



Leibniz-Zentrum für  
Agrarlandschaftsforschung  
(ZALF) e.V.

Mitglied der



Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research

# How to stimulate practice-science links through EIP programming in RD and Horizon 2020

H. Kächele, K. Müller

Berlin, 25.11.2013

**EIP as new, additional pillar in science**

**EIP shall complement but not substitute  
customary scientific programmes (like ERC etc)**

## Central Questions

- How to identify needs?
- What are the bottlenecks?
- Which consequences for programming?

## From the perspective of science and research

## Present Conditions for Science

- Research needs are defined by scientific community (not practice)
  - ⇒ Practice is interested in (assured) state of knowledge
  - ⇒ Science is interested in the development of this knowledge
- Science is disciplinary organized and self-referential
- Solution of practical problems requires merging of disciplinary findings and dissolution of contradictions
  - ⇒ Max Weber: reality (practice) is not part of one discipline

## Present Conditions for Science

- Evaluation pressure for science:
  - ⇒ main evaluation criterion (peer-reviewed publications)
- Stakeholders are not really integrated and are not part of process
  - ⇒ Alibi-Practice-Partnerships
  - ⇒ Advisory Boards
- Consequences
  - ⇒ knowledge gaps from practical point of view
  - ⇒ answers to questions, the practice is not interested in

## Who is able to identify needs best?

- Science?
- Stakeholder?
- Politics?

## Who is able to identify needs best?

There is good reason to assume that best solution will be:

Science + Stakeholder + Politics

## What are the bottlenecks?

- Identification of needs!
- Allocation of financial resources for science!
- Evaluation criteria for science!
- Dialogue between stakeholders, policy and science along the whole scientific process (from needs to market/adoption readiness)



# Which consequences for programming?

## Identification of needs.

- Realize importance of identification process.
- Establish pre-phase for identification of needs.
- Integrate stakeholders + politics + science.
- Guidance on practical interests by integration of practice.
- Ensures that research questions - with utmost probability - generate added value for practice (private or public value).

## Allocation of financial resources for science

- Funding to enable proper pre-phase for elaborating needs/questions.
- Provide resources for pilot projects and prototypes.
- Shift of resources for practice-relevant research instead of "Alibi-Practice-Partnerships".
- If appropriate, integrate transfer partner through providing resources.

## Evaluation criteria for science

- Further development of evaluation criteria
- The power of definition regarding "good" research needs to switch, at least partially, from science to society  
⇒ Requires new understanding of science and scientists

## Dialogue between stakeholders, policy and science

- Real integration of transfer partners from pre-phase to market- /adoption readiness
- Transfer partner contributes to the definition of research questions (identifies practice-relevant knowledge gaps)
- Transfer Partners take over responsibility within research process  
⇒ e.g. on farm research, contribution to data collection
- Transfer partner takes over knowledge transfer to practice  
⇒ Ensures that relevant answers to practical questions are given

## Opportunities for EIP

- EIP (as a new instrument) harmonize science and practice, because different interests are resolved / mitigated
- EIPs can proactively tackle inevitable adaptation processes in agriculture
- EIPs contribute to the extension of technological, organisational or social innovations
- Cooperation between science and practice up to market-/adoption readiness

## Risks for EIP

- EIPs are used for stabilization / further reinforcement of existing / conventional structures
- EIPs are taken over by stakeholders and to satisfy their clientele (vested interests)
- EIPs could be established with minimal resources for research and maximum administrative expenses
- EIPs are talked to pieces in the fight over the distribution of resources and over the power of definition of "good" research  
⇒ EIP money = "bad" money for "bad" research

# EIPs offer chances to interlink science and practice



