



# **Report SCAR SWG AKIS4 Kick-off meeting**

29th Jan. 2016

Venue: INIA office in Brussels (c/o CSIC). 62, Rue du Trône

Participants: (see participants list at the end of the report)

Agenda: see Agenda at the end of the report

Chairs: Andrés Montero and Adrien Guichaoua

# **Objectives of the meeting:**

The main target of the meeting was to develop an Agenda for the achievement of the different topics raised in the AKIS4 mandate.

In this regard there was a need to discuss about the proposed topics (all except the topic 5 on analyzing the perspective of AKIS in Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture across developing countries, as it is considered to be developed and dealt with bilaterally with SCAR-ARCH group later).

Within this context there were also different sub targets to fulfil during the discussions for each topic:

- 1. Identification of external experts matched to the proposed topics
- 2. Ways of reporting
- 3. Locations to set the meetings
- 4. Involvement of non-active countries in previous AKIS SWG meetings
- 5. Studies to be developed

There were two other issues proposed to address: the commitment from SCAR CSA to support the development of the SCAR AKIS4 mandate and the enlargement of the group (proposal for new entities and organizations to be involved in order to better address the mandate.

The meeting started with a participatory game allowing the attendees to meet each other, and to identify within the group the strengths (experienced participants, sectorial balance) and weaknesses (geographical unbalance, lack of some civil and regional organizations).

# Following to this introduction Inge van Oost (DG Agri- EC) made a presentation on the EIP – Agri update (at Dropbox).

During the presentation different issues were tackled:

-Related to the ongoing FG's it was mentioned that the linkages between the FG on benchmarking and the topic on monitoring and evaluation set in the mandate could be explored.





- The workshop on first experiences with OG's has been postponed until 20-21st April, due to the delay in the process for launching the OG's at regional and national level. It was mentioned by Adrien Guichaoua that now OG's actors are mainly focused on the development of the OG's and not yet fully in networking activities. In this context Michael Kuegler mentioned that SWG AKIS events allow OG's participants to work outwards. Emilie Gaetje added that for instance it would be of interest to connect the different ongoing H2020 Thematic Networks to the OG's in this workshop. (e.g. The TN on laying hens as there is an OG on this theme funded in Schleswig-Holstein German lander) and more to come in the near future.

Karen Ellerman-Kuegler added that there two steps in this process, the first related to a need for clarification on what can be funded under a project (OG) and a second on what can we learn from each other.

Pascale Riccoboni mentioned that there is a need for the participation of Advisory Services experts in the Focus Groups.

The main outcomes from the successful EIP Seminar on knowledge systems held in Dublin in Dec. 2015were also presented.

The work plan of the EIP service point for 2016 is based on:

5 FG's: Nutrients recycling (May and Sept. 2016); Sustainable forest biomass mobilization (May and Sept. 2016); Agroforestry (Oct. 2016); Livestock/Robust animals (Oct. 2016); Wine/ Perennial crop diseases (Oct. 2016).

4 Workshops: Food and cities (end May 2016); Multiple forest value chains (Oct. 2016); NRN's (Oct. 2016); Sustainability indicators: tools for farmers (Jan. 2017).

1 Seminar: The data revolution-ICT new business models for precision farming, moving towards a digital community (June 2016).

Finally a state of play for RDP's was given: all are now approved. Based on a first analysis of the budgets allocation and the indicators set in the RDP's, it is planned to have 3205 OG's in the EU during the period 2014-2020.

A workshop on "interactive innovation in motion: multi-actor projects and Thematic Networks under H2020" was held at the end of Nov. 2015. The multi-actor projects should have non-research partners in the consortium, and should appear clearly in the proposal description.

Regarding the multi-actor projects, Jaume Sió mentioned the risk of having many different useless Apps as main outcomes from the projects. At this regard Inge van Oost mentioned that working with Practice abstracts make practical and useful information available in the long term. Multi-actor project

It should make use of existing tools, mechanisms and dissemination channels.





# Outcomes from the parallel discussions on the Mandate priorities:

- 1. Improve the integrated approach within the European AKIS and the Implementation of the EIP. Emphasize on the connections/links between H2020 projects and OGs (and among H2020 project especially Thematic Networks and among OGs) and the regional and national dimension. Incentivize implementation of the interactive innovation model of the EIP AGRI through other funding mechanisms and programs at national and regional level.
  - A. Complementarity and synergies among funds (H2020-EAFRD-EFRD-ESF-Education). Identify good examples with experiences in the MS and Regions as well as bottlenecks and barriers. Develop pathways to improve the governance and its communication/Implementation. Small study and a few experts. (With DG REGIO & DG R&I).

