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5th Bioeconomy Stakeholders Panel

Brussels, 30 March 2017
Mr Waldemar Kütt, Head of the Bioeconomy Strategy Unit, welcomed the participants and briefly presented recent updates concerning the policy aspects of the bioeconomy. He underlined that the first discussions on the CAP modernisation and the role of bioeconomy in that context have already started taking place. Mr Kütt mentioned that national bioeconomy strategies have been emerging globally. He also pointed out that the stakeholders approach coordinated by Unit F1 is seen as a pilot experiment by other Directorate-Generals.

Concerning the planning for the months ahead, Mr Kütt announced the upcoming bioeconomy week which will take place from the 14 to 17 November 2017 in Brussels. The most important day, concerning the policy developments in the field of the bioeconomy, is the 16th of November where Commissioner Moedas is likely to participate. The aim is to present the finalised European Bioeconomy Stakeholders Manifesto, drafted by the Bioeconomy Stakeholders Panel.

Mr Kütt concluded by wishing the participants a fruitful meeting and gave the floor to Ms Joanna Dupont-Inglis.

Ms Dupont-Inglis gave a brief overview on the progress on the Manifesto drafting and highlighted the tight timeframe to deliver the final document. She then gave the floor to Ms Sanna Alaranta and Mr Johan Elvnert who presented the latest version of the Manifesto and the working methods adopted so far.
2. The Manifesto Drafting Process
09:15 - 12:30

Bioeconomy Manifesto v7.0
European Bioeconomy Stakeholders Panel
30 March 2017, Brussels

Manifesto Editing Team:
- Sandra Alcaraz (Agrar)
- Dimitra Butuntzou (Academia)
- Joana Dias (Estrela)
- Joao Fustin (Finnish)
- Linda Zulkernine (Finland)

1. Process of the Editors Team
- 17 January Bioeconomy Panel
- ETObjective to take all your comments into consideration and make the BB accordingly
- 21 January Editing Team
- Discussion only on the first four BBs
- ET decided to use traffic light system
- 13 March Editing Team
- Discussion HET on the “most red” BBs
- Decision to remove Challenging and Opportunities as separate chapter
- 30 March Bioeconomy Panel

2. Structural changes to Manifesto
- “Challenges and opportunities” (former BB 5, 6, 7, 8) merged with “Guiding Principles” (former BB 9-17) to avoid repetition in the document

3. New Building Blocks
- Added BB 20. Promoting Biomass Availability (Johan)
- Added BB 21. Research and assessment of biomass potentials (Sini?)
- Added BB 24. Biodiversity and Environmental Safeguards (Sini?)

4. Todays exercise
- Use the traffic light system for all Building Blocks
- Red = I cannot accept/live with this
- Yellow = I wish to suggest some minor changes
- Green = OK text, looks fine
- Discuss the BBs in 5 groups, 2 rounds
- Each group will be moderated by one of the Editing Team members
- The group moderators to conclude the discussions on their respective BBs

5. Next steps of the process
- Discuss and collect input from today
- 3 weeks deadline for Panel Members to provide written input (Suggestion: Wednesday 19 April)
- New draft sent out until next Panel Meeting
- Next Panel meeting - deadline for a stable manifesto
As indicated at Ms Alaranta's and Mr Elvnert’s presentation, the Manifesto drafting process during the Panel meeting was divided in two rounds. At the first round, each of the five members of the Manifesto editing team hosted a specific discussion on the sections they have been personally drafting so far concerning the "Introduction" and the "Actions" developed in the document. All Panel members were welcome to participate to the discussions they found closer to their interests and provided constructive feedback which will be incorporated at the updated version of the Manifesto. The second round of discussions was structured in the same way and the Panel members were encouraged to exchange opinions and comment on the "Guiding Principles for the Development of the Bioeconomy" and on the "Recommendations to the EU and Member States”.

Below are presented the most important comments of the two discussions:

**Sini Eräjää**

BBs 5 – 8, (principles) 16, 18 and 21 (actions):

- BBs 5 to 8 on guiding principles for the bioeconomy did not raise any major concerns or disagreements. Further tweaks were done to note that biomass availability and global planetary boundaries are not necessarily statics and that ‘blue’ jobs should be considered on top of ‘green’ jobs.

- BBs 16, 18 and 21 on actions were mostly edited to have a clearer and shorter message so that first the reasoning of the action is stated and then concrete suggestions shortly listed. There were not major diverging views on the content.

**Johan Elvnert**

- BB19: There were no major disagreements on the text but it was suggested that e.g. number of work accidents was added to the list of statistics to observe.

