

**Draft Meeting notes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> MEETING**

**Day 1: Tuesday, February 12, 2013. Meeting notes by Philipp v. Bothmer**

**1 Welcome and Introduction**

**Main agenda items of Tuesday, 12 February 2013:**

- 1) Scope needs to be clarified – write down definition and send to Commission as first deliverable.
- 2) Focus point: what is the added value of the SWG?
- 3) Name of the group – add “Bioeconomy” to the name? Check with conformity of SCAR mandate
- 4) Further elaboration of work plans – prepare final versions

Agenda: agreed.

Notes of the last meeting: agreed

**2 Points from the SCAR Plenary:**

Bioeconomy Panel: Open call for members: Applicants should be from operational level but acting on own capacity. Women are underrepresented as is CE-Europe. Three experts will make a listing of the candidates, EU COM will then decide.

First meeting of the panel could be in April/May.

SCAR confirmed that SWG can progress in line with the work it started.

**3 Proposal on CWG integrated Biorefineries (Stefan Rauschen):**

Stefan Rauschen from PT-Jülich presents the proposal made to SCAR to install a Collaborative Working Group on integrated biorefineries.

As the SWG focuses on Biomass for the Bioeconomy, IRA IB 2 on conversion and the ERA-NET Bioenergy on end use, a CWG is needed to fill a gap between biomass production and end-use.

PPPBridge would cover the whole value chain

**Comments on the CWG Biorefineries:**

Jan van Esch (NL) points out that a CWG could tackle the biorefineries topic quicker than the SWG thus might be able to exert influence PPPBRIDGE via installing MemberState funding sources. Working at different speeds could be helpful. SWG and CWG would need to work closely together, e.g. by having members of the groups at respective meetings.

Jan Svensson (SE) distinguishes between the purpose of a CWG and a SWG. The CWG may integrate relevant ERA-Nets. The SWG should remain as a strategic forum.

Andres (ESP) stresses that the SWG should not double the SCAR WG. Jan S. sees the SWGs with a narrower focus, thus no danger of duplication.

Philipp v. Bothmer (DE) asks how the CWG Biorefineries shall have an effect on the PPPBRIDGE.

Participants were not yet able to answer that question but pointed to the fact that the CWG could work with more speed on the specific issue which is needed to follow the speed of the PPP.

Barna Kovacs (COM) points out that a CWG's aim is to become an ERA-Net. The purpose of an SWG can be to define areas where the formation of a CWG is sensible.

Philipp v. B If the CWG Biorefineries goal is to become an ERA-Net, it should pay attention to existing KBBE-ERA-Nets.

Stefan Rauschen explains that a number of activities are possible for the CWG, including ERA-Net activities. This will be for the CWG members to decide.

#### **4 Bioeconomy Observatory:**

Barna Kovacs (COM) announces that the Grant Contract to the JRC for the Bioeconomy Observatory (BO) is about to be signed and announced. As rough schedule the BO plans to set up a website in year one. The BO shall be fully operational and running after three years. Launch: March 1<sup>st</sup>

#### **5 Presentation of the possible scope of the SWG by Julien**

Refer to the presentation(downloadable from the SWG-Homepage)

#### **6 Groupwork: Split into two groups to discuss the scope of the bioeconomy in general.**

##### Result Group 1:

Supply side (agriculture, forestry, marine, waste)

End-use side: (Food and Feed, bio-based products/materials, bioenergy)

All processing steps imaginable that link value chains from supply to end-use.

##### Result Group 2:

Bio-based supply side enhanced to economic cycles view: the flow of biomass creating values is the bioeconomy. The determining method to identify the bioeconomy is to follow the value creation of biomass including ecosystem services.

There was a discussion about further “functions” which are bioeconomy based i.e. leisure, culture, ecosystem services.

It was also discussed whether biomimicri should be included. Participants warned that this may be too far off and that this is covered within material sciences.

Results of the group work to be added/integrated into the deliverable on Scope (by Corinne and Julien).