**Deliverable**: Best practices /policy recommendation for a synergistic approach of the EU and national funds within the EU AKIS.

#### From the discussion

# Key issues to be tackled:

- Bridge the gap between OG's and H2020.
- Better connect Managing authorities of RD and Research at national level
- Connect RD funds with regional funds with a whole value chain approach. In this context S3 is considered as an incentive, although there are also some barriers as it is tricky to avoid double funding.
- How to link regional projects with OG's?
- Importance of connecting the networks (EIP, NRN's), and also connecting different knowledge actors.

# **Experts/Actors to be invited:**

- DG Education as important actors in the AKIS. Consider the Erasmus+ experience for farmers
- EARTO
- ERIAFF
- ERRIN
- DG R+I (Olivier Brunet B5 Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation in HORIZON 2020 ; Connecting Research & Innovation to regional and urban policies)
- DG Regio (Expert : Katia Reppel Unit G1 Smart and sustainable growth)
- JRC-S3 Platform: Mathieu Doussineau-Unit K4G

#### Study:

Identify good examples with experiences in the MS and Regions as well as bottlenecks and barriers. Develop pathways to improve the governance and its communication/Implementation. Small study and a few experts. (With DG REGIO & DG R&I).





Poster template translated to the different EU official languages as English is considered a selecting factor, in order to clarify the different options for the interested actors developing the interactive innovation model in the agri-food sector in the different MMSS and regions. (What are the main instruments in the AKIS of the MMSS? and how to connect at EU level?)

To be further developed after AKIS meeting in Barcelona

B. Thematic interconnection and collection of expertise of interactive innovation projects at different levels

Deliverable: Inventory and communication about similar processes and groups (themes, approaches) at national and regional level. Recommendations for NRN's to better link interactive innovation projects with OG's

# From the discussion:

# Key issues to be tackled:

NRN's and EIP service point considered key to identify and connect different actors Connect with OG's the H2020 TN and Multiactor projects

Keep part of the budget in TN and MA projects to be flexible and include key actors, and to connect to relevant projects.

#### **Experts/Actors to be invited:**

EIP service point / Some NRN's and EIP National Unit representatives. **Deliverables:** 

Workshop on the EIP database

C. **AKIS supporting Infrastructures** (Synergies between research infrastructure and facilities). Explore possible infrastructures and bottom-up initiatives, which improve knowledge exchange between innovation projects within the food/non-food supply chain and linking to practice (including "living labs" such as in the UK and the new dynamic in France). Search for connections and interlinkages beyond borders, e.g. extend current thematic networks to broader cover the EU and reflect on sustainability of tools and infrastructure beyond the project.

Deliverable: Policy recommendation for a more efficient use of infrastructures (including ERDF and other opportunities) in the Agri-food/bioeconomy sectors including ICT and Open Data Bases Infras.

# From the discussion:

#### Key issues to be tackled:

How to build a broader EU infrastructure?

Make use of existing TN's and other H2020 initiatives, but also National and Regional representatives to identify and get information about existing or future infrastructures. Need to characterize infrastructures (Typology)

Open access to key infrastructures (Advocacy for "infrastructure for all" that enhance the AKIS and knowledge flows).

Look for EU supporting funding for testing and encourage transnational cooperation.

# Key experts:

Krjin Poppe (Euro-Dish / DISH-RI- LEI-Wageningen) Lee Ann Sutherland (JHU-UK) Abad Chabbi (INRA-Coordinator of A European infrastructure for analysis and experimentation on ecosystems-ANAE) André Lapierre (GODAN Secretariat) Earto representative / H2020 Infrastructure call expert (NCP?)





# Study:

Case study and lessons learnt about existing initiatives, infrastructures and projects (more focus on practical approaches, themes and uses). Identify synergies between research infrastructure and facilities and advocacy to improve open access to infrastructure for practitioners

D. Further development of the EIP approach through mechanisms to collect practice needs, broaden communication of relevant info towards practitioners, design of peer review, stimulating interaction with EUFRAS, civil society and stakeholder engagement, etc.

Deliverable: Communication on EIP (education/training content) to be communicated through the EIP-AGRI Service Point.

# From the discussion:

# Key issues to be tackled:

Collection of practice needs is not well functioning, need to better address this issue. Still needs to better communicate and disseminate – identify further key levers and formulate recommendations. Still needs to better take into account the overall practitioner 'visions and expectations for further development and improvement of the EIP approach...