- BB20: The panel members found that the BB described the challenges around biomass mobilisation but lacked recommendations on how to address these challenges. A few suggested recommendations were: encourage cooperatives and cooperation between biomass producers. Improve the rural transport system. Identify barriers for primary and secondary biomass side streams. Develop new
decision support systems. Make sure that the biomass mobilization system is dynamic and able to adapt to changing demands. It was also recommended to merge BB21 with BB20.

- BB22: Minor improvements and corrections were made to the BB. For instance “standards” were added to certification and labelling schemes.

- BB23: This was probably the most discussed BB in this group. However, constructive suggestions helped to find a compromise all partaking panel members were pleased with. The largest changes were to keep only first sentence of BB (statement) and add recommendation to include all stakeholders of the bioeconomy in consultations on future changes to CAP. It was also noted that also the Common Fisheries Policy was of interest to the Bioeconomy.

- BB25: It was recommended to change the focus to the EU citizens from international treaties.

Christine Bunthof

General comments remarked by many at meeting: good that the texts as a whole is now shorter; good to have short texts on different topics under different blocks; better to make short messages under more blocks then to merge different aspects.

Specific comments:

- BBs 11, 13, 14: check for redundancy and see if texts can be made shorter.

- BB 8: The aspects yield, sustainable intensification and profitability are not clear enough. To check by editing team: should that be stressed (more) in this point or is it to be covered further in other blocks? Furthermore, replace ‘sustainable agriculture’ with ‘sustainable primary production’, so that fisheries and aquaculture are included while text is kept short. In same reasoning, last sentence can be made shorter.

- BB 10: Reconsider whether to write ‘visibility to students, consumers, and policy makers’; are these subgroups to be specified? Maybe BB 10 should be just on the engagement in value chains, so it would not be needed to also mention here the visibility, which is covered in another block. Note that in value chains the role of consumers is to be recognised. Furthermore, what is the added-value, needs explanation. Stress why we need extra effort for bioeconomy (above other areas). This is in things such as scaling up, demonstration, innovation approach, cooperation between sectors and actors along value chains.

- BB 11: ‘development of thriving bio-based economy’ would be preferred way to say it. First sentence ‘bio-based and circular economy’ is better.

- BB 14: It is pertinent to acknowledge that innovations are founded on basic science. Also, text to be shortened and made more into actions. Content is fine, but is phrased very descriptively. The notion on tipping points is good and should be introduced earlier on (in section guiding principles and challenges). Finally, missing: link to research and support to bioeconomy challenges outside the EU (food security, sustainable fuel provision). FAO is strongly interested in cooperation on and exchange with regard to those points.
Sanna Alaranta

- BB9: What does “sustainably” mean in this BB? Could be “in a sustainable way” instead. Also, the second sentence was suggested to be changed into something more positive – in order not to give wrong assumptions. A suggestion: “We need legislation to create regulatory certainty for the uptake of bio-based products…”
- BB12: The importance of regional bioeconomy (and S3) strategies should be highlighted more.
- BB15: Some discussions on whether we need this BB but the consensus was in favour of keeping it. The 2nd sentence on the BBI JU was suggested to be rephrased as: “Initiatives like the Joint Undertaking Biobased Industries…”
- BB17: It was suggested that this BB could be divided into different paragraphs as it has many different actions under the regional umbrella.
- Rural concerns → suggestion: rural priorities
- Meaning of “value chain” in this context should be explained
- The last sentence was suggested to be moved to biomass availability (BB20) but making sure that the part about innovations and investments is kept.
- Some more work to be done to make this BB more concise while trying to keep the action points – more suggestions on how to modify the text will be sent by email by the given deadline.
- BB24: Main comments on this BB were that this recommendation BB should be true with or without Bioeconomy; it is not clear why biodiversity protection or nature legislation should be an action for a Bioeconomy Manifesto? Hence it was suggested that this BB should be re-written with a clear idea of what is the actual recommendation when it comes to Bioeconomy or merge it with another BB (BB9 for instance).
Joanna Dupont-Inglis

Aside from some specific requests for text changes here were discussions around the introduction to the document where some felt that a forward from Commissioner Moedas would be appropriate and others did not. Those who were not in favour, felt that this would make ‘ownership’ of the document. Equally, there was some enthusiasm for having an image or illustration at the beginning of the document, but others felt that perhaps one illustration only might raise questions as to why others were not used. The same concern was raised for the graph featured near the introduction. In addition, there was some discussion around the need for a stable, predictable policy framework.
The last step of the Manifesto editing session was to identify the remaining, most important issues that should be addressed and that are considered to be fundamental for the Panel members:
Predictability of Regulation should not compromise sustainability of biomass sourcing or it happened with poisons policy "Putin"

Access to new markets as companies would never have been possible again.

