

Draft Meeting notes of the 5th MEETING

Berlin, October 24, 2013. Meeting notes by Philipp v. Bothmer

Summary of Action Points:

Action point: officially ask SCAR to send a SCAR Member that is member of the Bioeconomy Panel to one of our meetings.

Action Point: Jan and Eva to contact AKIS group to establish cooperation with SWG

Action point: Develop a time plan to end 2015 with first phase of SWG.

To be considered when developing the time plan:

The H2020 Work Programme for 2016/17 will be drafted beginning of 2015. Thus input would be needed by then.

Bioeconomy Stakeholder conference will be in Sept 2014 in Torino.

To prepare a proposal for support from the commission(DG RTD), Corinne, Juan and Jan will select from the workplan the questions and the analysis we think are needed, and contact the Commission.

Action point for Work Plan part A: Allocation of responsibilities for lead of actions:

A11: Not leads but support from Jan Svensson and Anne Miller

A12: special area, expert needed. Funding from Commission?

A13: Lead by France – brochure in 2014. A website could be established during the second phase of SWG work.

A21: Lead by France. Possibly supported by Stefan Rauschen. Decision postponed – depending on work load.

Action Point: Discuss possibilities for cooperation with JRC Bioeconomy Observatory Project to produce a more sophisticated questionnaire on national bioeconomy strategies, Programmes and public funds. Resources time/workforce/funds of the SWG are to scarce to deliver that.

Action point: Eva and Jan combine their findings and make a proposal for first agenda.

Welcome by Dr. Justinger from the German Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer Protection

Adoption of Agenda

Minutes of last meeting accepted

SCAR Foresight

Comments:

Jan v. Esch: SWG should work in close cooperation with the foresight group. How to cooperate?

Elke Saggau: The FEG (Foresight expert group) should include the expertise of the SWG or FEG should be supported by SWG

PPP BiobasedIndustrie

Budget: 1 bn € from Commission, 2,8bn € from industrie

Corinne reports from meeting in Paris: Role of Member States to be very limited with regards to influence on work programme and selection of topics and projects. Sustainability criteria for biomass will not be an issue as industry does not intend to buy biomass from outside of Europe. Information on where the flagships will be built is not yet available.

SWG cannot be involved in PPP but keep close contact to receive information about what kind of research is going to be funded by PPP.

Bioeconomy Panel (report from Barna Kovacs)

First meeting held. Panel is interest based Panel with industry heavily involved. SWG is MS Platform. Two meetings per year. Opinion will be considered by Commission but with only 2 meetings the time that can be invested by members is limited. Thematic working groups will be established in the Panel with one of them dedicated to biomass. Topics to be discussed not yet clarified. SWG SBGB was presented to the Panel. The first meeting was Chaired by DG RTD and DG Agri. The next meeting will be chaired by DG RTD and DG ENTR.

Action point: officially ask SCAR to send a SCAR Member that is member of the Bioeconomy Panel to one of our meetings.

Action Point: Jan and Eva to contact AKIS group to establish cooperation with SWG

Action point: Develop a time plan to end 2015 with first phase of SWG.

To be considered when developing the time plan:

- The H2020 Work Programme for 2016/17 will be drafted beginning of 2015. Thus input would be needed by then.
- Bioeconomy Stakeholder conference will be in Sept 2014 in Torino.

Presentation of workplan Part A by Corinne Bitaud:

Actions to be taken towards Stakeholder Conference:

- 1) Do we have research on Public Policy (PP) and complexity optimization which can be transferred to policy makers? Make priorities.
- 2) Make a brochure of conclusions and examples on by-effects to promote to policy making.
- 3) Good Practice (GP) of new tools and models. Highlighting of examples and forwarding to foresight.
- 4) Good Practice cooperation to be put in guidelines and brochures for teachers.
- 5) ...

All items need lot of work and money and cannot be done in SWG

Allocation of responsibilities for lead of actions:

A11: Not leads but support from Jan Svensson and Anne Miller

A12: special area, expert needed. Funding from Commission?

A13: Lead by France – brochure in 2014. A website could be established during the second phase of SWG work.