2.-Learning and feedback from interactive projects approaches (multi-actors projects, thematic networks, operational groups). Analysis and potential further development of the projects scheme/paradigms. Based on the previous experiences (arisen through the first H2020 projects) and AKIS group discussions, greater synergies and complementarities with other funds should be foreseen for boosting interactive approach and its potential evolution (rewarding mechanisms).

**Deliverable:** Insights for potential developments of these projects approaches (should be finalized before mid- 2017); Seek for interactions with the H2020 mid-term evaluation.

Advocacy for interactive innovation approach towards national and regional funding agencies (even out of the EIP scheme).

From the discussion:

#### Key issues to tackle:

Use of modern technologies to attract researchers

Raise simple examples from projects that clearly went well

Pick-up good ideas and best practices in several projects to write an inspirational inventory for the overall MAA.

Develop a decision tree to see the best program and way for interacting for project setting and implementation

Develop a template questionnaire to implement the analysis agreed with the SCAR SWG AKIS that should consider the existing theoretical background at this regard that will allow the support of recommendations

Establish a prize of the e-tool project of the month (Year?)

Experts/Actors to be invited: All TN, some MAP and few targeted OG's coordinators Study:





Study oriented to look what it is already in place (good practices) to further develop the MA approach. (following the template questionnaire mentioned above)

**3.-Better address the knowledge flows along the whole production/value/supply chain** in the AKIS for the future. Better address the vertical and horizontal relations through e.g. the application of the concept of Net Chain Analysis (Agrifood sector - Small chains – Food City -Urban farming policies).

**Deliverable:** Reflection on more "integrated" approach along the value chain. **From the discussion:** 

# Key issues to tackle (developed by Tom Keen):

The group suggested that a mapping study of existing methods and example of knowledge transfer in value chains would be a good starting point. With this, lessons could be learned of what works well and provides benefits to stakeholders. It was also stated that the terms supply chain and value chain had nuances in their meaning. The expected outcome of increased integration along the value chain was discussed. Was the goal of integration, increased innovation, profitability, cost efficiency etc., as the type of knowledge and levels of trust necessary may be quite different? Different relations (e.g. vertical or horizontal) were more likely to deliver different outcomes.

The discussion threw up some key themes that the group thought would be important to consider during the study:

**Trust** was identified as important for all players in the value chain. How much would for example a retailer be willing to tell a supplier about their practices? Equally, when thinking horizontally, there might be some knowledge that would be commercially sensitive and which actors would be unwilling to share. How is trust re-established when it breaks down?

The **value of knowledge** was seen as important. In order for knowledge to flow, there must be an incentive for it. Clearly this incentive would be how valuable it is to particular groups. Whether knowledge is public or private impacts incentive structures and relative value to different actors in the chain.

**The role of public authorities** in facilitating knowledge transfer within value chains was highlighted, with particular reference to public procurement of food. For example, the power that schools for example have in aiding consumer knowledge of food simply by their choices in procurement is not to be underestimated. Furthermore, the education often linked to such procurement was seen as a positive way in which knowledge flowed.

Knowledge in the context of the **functioning of value chains** was identified as important, i.e. how increased knowledge flows can result in the fairer treatment of suppliers, retailers and consumers.

# How to find this out?

A number of names of experts were listed by the group and there was a consensus that both academics and practitioners in value chains would need to provide input.

#### Next steps





Each member of the group is now asked to build upon this work. The above themes can provide templates for discussion. Therefore any insights on these, or new ones, on behalf of the stakeholders that members of the group represent or previous experience would be welcome.

# **Experts/Actors to be invited:**

- From existing and former projects
- Key content experts. Joost Pennings Wageningen. David Gereffi Duke University. Community Supported Agriculture : Urgenci Network. FoodLinks. Malmo. Copenhagen Jan Willem van de Schans (LEI-Wageningen). La Vialla, Tuscany ;

Technical Institutes: Christophe Cotillon - ACTIA (FR)

University of Bologna

KIC FOOD representatives

Netchain approach: Ana María Pérez (Universidad La Laguna) and Marian García (Prof. Marketing and Innovation at Kent University).