Limit imports to burn these resources temporarily

Take out fast path "and have working plan now instead"

John
3. Presentations on the Current Bioeconomy Developments
13:30-14:15

3.1 Bioeconomy Stakeholder Dialogue: BioSTEP by Ms Zoritza Kiresiewa and Ms Sara Davies
13:30-14:00
BioSTEP Policy Workshops: lessons learnt

- Link to larger events (e.g., conferences, meetings)
- Financial support for CSOs (facilitating access)
- Policy relevance (which audience and policies)
- Keynote speeches (as part of an event)
- Stakeholder survey as a mobilization tool (before or after the event)

BioSTEP exhibition “Bioeconomy in everyday life”

- The exhibition “Bioeconomy in everyday life” shows that renewable biological resources are already used to produce food, materials and energy
- The exhibition takes a “hands-on” approach – people can touch the different items and learn about the procedure and raw material of the innovation
- Main target group is the general public. However, the exhibition has also proven to be of interest to people that are familiar with the concept of bioeconomy and even experts

Glasgow/UK 2016
- Notable success: Reached a very broad audience
- Positive feedback and more than 60 surveys completed
- Survey: Valuable ideas of perceptions and ways to improve
- Public spaces (e.g., museum): perfect location but need to be frequent, proactive involvement of people needed
- Young people access via videos and other multimedia actions

Upcoming 2017: Veneto/Italy and Stara Zagora/Bulgaria
Open question: Communication of complex issues?

BioSTEP Living Labs: lessons learnt

- “Living Lab” is an innovative concept, where citizens and end users take an active part in co-called user-driven processes of innovation.
- BioSTEP applies and tests tools for participatory governance of the bioeconomy in two regional case studies in Italy and Bulgaria.
- Target Group: business, local authorities, CSOs.
- Aim: to formulate appropriate and effective programmes of measures to foster regional bioeconomies.

BioSTEP Living Labs
- Creation of local networks composed of companies in the building and construction industry, small-scale farmers, research institutions, regional authorities, consultants
- Some co-creation of bioeconomic business models and policies revealed to be possible
- Challenges: stakeholders are not aware of their power in the decision-making process (as entrepreneurs or citizens) → “top-down” governance

Key message

- Positive outcomes from BioSTEP but still need research and broader dissemination work to ensure an embedded participatory approach and greater democratization in bioeconomy strategy building

BioSTEP Partners

www.bio-step.eu
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3.2 Presentation of the BIOEAST Workshop  
By Ms Adrienn Somosné Nagy  
14:00-14:15

**BIOEAST Initiative**  
for Knowledge-based bioeconomy in the CEE macro-region  
5th Bioeconomy Stakeholders Panel  
Brussels, 30 March 2017  
Adrienn Somosné Nagy

---

**What are the challenges for the CEE macro-region?**

- Low performing in:  
  - Bioeconomy Strategies and Activities  
  - Until now, in H2020, the participation rate of EU 13 is only 4%.

---

**What are the strengths of the CEE region?**

- High potential in:  
  - Biomass production  
  - RI excellence and networking

---

**Objectives of BIOEAST**

To improve the sustainable growth of knowledge-based agriculture, aquaculture and forestry in the bioeconomy in the CEE regions.  
1. Initiate cooperation and knowledge-based policies development  
2. Identify common challenges and validate common research topics  
3. Initiate strategies  
4. Provide an evidence base  
5. Improve skills  
6. Initiate synergies development  
7. Increase visibility

---

**What have we done? I. Political Agreement**

- 26. October 2016: common declaration of the Ministers of Agriculture of the Visegrad 4 countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia) and Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia  
- For the stronger inclusion of the research potential of the Central and Eastern European countries into the implementation of projects within the Horizon 2020 in the field of agriculture in the bioeconomy.

- V4+3 DECLARATION and Annex was presented and discussed during:  
  - November 2016 AGRI FISH COUNCIL  
  - December 2016 COMPETITIVENESS COUNCIL

---

**What have we done? II. Start Activities**

- Organized conferences and workshops to:  
  - Raise awareness  
  - Develop network  
  - Identify specific RI needs  
- Formulated documents to have:  
  - Vision paper  
  - Scoping paper review  
  - Mapping of bioeconomy and RI solutions
What have we done? III. Start Communication

- Started communication activities
  - Developing a portal for the EUP Agri implementation in Hungary – hosting BioEast information as well
  - Developing a newsletter
  - Publishing a CEE bioeconomy research catalogue

What are the RI focus areas of BIOEAST?