A21: Lead by France. Possibly supported by Stefan Rauschen. Decision postponed – depending on work load.

About possibilities for funding from the Commission, larger funding is not possible since H2020 WP 2014/2015 is closed. The SWG will try to ask small amounts of support for 2-3 experts. **To prepare this Corinne, Juan and Jan will select from the workplan the questions and the analysis we need and make a proposal to the Commission (DG RTD) .** For that it would be favorable to present that MS also pay/contribute with one expert.

Presentation of Workplan Part B by Juan Carrasco

Comments:

Damien Plan: ISPRA is going to deal with sustainability issues within the Bioeconomy Observatory project of the JRC.

Jan Svensson: Line of logic is missing in the workplan. Link to the SWG goals (ToR) is needed.

Jan v. Esch: Interaction with CWG Biorefineries on how biorefineries can contribute to sustainability would be welcomed.

Barna Kovacs: SWG should ask why Member States want Bioeconomy? That defines possible research questions.

Juan Carrasco: PPP BBI needs significant amount of feedstock. Can Europe satisfy that demand? Which type of bioeconomy do we want to develop? Biomass for what purpose?

Jan v. Esch: Biomass to be bought first is the cheapest one. Where does that come from? What about its sustainability?

Finland: MS aim for bioeconomy is to reach a carbon neutral economy. EU2020 targets are already so high that we have to rely on imports. Also biomass is in disadvantage regarding competitiveness. Thus the markets do not push to develop a bioeconomy. Therefore PPP BBI is a crucial tool to bring the value chains economics closer to market level.

Barna Kovacs: The role of the SWG is evolving because all other structures developing under bioeconomy are in a process of defining themselves and SWG needs to adapt to fit in. The Work Plan thus needs to be handled flexibly.

Presentation of Template results by Philipp v. Bothmer

13 replies so far

Possible issues for qualitative analysis are:

- Analysis of bioeconomy coverage via „related“ policies
- Comparison of bioeconomy definition among Member States
- Identify possibilities for international research cooperation

Gaps in the coverage and answers of of the questionnaire:

- R&D programmes missing/incoherent between MS which results in unrealistic/incoherent numbers of public funding available for bioeconomy research
- Further countries should answer the Questionnaire to come closer to a complete overview within EU-29

Action Point: Discuss possibilities for cooperation with JRC Bioeconomy Observatory Project to produce a more sophisticated questionnaire on national bioeconomy strategies, R&D programmes and public funds. Resources time/workforce/funds of the SWG are to scarce to deliver that.

Workplan for innovation agenda presentation by Eva van Buggenhaut

Assessed Q5 of questionnaire – transnational research cooperation

Discussion:

Jan v. Esch: Sustainability is interesting for all MS thus interest to cooperate. Algae research is very expensive research. Some research may not be wanted on international level in order to “protect” national industries.

Philipp v. Bothmer: Despite the main driver for bioeconomy development being the new business and employment opportunities at the moment, research is requested in the field of sustainability.

Jan Svensson: Reason why social inclusion is left blank so often could be the agricultural focus of SCAR.

Stefan Rauschen: Good to run question on research cooperation on a regular basis in order to bring results to COM for ERA-Nets for example.

Barna Kovacs: Connect the work to ongoing projects.

Jan v. Esch: Maritime area is missing

Zdzislaw: Empty slots probably mean no (or don't know?). Question should be posed "loud" clearly expressing that all fields need to be filled in.

Action point: Eva and Jan combine their findings and make a proposal for first agenda.

Bioeconomy Actor Mapping: Brainstorming exercise conducted.

Results to be followed up by Philipp v. Bothmer

Website:

Passwords for some to be reset. Stefan offers to have a public website but would need input to design the webpage. The webpage would be provided by BMBF.

Anne Miller: Use public website to provide links to other bioeconomy related groups.

Stefan: Website could be ready to set up beginning of 2014 (Q1).

Next meeting:

Have next meeting in Paris/Reims in February.

Agenda more or less the same as today. Follow up on work plans and deliverables

Denmark and Finland to present country profiles for February.

Further meetings targeted for September 2014 (Stakeholder Conference) and December 2014.

Participants:

