi-actor projects, yet it is important to develop a good communication strategy for the project.
- Relating to the practical implementation there could also be a rule implemented such as 10% of the project activities (and budget) should be devoted to communication;
- Other projects such as EURAKNOS also address issues related to communication of innovation projects and are therefore complementary to this study. EURAKNOS' objective is to stimulate the compilation of knowledge ready for practice by intensifying interactions between different thematic networks in order to maximize outputs for practitioners. The project will be based on existing networks and their results to promote and develop them in an interactive way. A cross-fertilization will be made between networks and between countries, regions, production systems avoiding duplications.

COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY post-2020 Legislative proposals related to knowledge and innovation (Inge van Oost – DG AGRI)

Discussion

- Q: 1) there is concern about the indicators. Will there be a common M&E system, how will this be measured? We will need to do a lot of calculations to come up with figures. Related to the objectives, will it not become more complicated? 2) the advisors are meant to have a brokering role. How is the member state supposed to implement that in the field? Will it be mandatory to introduce innovation brokers; will (s)he still be an advisor: what is/will be the difference between an innovation broker and an adviser? 3) if the funding of projects will not become mandatory in the regulation, will this not be a step backwards? 4) how do we assure sufficient room for innovation in the AKIS plans?
- A: there will be a system provided that MSs will follow-up. We will need to come up with concrete answers on concrete questions. There has not been a debate yet. The idea is that in the CAP plans the MSs will integrate additional measurements related to their performance.

- Regarding the role of advisors, the idea is not to draw mandatory lists. On the contrary, all advisors – public and private - have to be integrated in the AKIS to step up their competences and help feeding in farmers' and foresters' needs and opportunities to develop. We will list inspirational examples but nothing obligatory. It is about incentivising. Regarding H2020 budgets and possibilities for advanced payments in multi-actor projects, there is now the possibility for OGs to receive 50% of advanced payments. OGs will be financed by art. 71;
- Q: ring-fencing of budgets does not sound like a good idea (in contradiction to the plans);
 - A: The minimum budget for ring-fencing of total EAFRD contribution will be 30% for interventions addressing the three environmental/climate objectives and 5% for LEADER;
 - Q: will it be possible to support farmers, institution and advisory activities cross-country, in particular for border regions?
 - A: yes, from the EU side it is possible but this was too detailed to describe it in the legislation. Here counts: less regulation from the EC, more flexibility to the member states for implementation of the plans;
 - Q: how will we link research and innovation in Horizon Europe properly? How will regional, national and EU strategies be linked if there is so much flexibility. How will this be streamlined?
 - A: it will be streamlined. For MA projects there is a need to involve end-users and different networks enable synergies to ensure this will happen. It does not happen sufficiently yet. The rural development community was not aware enough of H2020. Several events are organised to bring OGs and H2020 multi-actor projects together, also cross countries, organised by the EIP network;
 - C: there is no strategic synergy in the programming;
 - A: in the strategic CAP plans MSs have to explain what the networks will do so this will also be part of the strategic AKIS plans;
 - Q: there are other projects than OGs and there is different advisory capacity related to the objectives. How should we interpret the difference between advisory services and advisors?
 - C: with regard to advisory services, most people picture the chamber of agriculture, not innovation brokers. People are puzzled if advisory services and chambers should undertake all these functions/tasks and other actors not;
 - C: the English term "advisory services" is confusing. An "advisory service" may be the body delivering the advice or equally also the advice delivered itself. Also, "farm advisory services" as taken up the future CAP regulation are being confused with the old "farm advisory system" approach applied in the past and current CAP. It is simpler to use the term 'agricultural advice' instead of advisory services;
 - C: referring to the AKIS, it should be a comprehensive way to describe the whole transfer system. It is now possible to integrate two interventions in one project where we have training in a team and specific advice to farmers combined.;
 - A: the intention is to have more integrated measures. E.g., first a meeting/training is organised in which the advisors bring in the latest information from the OGs and next they provide specific on-farm one-to-one advice to the farmer how (s)he can apply it. We expect that the MSs will develop the best (integrated) measures which will fit their needs properly.

Other agenda topics

SCAR AKIS report discussion:

- C: there should be sufficient emphasis on R&I towards DG RTD, the relationship between R&I and AKIS should be well explained as well as a good introduction to the mandate and the structure of the report in relation to the mandate. We want to build on previous results of the former SCAR-AKIS mandates. It is important to keep the impact on policies well in mind;
- C: yet, we do have the flexibility to make changes or for example merge topics such as cross fertilisation and agri-food;
- C: we could start with an introduction where we reflect on this mandate and also previous mandates so the reader knows what and why (s)he is reading the report (the why and how of the group). Before writing the introduction, we have to know the conclusion and recommendations so we give concrete answers on the questions addressed in the introduction part. What is the main message we want to provide related to our mandate?
- However, it will be difficult to have one or two main recommendations from all our work. This still needs to mature a little bit. We could for example come up with a few bullet points (as recommendations);
- We can also include and propose other projects which were not presented if they serve the mandate;
- Will the objective be to work towards an EU AKIS?
 - o We are probably moving towards a wider vision on AKIS instead of one EU AKIS, hence: should we work (towards) EU wide common vision(s)/understanding on AKIS?
 - o It is both about EU AKIS and building a common vision on that and it is also about creating a common understanding on your vision. Hence, we are connecting but also influencing MS' views;
- It can be quite useful to include hyperlinks to recommendations, also insert good graphics and visualisations;
- The introduction needs to be clear, to have a simple and quick understanding of what the report is about and we should be able to jump to the chapter which you want to read;
- It should not only be about agriculture but also about food and value chains;
- The role of networks should be highlighted as an important part of AKIS, in particular the role of rural networks should not be underestimated;

Who does what?