Theme 1: Climate change challenges in the Continental and Pannonian Bio-geographical Regions
- Sustainable intensification by maintaining soil conditions and improving water management
- Sustainable extensification by maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem services
- Improvement of organic farming in terms of production technology
- The reduction of high dependence on non-renewable energy sources
- Exploiting the potential for protein crop production
- Strengthen the Region as a buffer zone against emerging and changing pathogens
- Sustainable, efficient and competitive freshwater fish production.

Theme 2: Policy and governance challenges in the Continental and Pannonian Bio-geographical Regions
- Motivating knowledge-based modern farming and cooperation among farmers
- Supporting the generation change of the first entrepreneurs in the agri-food sector
- Improving supply chain efficiency and increasing its added value
- Increasing consumer awareness in institutional and price-sensitive societies
- Increasing the value added use of agricultural and forestry biomas
- Experiences of less developed EU regions in social integration challenges such as food, energy or social care security

Budapest BIOEAST Workshop 21-22 FEB

Experts from:
- Research Institutes
- Universities
- Administration

Workshop for 4 topics
- Sustainable intensification of plant production and forest production
- Sustainable, efficient and competitive freshwater fish production in the changing climate of the Continental and Pannonian Biogeographical Region
- Motivating knowledge-based modern farming and cooperation among farmers
- Improving supply chain efficiency and increasing its added value
- Increasing the value added use of agricultural and forestry biomas
- Sustainable intensification by maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem services including the role of pollinators, sustainable use of genetic resources

OUTCOME

Output of the event were as follows:
- Renewed commitment for closer cooperation both at political level and operational level
- Further networking at international level - personal contact and communication between the countries at operational level
- Common work carried out by experts as a follow up on V4+3 Common Declaration
- Validation of the common research topics

Immediate actions
- Active involvement in the development of the H2020 SC2 2018-2020 Work Program
- More workshops to be organised, the first in Poland to cover the remaining CEE relevant research topics
- Building a website for BIOEAST Initiative
- Starting a regular newsletter dissemination
- Starting to discuss and lobby the set-up of a common CSA and a common ERA-NET Cofund instrument with the thematic content previously defined in this paper (contributing to all objectives)

Structure of Bioeast leadership

Who are involved in BIOEAST in Hungary?

Ministry of Agriculture (FM)
- Coordinating team leader
- National lobbying: governmental
- International lobbying: COM, EP, Council, V4

AKI Research Institute of Agricultural Economics (AKI)
- Providing RDI activities
- National lobbying: scientific bodies
- International lobbying: SC2 Advisory Group, AMIF, EUTRANSTECH

National Chamber of Agriculture (NAK)
- Sectoral stakeholder involvement
- National lobbying: local administration
- International lobbying: Copa-Cogeca, V4 Chambers

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

ADRIENI SOMOSNE NAGY: ANAGY@PLEUROTUS.HU
ZSOFIA KUNYA: ZSOFIA.KUNYA@FMI.GOV.HU
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During the afternoon discussions the focus shifted from the Manifesto to the Action Plans that have been drafted during the previous Panel meeting in January 2016. The aim of this session was to better allocate tasks and organise the work within each group for the months ahead.

**Circular Economy**

Basics: The Bio-based Economy (BBE) should not be forgotten when policies are more and more focussing on the Circular Economy. BBE plays an important role in the Circular Economy (CE) and that shall be highlighted. Next the BBE needs to be developed further as part of the circular concept.

The group discussed the following actions from the January meeting:

- **Meetings at local/regional level on pilot projects and funding synergies**
  
  This action has a two-year timeline. It was decided to catch up with the Action Plan of the regions and feed into their ideas when required. BBE and CE specifics should be implemented in their action in time.

- **Report of CE standards and labels, and their usefulness**
  
  This action has a deadline of the 4th quarter of 2017. People noted that it would need money to do this research. Ortwin Costenoble offered to collect knowledge from the panel members on CE standards, certification and labels and especially investigations on their usefulness. He would then start drafting a report on it. The aim was to have that report ready for the November 2017 Bioeconomy Week.

