



THIS PROJECT HAS RECEIVED FUNDING FROM
THE EUROPEAN UNION'S HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH
AND INNOVATION PROGRAMME UNDER GRANT
AGREEMENT N. 772705



Deliverable 8.1

Outcomes of the kick-off meeting





Document Summary

Deliverable Title: **Outcomes of the kick-off meeting**

Version: **1**

Deliverable Lead: **ACTA**

Related Work package: **WP8**

Author(s): **Adrien Guichaoua**

Contributor(s): **Lian Lomax-Hamster**

Communication level:

CO Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)

Project Number: **772705**

Grant Agreement Number: **772705**

Programme: **NEFERTITI**

Start date of Project: **January, 1st, 2018**

Duration: **4 years**

Project coordinator: **Adrien Guichaoua**



Abstract

NEFERTITI Programme promotes the creation of interactive thematic networks related to the agriculture sector to promote knowledge, learning and the adoption of innovative techniques through the exchange of information between different actors and live demonstrations..

1

Summary

NEFERTITI 



The Kick-Off meeting (KOM) of the NEFERTITI project took place on 16 – 17 January 2018 at University of Almería in Spain.

Day 1 Welcome

Adrien Guichaoua (ACTA), the coordinator of the NEFERTITI project welcomes everyone to the first Kick Off meeting. Adrien explains the network organization of ACTA and that this project is a continuity of the 2 projects named PLAID and AgriDEMO. NEFERTITI is not a classical research project, it is a big CSA project for farmers, advisors and actors working in the field. The objectives for the KOM are explained:

1. Get to know each other (human aspects)
 - So big network: 32 partners / 17 countries /45 hubs etc....
 - Key condition for efficient implementation of the work
 - Most of EU project miss it at the beginning...reach it at the end!
- Friendly and team building activities during the KoM
- The same for the 2 following annual meetings (with the hub coaches etc...)

Objective: to know each other well for 2019 (starting of the demonstrations).

2. To refresh our mind on the project objectives
3. To agree together on the 6 months (up to 1 year) work plan

Furthermore, the project structure, timeline, communication are being explained. First annual meeting will take place 5 – 7 June 2018 in Toulouse, France to:

- team up and train the Hub Coaches of the 10 Networks.
- to make a balance of the first 6 months of work.
- to prepare the rest of the work of the first year.
- before the launching of the demo activities in year 2 (2019)

AgriDemo and PLAID (FARM DEMO) by Fleur Marchand (EVILVO) and Boelie Elzen (WR).

Both projects (scope and primary outputs) are being explained by Fleur and Boelie. These projects responded to the call dealing with the same topic. What links these 2 projects is FARMDEMO; out of these 2 projects NEFERTITI was originated. Coordination between 2 projects:

- 50% of NEFERTITI partners participate in PLAID/AGRIDEMO
 - To facilitate human relationship and cooperation efficiency
- Both coordinators have a key role in NEFERTITI (WPL1 + WP5)
 - To facilitate strategic coordination and alignment of actions
- NEFERTITI work plan has been scheduled according to the expected PLAID/AGRIDEMO readiness deliverables
 - To tailor PLAID/AGRIDEMO deliverables as NEFERTITI inputs
- PLAID&AGRIDEMO final conference jointly organised with NEFERTITI mid-term conference
 - To boost communication impact and create added-value from synergies between H2020 projects.

Questions/comments on presentation:

A comment from Adrien regarding interaction project: think about platform technically and politically and regarding farm inventory: online and offline questionnaire on willingness of people. Please keep it open for the first year to get a higher figure. Interaction with WP2 from NEFERTITI to put data of herbs in questionnaire. Fleur wants to discuss questionnaire to come to a shorter version, what should be kept. Boelie comments that



the key aspect is that the users feel that it is 'their thing'. Should be core in all 3 projects! A comment was made on networking: not done by many so we need to be prepared that users are innocent about networking.

WP1 Developing customized dynamic action plans and best practices for demo-farm networks in EU AKIS

Presented by Fleur Marchand (EVILVO)

Questions/comments on presentation:

Adrien points out that we should circulate excel sheet to harvest literature. Regarding the academic output: the main objective is to be operational to have a useful deliverable for WP2. If we can produce relevant academic outputs please do so but our first objective is to be operational.

A general comment was made on specifying work of hub coaches: what do we need to do and what to deliver and time of action. Fleur Marchand answers that for task 1.2 we will interact with you but we still need to develop the methodology but we will give you the tools to do so. It has to happen between April and August 2018 to have the input from you all. This will be further discussed in tomorrow's session. Task 1.4 has the duration of the entire project: you say what you want to do in the hub (support work). Adrien: for efficiency we could also team up task 1.2 and task 2.1 while establishing the hubs.