Practitioners: David del Pino (DG Granada la Palma Coop)

# Explore organising actions jointly with the future SCAR "Food Systems" working group in 2016-2017.

# Study:

- What is objective of study improve knowledge, identify weaknesses strengths
- Inventory of types of chains
- Inventory of perspectives for looking at supply, value, governance, knowledge
- Knowledge flows. What types of knowledge
- Identification of best practice
- Role of regions, cities, procurement,
- Link with share info with Taskforce on Agricultural Markets
- Include the Net chain analysis approach (Lazzarinni et al 2001), to analyse the different relations that occurs within a network, between different networks and along the value chain

**4.-Cross-fertilization with other EIPs and sectors:** identification and evaluation of experiences from other EIPs (Water, Raw materials, Bio-Economies, ICT, Health, Aeronautics ....) and other sectors not related for boosting and improving the AKIS. Deliverable: Improved methodology (tools) fostering and boosting the Innovation processes.

# From the discussion:

# Key issues to tackle:

Need for a cross fertilisation with existing events. Back to back to other EIP's Excursion of AKIs group to other EIP's (Water?)

Back to back with developing countries (perhaps better to address this issue within the priority 5 on analysing the perspective of AKIS in food and nutrition security with ARCH group).





Collect and use knowledge from refugees. Innovation for the integration of refugees. Connect AKIS with neighbourhood initiatives Use methods applied in Switzerland Promote the essence of MA projects Discover other H2020 challenges (black spots) Consequences of ICT's. sometimes broadband connection is a brain drain element Focus on AKIS to link with renewable energies and with recycling of nutrients Policy timeframe adequate for the development of the Bioeconomy Strategy to be revised and published by Sept. 2017) Learn from AGRISPIN experiences. Thee example of the cross visit in Denmark by applying Car industry Lean manufacturing production system in the Danish dairy sector Best practice driven (best practice across different situations). Identify innovations coming from entrepreneurial farmers (AGRISPIN +Collect knowledge from other projects)

**Experts/Actors to be invited:** Coordinators/ partners strongly involved from Probio and Combebiz projects (Topic ISIB 8b-2014). JPI FACCE & JPI HDHL; DG ENV (EIP Water); DG Connect (ICT's); Technology and Innovation International (TII) (Christine Robinson)

# Study: No specific needs for a study

**6.-Monitoring interactive innovation policies and benchmarking for sustainability:** relevant input is expected in the coming period from MS EIP implementation and monitoring processes, from the **OECD country reports**, from the EIP evaluation study, from the FG benchmarking and from big data initiatives. This material can be collected and structured in a small study. On the basis of this, the SWG AKIS can analyze and discuss trends and evaluation systems and Try to formulate indicators for interactive innovation in collaboration with OECD.

Deliverable: policy recommendations to monitoring innovation processes and instruments.

# From the discussion:

# Key issues to consider:

Inventory of existing dynamic and set of indicators.

Merge all in a meeting: OECD, IMPRESA, joint interactive session with AKIS SWG

Ex-ante EIP evaluation at EU level by end 2016

(Just looking to what we have in the RDP's)

# Experts/Actors to be invited:

Catherine Moreddu (OECD), Peter Midmore (Impresa), Dutch and Estonian colleagues in charge of the OECD studies.

Other EU Specialist of EU indicators and benchmarking? (Methodological – theoretical support).

# Study:

Capturing a qualitative evolution. We could learn from Sweden that are willing to develop a rather comprehensive qualitative study on the EIP)

Learn from participants involved in OECD studies (The Netherlands and Estonia)

AKIS group as a platform to extract and analyse comprehensive information from the different studies

Prior to the proposed meeting with OECD and Impresa main actors, the AKIS SWG participants should collect views and ideas about how to evaluate and monitor OG's, MA





projects and TN's with emphasis on the Impact and the EU Innovation Union Flagship initiative objectives: Smart, Inclusive, sustainable growth.

Following the kind offer from different participants to organise AKIS meetings we have developed the following schedule that will allow to further implement the AKIS4 mandate. How to monitor innovation in rural areas? Can it be measure innovation in terms of regional growth?

FADN should be considered as can provide an image about the adjustment of productivity/adjustment of volume. Anyway incremental changes are difficult to calculate.

A cross-cutting aspect of AKIS system like Education, not well considered in the AKIS group up to know should be paid special attention from the different perspectives of the different topics already considered in the SCAR SWG AKIS 4 mandate.

-Dr. Kevin Heanue has recently published a report on this issue (The economic returns to formal agricultural education:

<u>http://www.teagasc.ie/publications/2014/3374/Teagasc\_Impact\_of\_Education\_Report.pdf</u> -Also of interest OECD Netherland report recently published that make a reference to the Green education

-Experience of Aberystwyth Univeristy with the <u>Advance Training Partnership</u> (ATP). Expert: Marty Spittle (ATP Coordinator) and Neil MacKintosh (Teaching Fellow)

Potential AKIS 4 themes for the development of Studies (not limited to one study per theme):

- 1A: Synergies
- 1A Linking education into AKIS
- 1C: Infrastructures
- 3: Value/supply chain
- 6: Monitoring and benchmarking

It's key to identify who could be the sub-contractor for these studies. Please indicate you interest or relevant person/organizations that could carry-out these works.