- **Collection of good examples**
  
  Some of the examples already shared are on bio-based products where others are on circular economy processes. The group members discussed what would be helpful examples. As the definition of good is difficult, the idea was that we would start collecting and try to define "good examples" from thereon. Jenny Walter-Thoss knew of the FAO initiative of collecting processes as examples; she would share that with the group.

  It was agreed that the Group would need to collect examples of either European products or process that have a bio-based and a circular component. These could be showcases for an event in November so partners in the platform needed to have close connections with them. They should also be a stepping-stone for the comparison of what is a 'good example' and be exemplary for regions, policies or investors.
Develop a policy paper for next funding programmes

The H2020 programme on SC2 for 2018-2019 has already been defined and will be presented in November. So a paper for this would be too late. It was felt better to wait for the presentation and then discuss what BBE needs here not yet covered. Also the BIC was entertaining a mid-term review on the BBI-JU. Ortwin would check if the panel could still present its views in that process. It was noted that the regional restructuring funds would be redefined in 2018 so a paper might be of help there. However, no concrete steps were defined, so this is parked for the next panel meeting.

Education and training

The Education and Training Action group has active participation from Poland, Spain and Netherlands contact persons involved or interested in academic and vocational training. Stanislaw Bielecki of Lodz University of Technology, Poland agreed to lead the action line. The plan is to compile an overview of 1) universities that have an academic curriculum (BSc or MSc) on bioeconomy and information about how the programmes look like; 2) collect good cases of vocational training in bioeconomy, in particular post-graduate courses. Possibly there are COST actions or existing networks that have some information and that we can find out about. An interaction may be established to tap into such source. The action group would probably then like to derive common good practices and recommendations, and present this in case a broad dissemination event from the Stakeholder panel would be organised on 17 November in Brussels.

If a list of names for each of the action groups is going to be updated, then be informed that Yannis Fallas and Daniel Zimmer asked to be taken out of the action group Education and Training (to focus on other action group in which they also originally enrolled).

Persons that are willing to be active in the group: Stanislaw (TUL), Nuria Arribas (FIAB), Christine Bunthof/Gerlinde van Vilsteren (WUR).

Regions

The Regions action group discussed the idea of organising peer-to-peer reviews of regional bioeconomy strategies, using the model of the S3 platform on Smart Specialisation strategies. This would help the late comer regions to catch up with the help of the developed regions while at the same time tying new contacts and support cooperation.

The group also considered organising several visits in their regions with the goal of knowledge exchange and identifying possible partners and to create more awareness. The Zuid Holland region suggested organising a visit to their Bioprocess Facility or to one of their incubators.

Public awareness/communication

The public awareness/communication action group aims to develop and launch a website to support the establishment and awareness of the EU Bioeconomy.

The objective is to provide visibility for examples of activity around the Bioeconomy in different EU member states and regions. The website should enable visitors to find examples of local initiatives in the Bioeconomy in their own EU language.
Such initiatives could include:

- School projects
- Farm and or forest visits
- Exhibitions
- Book and or film launches
- Development of new bio-based products or processes
- Site visits etc.

To maximise impact the majority of activity could be planned around a designated ‘bioeconomy week’. Individuals would be able to upload information about their initiatives onto a webpage on a common site - e.g. www.mybioeconomy.eu

Ideally the action should be launched within the next year (2017/2018).

Actions to take the initiative further include:

- Searching for possible domain names
- Scoping what resources would be needed
- Beginning search for content/mapping existing relevant events
- Discussing possible collaboration with similar ongoing initiatives (e.g. Biostep)
Mr Lino Paula took the floor to summarise the discussions that took place during the day. His main message to the Panel members was that they need to ensure a stronger collaboration and active participation in the action groups between the Panel meetings. Lastly, he thanked the participants for their hard work during the day.

Participants:

*Stakeholders Panel Members: Sanna Alaranta, Nuria Vera Arribas, Alberto Bezama, Stanislaw Bielecki, Fabio Boscaleri, Christine Bunthof, Ortwin Costenoble, Ann Dierckx, Joanna Dupont-Inglis, Johan Elvnert, Sini Eräjää, Yannis Fallas, Maria Hollander, Courtney Hough, Kjell Ivarsson, Michal Korolko, Paolo La Scola, Jesper Lund-Larsen, Magnus Matisons, Nadia Moalla, Jorge Molina Villanueva, Nicole Polsterer, Bertrand Rigal, Adrienn Somosne Nagy, Jenny Walther-Thoss, Daniel Zimmer*

*In attendance: Jacqueline Spuijbroek, Sophie Vogelaar, Mindaugas Maciulevicius*
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