#### **7 Groupwork: Split into two groups to discuss the focus of the SWG**

##### Results of Group 1 discussions:

- 1.) New/innovative value-chains between biomass supply and end-products
- 2.) New transsectoral connections between supply, processing and products and services
- 3.) Socio economic considerations
  - a. Consumer behavior
  - b. Ecosystem services
  - c. Employment
  - d. Additional added value along value chains
  - e. Exploring positive multiplier-effects
  - f. Avoid the creation of a bioeconomy bubble
  - g. Traceability/transparency to secure consumer support

Use a complex systems approach

- 1.) Identify weaknesses using case studies

- 2.) Using case studies to identify positive multipliers
  - a. Makers and breakers of the bioeconomy
- 3.) Public engagement + acceptance
  - a. Learn from GM and bioenergy discussions
  - b. Include public
- 4.) Analyse push and pull mechanisms

Results of Group 2 discussions:

A focus should be on knowledge creation and cross-sectoral interaction. The approach should be interdisciplinary involving socio-economics. Focal point should be material flows/streams and drivers behind those. Also the terminology should be changed from "biomass" to "bio-resources".

It was also discussed that value can be created from a bioresource while not using it up.

Results of the group work to be added/integrated into the working plans by Jan/Philipp

## **8 Name of the SWG**

It was agreed that the SWG shall have a different name

**SWG Sustainable use of bio-resources for a growing bioeconomy (SBGB)**

## **9 Presentation of work plans:**

In order to prepare the group work on the workplans on day 2, the current statuses were presented:

Andres Montero – Part B

Jan v. E. – Part C

Philipp v. Bothmer Part D

## **Day 2: Wednesday, February 13, 2013. Meeting notes by Philipp v. Bothmer**

It was decided that Part A will not be discussed in groups since important group members are missing.

## **10 Group work results of Part B discussions:**

Revisit the objectives and actions in the context of the bioeconomy.

Use a stocks/flows/systems approach

Address sustainability to each of these production and processing chains. Also consider waste streams and reprocessing.

Collect samples of these as wide as possible. Use Member state examples and private/voluntary cases.

Pick up on existing surveys (IEA task 38?: Mike Temmerman)

Also focus on:

Ecosystem services and public goods.

Research questions

Sustainability criteria leading to consumer trust

The key concept of sustainability is intrinsically understood by everyone, but there are different emphases for different stakeholders/sectors. Definition of sustainability is a process/dialogue between actors, changing with the growing Bioeconomy landscape.

Need to look at biomass flows from outside the EU as well.

## **11 Group work results of Part C discussions– Strategic questions:**

### **Mapping of MS Strategies (Philipp, Jan v. E., Lasse)**

Refine the mapping of strategies (questionnaire) and present at SCAR Plenary in June.

### **Add WP to support the Foresight Group of SCAR (Jan v.E. and Elke Saggau)**

The aim of the SWG would be to review research methodologies and modeling bases.

- The SWG is invited by SCAR WG to present first ideas that could support the SCAR foresight within the next few weeks.
- Workshop on research methodologies in September/October 2013 to be organized by Jan v. E. and Elke Saggau
- Contact JRC about it in order to coordinate with the Bioeconomy Observatory
- Invite PPPBRIDGE to present their views
- How to include multiplier effects instead of having simple linear models

### **Develop a knowledge and innovation agenda (Lasse Juul-Olsen):**

- a) **Low-hanging fruits** on specific topics for European research cooperation (i.e. proteins)
- b) **Concept list for June meeting**

Working list on research and innovation to be ready by October to feed into first work programme under Horizon 2020

Try to make connection to FACCE JPI and Innovation Partnerships (EIP) to establish focus group on biomass for the bioeconomy. CAP 2<sup>nd</sup> pillar money for innovation programmes and link to Horizon2020 to complement the CAP funding

### **Mapping Bioeconomy players (Philipp and Jan v.E.):**

FNR possibly with support from Stefan Rauschen to have a first shot on mapping. The Commission will be asked for support (review of first shot).

Produce a graphical presentation to see who-is-who and display the sectors that are covered.

Graphical presentation to display which stakeholders are close to SWG and which are further away (determine at September/October 2013 meeting).

