EIP-AGRI SeminarMoving EIP-AGRI implementation forward

May 10 – 11, 2017 – Athens, Greece





*Moving EIP-AGRI implementation forward Thursday 11 May 2017 – Athens, Greece

08:00 – 09:00 Registration Day 2

Getting back to business – Tips and tricks from Day 1

09:00 – 09:05 Introduction to Day 2 – *Inge Van Oost, DG AGRI*

09:05 – 09:15 Brief recap of the main results from Day 1 – Sebastian Elbe – EIP-AGRI SP

09:15 – 09:30 Keeping in mind what EIP-AGRI is about – examples of OGs

- DE Sachsen, Bernhard Jansen Innovative fertilisation and weed control in organic rapeseed
- ES Catalunya, Rosa Altisent Minimising pesticide use in stone fruit
- DE Niedersachsen and Bremen, *Hubert Gerhardy A learning factory to reduce antibiotic use in pig production*

Calling for innovation – bottom-up or thematic OG calls?

09:30 – 09:40 Experience from Ireland

Ronan O'Flaherty, Head of Division Agri-Environment (Organics and Locally-Led Schemes), Dpt of Agriculture, Food and the Marine

09:40 – 09:45 Introduction to the session – *Inge Van Oost, DG AGRI*

09:45 – 10:50 4th breakout session – "Calls for OG projects"

Questions for discussion:

- 1. How can a call with open themes and/or prefixed themes ensure you cover the needs and opportunities of farmers/foresters?
- 2. Can you share good practices to help the call capturing innovative ideas and reaching the right partners at the right time?

10:50 - 11:20 Coffee break and networking

11:20 – 11:30 Harvesting from the breakout session





The European Innovation Partnership (EIP) "Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability" Moving EIP-AGRI implementation forward



EIP Seminar - TIPS AND TRICKS from day 1
Athens - 11 May 2017
Inge Van Oost - DG Agriculture and Rural Development





Content of application form - step 2

- 1. WHY Project **objectives** supporting practical needs/opportunities of farmers/foresters (= definition of the problem/challenges in a clear way)
- 2. WHO Name of applicant + List of partners. Attribution of roles/responsibilities in the project: are the farmers real partners? ("It is not because a project is targeting farmers' needs that the farmers are really involved")
- => Justify the contribution (relevance) and the added value of each partner in the OG = illustrate why this mix of actors is the most targeted for this project (not the most diverse or best representation). Include multipliers (advisors, farmers' org, etc) which can capture needs, have practical knowledge, help communication and dissemination as from the start of the project.



Content of application form - step 2

- 3. WHAT & WHEN Planned activities + coherence with objectives (consistency of the proposal, are the activities the right ones to achieve the objectives?) + milestones (not necessarily tangible "deliverables", or intermediate "results") if needed for enabling intermediate payments when certain activities have finished + provisional timing
- 4. Communication plan + dissemination moments and channels foreseen – ask for practice abstract explaining what the OG will do & benefits for the farmers
- 5. Planned budget for each partner per activity
- **Step 1** much less, only 2 key criteria (who and why, the rest is to be developed in next operation= step 2)





Cooperation agreement

- to be discussed when making up the project plan + to be signed by each partner after selection is done and before the project start
- Administration provides template

Content of the partnership agreement:

- Partners agree with content of the application (=> add approved application with all details in annex – no repetition needed in agr.)
- Foresee what to do if changes during the project are needed
- Financial arrangements
- IPR??? May make things a bit difficult: what about management and incomes? (Guidelines EIP & Art 35: "emphasis of M16 is on creation of knowledge freely available to all")



Key selection criteria

- "Innovation" cannot be defined ex-ante, so must be translated into precise operational criteria.
- The EIP guidelines indicate selection criteria which avoid using "innovation(potential)" as a criterion:
 - (1) <u>'targeted project objectives</u> towards practical outcomes' (tackling problems/opportunities of farmers/foresters);
 - (2)'the particular and targeted composition of the project partnership benefiting the specific project, making the best use of the needed types of knowledge in an interactive way' (=complementary knowledge), including active commitment of the farmers





Further selection criteria

Attributing the right weight to selection criteria = essential. E.g. 50% for the two key criteria on former slide because seeking innovation is key ("idea, put into practice, with success")

Further selection criteria may refer to

- the **added value** expected from the project compared with the available knowledge (= checking state of the art and see if partners have done their homework when preparing the project)
- link with call, eg. EIP aims Art 55 or specific themes chosen
- relevance and feasibility of actions, coherence with objectives
- the organisation of activities (coordination, workplan, timing)
- costs clear and realistic?
- planned communication and dissemination





Selection procedure

- Make a mix, the more diverse the selection committee the better (not only scientists, also innovative farmer, innovation specialist from outside sector, extension service, etc)
- To avoid conflict of interest: wait until you see the applicants to chose your selection panel
- Think about possible appeal: second (group?) expert

General conclusion from day 1:

(FAILING FORWARD) + KEEP IT SIMPLE!

(absolutely necessary if you want to get farmers involved !!)

And don't hesitate to come back to us in case of doubts/questions





Innovation is: an idea put into practice with success!



Thank you for your attention!

To an "Agriculture of Knowledge"

Inge.Van-Oost@ec.europa.eu



Moving EIP-AGRI implementation forward

All seminar presentations and documents are available on www.eip-agri.eu