See also the power point presentation.

- Regarding synergies, it is important to note that this derives from networking at AKIS level. How to build an EU knowledge reservoir, how to bring the NCPs and the NRNs closer together. What can we say about synergy and networks?
- Lessons learned from the connection of OGs etc.: all NRNs, MS, EIP, SP;
 - o Who: Pascale Riccoboni, Rosa Maria Mosquera Losada;
- Education: organise a next meeting with DG EAC, link it to a next mandate. Erasmus+ should be a chapter in the next mandate.

- Who: Floor Geerling, Kevin Heanue, Martijn Plantinga/colleague,
- Towards an EU wide AKIS:
 - Advisory services: Simona Cristiano;
 - CAP and AKIS: Inge Van Oost
- Digitisation transforming AKIS:
 - Digital AKIS (some SCAR-AKIS examples): Mark Gibson and Christian Rosenwirth;
 - Knowledge reservoirs: Sylvia Burssens, Jean-Marc Gautier, Maria Rosa Mosquera Losada;
- Lessons learned from other EIPs and sectors, EIP Water, GIZ, Leader:
 - Who: Luis Mira, Susanne Braun;
- Evaluation and impact:
 - SCAR AKIS analysis: new paradigm for evaluation: Simona Cristiano, Aniko Juhasz .



Annex 2: Participants' list

Country	No.	First name and second name	Role
Austria	1.	Christian Rosenwirth	Policy
Belgium	2.	Sylvia Burssens	Research
Belgium/Germany	3.	Karin Ellermann Kuegler	Farmers organization
Denmark	4.	Kirsten Klitgaard	Research /Advice
Estonia	5.	Annika Suu	Policy
Estonia	6.	Leho Verk	Advice
EU	7.	Inge Van Oost	EC policy R&I/EIP
France	8.	Jean-Marc Chourot	Policy
France	9.	Adrien Guichaoua	Research /Advice
France	10.	Pascale Riccoboni	Policy
Germany	11.	Susanne Braun	Research
Germany	12.	Arno Krause	Research
Germany	13.	Susanne Von Münchhausen	Research
Germany	14.	Anna Häring	Research
Hungary	15.	Aniko Juhasz	Policy/Research
Hungary	16.	Timea Reszketo	Advice
Ireland	17.	Kevin Heanue	Policy
Ireland	18.	Mark Gibson	Policy
Italy	19.	Simona Cristiano	Policy/ Research
Italy	20.	Mara Lai	Policy/ Research
Lithuania	21.	Gintare Kucinskiene	Advice
Lithuania	22.	Edvardas Makelis	Advice
Netherlands	23.	Annemiek Canjels	Policy
Netherlands	24.	Floor Geerling-Eiff	Research
Netherlands	25.	Martijn Plantinga	Policy

Poland	26.	Małgorzata Bogusz	Research
Poland	27.	Min. Ryszard Zarudski	Policy
Poland	28.	Jarosław Danowski	Policy
Poland	29.	Alina Bochniarz	Research
Poland	30.	Katarzyna Boczek	Advice
Poland	31.	Agnieszka Borysewicz	Policy
Poland	32.	Wanda Chmielewska - Gill	Policy
Poland	33.	Marek Cieśliński	Policy
Poland	34.	Justyna Cieślikowska	Policy
Poland	35.	Jolanta Fiejka	Advice
Poland	36.	Anna Folta	interpreter
Poland	37.	Tomasz Grudniewski	interpreter
Poland	38.	Ewa Grodzka	Policy
Poland	39.	Ryszard Kamiński	Advice
Poland	40.	Stanisław Kaniszewski	Research
Poland	41.	Szymon Konarski	Research
Poland	42.	Małgorzata Korbin	Research
Poland	43.	Lidia Lewandowska	Advice
Poland	44.	Barbara Odrobińska	Policy
Poland	45.	Aneta Pieczykolan	Research
Poland	46.	Katarzyna Sadowska-Kwas	Policy
Poland	47.	Henryk Skórnicki	Advice
Poland	48.	Maria Suszko	Advice
Poland	49.	Barbara Ślusarska	Policy
Poland	50.	Jacek Węsierski	Advice
Poland	51.	Edyta Wieczorkiewicz	Policy
Poland	52.	Sławomir Wiesławski	interpreter

Poland	53.	Maciej Zacharczuk	Advice
Poland	54.	Ewa Hajdukonis	Policy
Poland	55.	Karol Krajewski	Policy
Portugal	56.	Luis Mira	Research
Scotland	57.	Stefan Kah	Research
Slovenia	58.	Meta Candek-Potokar	Research
Spain	59.	María Rosa Mosquera Losada	Research
Spain	60.	Jaume Sio Torres	Policy
Spain	61.	Natalia Villalobos	Research
Spain	62.	Rocio Wojski Perez	Policy