**Further points** that could be included into Part C is consumer oriented actions and employment effects, creating added value also on primary producer level

Visit Reims next year to see bioeconomy cluster with farmer involvement

## **12 Presentation of template results “national strategies” by Philipp**

See slides of presentation

It was decided to prepare a refining round.

## **13 Presentation of EIP by Inge van Oost, DG AGRI**

See also slides of presentation.

The EIP concept: Closing innovation gap, interaction between research and farming is necessary. Forming partnerships, bottom-up approaches in operational groups bringing together different actors from research, farming, advisors, agribusiness, NGOs, etc. to create knowledge exchange and increased creativity to develop new ideas. Have farmers directly integrated into research projects to enable direct feedback in the research stage.  
Share results via the EIP Network

National networks possible and also thematic focus groups across Europe for i.e. dairy, cereal, IPM but also biomass for the bioeconomy.

Network function of EIP: collect information, effective flow of info, give advice within policies, connecting networks

Thematic Networks to boost innovation, in collaboration with CWG AKIS  
Focus on end user materials. Tools and knowledge to be able to discuss on educated farmers' level. Themes for Networks may be linked to: Sectors (i.e. arable crops, fruit and veg, pig,...); Subjects (bio-based materials, biorefineries, ...)

The first bi-annual Work Programme of H2020 is just being developed. If the SWG wants ideas to be picked up in the first bi-annual WP for 2014/15 a list of "low-hanging fruits" would be needed very quickly (until summer).  
Ideas developed until October would go into the next bi-annual WP (2016/2017).

SWG is welcome to deliver:

Ideas for operational groups

Thematic networks

Focus groups (narrow focus: i.e. protein crops)

Subjects for research but linked to specific H2020 work programme

## **14 Presentation "Foresight and Bioeconomy" by Elke Saggau**

See also slides of the presentation.

How can the Foresight process be connected to the SWG

The foresight process is a continuing process. SCAR Plenary wants to include SWGs into the process.

12 December SCAR WG gave mandate to foresight group for an analysis for a 4<sup>th</sup> foresight

COM intends to make budget available under H2020 for foresight

SWG asked to give input regarding necessity of foresight for their sector. Answers necessary for SCAR WG meeting on 19 March

The SWG Biomass is very important for input to the next foresight dealing with issues of transition to a bioeconomy.

Barna: Observatory plan foresight on Bioeconomy – coordinate with SCAR Foresight!

## **15 Presentation of Website by Stefan Rauschen:**

Refer to slides on homepage

## **16 Date of next meetings in 2013**

Meeting/workshop 5 June 2013

- B2b to SCAR Plenary in Brussels

Proposal for agenda items of workshop

- Present results of MS bioeconomy strategy mapping
- Present the scope of the SWG
- Discuss workplan part A
- Sustainability
- IEA Bioenergy task 38? (Temmerman)
- Low-hanging fruits

Meeting/workshop in September/October 2013

- Location? Berlin

Proposal for agenda items of workshop:

- Workshop on research methodologies to be organized by Jan v. E. and Elke Saggau with help from others
- PPP BRIDGE presentation
- Mapping of actors
- Low-hanging fruits and concept list for the knowledge and innovation agenda
- Bioeconomy Observatory methodologies
- Invite research project on methodologies Sat-BBE

## 17 Participants:

<b>Jan van Esch (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>
<b>Anna Munck Laybourn (13.2)</b>	<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Julien Colin (12./13.2)</b>	<b>France</b>
<b>Dale Crammond(12./13.2)</b>	<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Marcello Mastrorilli (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Italy</b>
<b>Zdzislaw Klukowski (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Poland</b>
<b>Süveyla Yilmaz (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Turkey</b>
<b>Stefan Rauschen (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Germany</b>
<b>Philipp von Bothmer (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Germany</b>
<b>Elke Saggau (13.2)</b>	<b>Germany</b>
<b>Anne Miller (12./13.2)</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Andres Montero (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Spain</b>
<b>Jan Svensson (12./13.2)</b>	<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Barna Kovács (12./13.2)</b>	<b>European Commission – DG Research &amp; Innovation</b>
<b>Inge van Oost (13.2)</b>	<b>European Commission – DG AGRI</b>