



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.



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:



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