# AKIS 4 mandate functioning and mindset:

It's foreseen to organize between 6 up to 8 AKIS4 meetings and workshops over the next 2 years.

The organization of the work might be the following:

Each workshop/meeting must address one specific topic of the mandate.

During the meeting, we will address collectively the specific theme through

- $\circ$  i) member states experiences from the AKIS members,
- ii) several EU experts presentations
- iii) input from contracted studies
- iv) potentially additional practical examples from the country hosting the meeting.

More time should be dedicated to parallel discussion groups in order to foster exchanges and incentivize collective creativity.

The meeting addressing one topic will be the starting point of the work of the mandate on this topic: most of the time, additional actions will be necessary to integrally address these topics:

• Specific studies when needed





• Further works and analyses on this topic can be presented in the following meetings, even if the meeting is dedicated to another topic.

As one of the main mission of the AKIS group is to follow-up and monitor the EIP implementation, it's also important to keep space for non-foreseen presentations of relevant dynamics and mainly fruitful practical examples.

As in the AKIS 3 Mandate, we will also pay particular attention to follow-up the AKIS and EIP related H2020 key projects such as VALERIE, AGRISPIN, other relevant Thematic Networks and in particular the relevant RUR projects which should liaise with the SWG AKIS as specified in the H2020 WP.

A flash report (2 pages) will be produced shortly after the meeting in order to i) display it on the AKIS webpage of the SCAR website to provide high visibility to our works ii) allow people that are not members of the AKIS group to provide us with their inputs and insights on such or such topic iii) lay the foundation of the final report of the AKIS4 mandate.

# Membership:

With regard to the evolution of the public policies and the research and innovation landscape, it's crucial to renew AKIS membership following the bellow mindset:

- With respect to the EC objectives and the SCAR CSA project, its' expected to have more participation of the EU 13 and more workshops in eastern countries.
- With regard to the above expectations, it's key to keep a balance in the membership between the kind of actors (research, states, managing authorities, advisory services, practitioners). Particular attention will be paid to attract advisory services and mainly practitioners.

# SCAR SWG AKIS4 MEETINGS SCHEDULE for 2016:

# June 14th and probably half day June 13th or June 15th): Brussels

To deal with point 1.d and point 2 of the mandate. Will a view to the topic on Education as well.

# **October 5-7th: Budapest**

Point 3 and 4 of the mandate. With a view to widening SCAR SWG AKIS activities as well.

The schedule for 2017 will be agreed further during the next SCAR SWG AKIS meetings.





# **SCAR SWG AKIS 4 preparatory meeting**

Friday 29<sup>th</sup> Jan. 2016 (9:15-14:15h) Brussels Venue: INIA office, 62 Rue du Trône 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

**9:15-9:30h** Welcome and introduction to AKIS 4 mandate.

9:30-9:50h Objectives of the meeting

**9:50-10:15h** Update from the EC on the EIP. Main ideas/ conclusions from the Agri conference and from the Dublin EIP seminar on AKIS

- 10:15-10:30h Introduction to the Discussion.
- 10:30-10:45h: Coffee break
- 10:45-11:30h Group discussion
- 11:30-12:00h Conclusions from group discussions
- 12:00-12:45h CSA needs
- 12:45-13:30h Rolling out of the AKIS4mandate commitments
- 13:30-13:40h: Closing remarks and other business
- 13:40-14:15h: Sandwich lunch end of meeting



Participation AKIS4 meeting 29th	
Jan. 2016	Yes
Ines di Paolo	Х
Lena Lind	Х
Carolina Gutiérrez Ansótegui	Х
Jaume Sió	Х
Pascale RICCOBONI	Х
Valérie Dehaudt	Х
Emilie Gätje	Х
Annemiek Canjels	Х
José Matos	Х
Floor Geerling-Eiff	Х
Bram Moeskops	Х
Yulia Baranova	Х
Karin Ellermann-Kuegler	Х
Inge Van Oost	Х
Hans Jorg Lutzeyer	Х
Annemiek Canjels	Х
Tom Keen	Х
Michael Kuegler	Х
Andrés Montero	Х
Adrien Guichaoua	Х