Principal challenges within period 1 (M1-M18)

- 1) We will start with identifying the key factors behind successful network establishment. This will be done by combining of desk review and interviews with FP7 and H2020 project co-ordinators and EU AKIS who have undertaken related projects (e.g. H2020 thematic networks, Pro-Akis, Solinsa FP7, PLAID, AgriDemoF2F). Main challenge here is deliver on time a first version of conceptual approach in a way we can use it to build a short questionnaire (semi-structured/open) for task 1.2. All network/hub leaders will then perform these questionnaires with the potential actors in the ten NEFERTITI networks and belonging hubs, to determine their needs, and factors facilitating or hindering current knowledge flows between Demo-activities. This should be done by network/hub leaders between April and August.
- 2) Another challenge is to select best practice recommendations from RUR11 projects PLAID and AgriDemoF2F, since the in-depth results of the case studies are (as official) deliverable are due after the deliverable in NEFERTITI. Therefore, we will base us on the literature and output from PLAID and Agridemo-F2F which is already available and on intermediate results. To further specify these best practices in relation to the 10 NEFERTITI themes, we will be able to use the case study results from PLAID and Agridemo-F2F
- 3) To Produce and update Dynamic Action Plans (DAP) for each NEFERTITI network. A close collaboration with many partners is necessary: 1/ the coaches and network leaders, to identify practical plans for network establishment and facilitation, 2/ evaluation will be done in a loop for each of the three demonstration campaign (year 2, 3, 4) of NEFERTITI (WP3), and 3/ input of tools and processes comes from WP5 as such, a close collaboration between all these partners is necessary to do the reflexive exercise which is at the base of DAP.

WP2 Networking demo-farmers to increase knowledge flows

Presented by Luis Mira da Silva (INOVISA)

Questions/comments on presentation:



A question is asked about Hubs/networks: how to reach out to rest of Europe? How to make them interact? Luis answers that the interaction takes place through cross visits and exchange meetings. Adrien adds that network leaders also have the responsibility to cross fertilise with non EU farms. If people want to participate and are not a partner in the project and have enough resources (no funding), they are free to join the network and to be an additional hub. Cross visits within the network will take place and meetings across all the networks. From experience with cross visits we have more results of side effects than main effects. We are open to other networks. We have videos of different hubs to keep up us to date. Demonstrations are organised but could also be a cross visit. Aim not to organise but to support existing demonstration and invite many others to organise cross visits.

Will we establish new hubs? We will use already existing demo farms with whom we already interact, we might add some new farms or new actors. The ambition is to extend from your existing network. Most network leaders are already leading thematic networks. Why Brazil and New Zealand: this is something outside Europe and we already have certain relations and contacts over there.

Who participates in cross visits, which resources to be used? It is explained that a 1000 euro per hub for a cross visit by coach + a demo farmer so enough resources are allocated.

How can we motivate the farmer to be a member of this new group? This is one of the challenges: to add value for the farmers otherwise they will not participate - the answer is knowledge. That's why WP3 is already engaged in activities and will provide support, knowledge, best practices. WP1 and WP5 are supporting the hubs, so we are not completely on our own.

What will be the size of a hub? Luis explains that with the right players we are thinking of 15 to 20 partners to start with. Coaches will be identified in June.

Principal challenges within period 1 (M1-M18)

WP2 will start by shaping the hubs and networks of demo-farmers (T2.1 and T2.2). One of the main challenges arising from these tasks is related to the definition of a governance model for the hubs and networks that potentiate the effective exchange of knowledge and best-practice among actors. WP2 will work closely with WP1, as WP1 identifies 1) the key factors for the successful establishment of networks and 2) best-practice recommendations on how to carry out effective demo-activities, building on results from PLAID and AgriDemo. Additionally, hub communities of regional and national innovation actors will be set up and provide reflection and advice on how to structure the hubs, following a participatory approach. Another important challenge of these tasks is linked to the identification and engagement of relevant regional and national AKIS actors. For this, WP2 will consider the inventory of demo-farms delivered under the afore mentioned projects and identify and select existing actors, stakeholders, networks and projects of the regional and national AKIS. WP1's analyses of relevant actors, how they relate to each other and characterisation of the actor's needs, will both contribute to shaping the architecture of the hubs and networks and defining the best course of action to assure the efficient engagement of all actors. Actor engagement will also be potentiated by the clear definition of what is the added value for them. It is essential for farmers to have a central role in the hubs/networks, either as demonstrators or as active learners.

WP3 Supporting and facilitating on-farm demo-activities

Presented by Matthieu Merlhe (APCA)

Questions/comments on presentation:

45 hubs: number of demonstrations 10 thematic networks so around 250 demonstrations per year.

Adrien sees the figure more as an average, taking into account the climate and gaps between years. Commercial farm and experimental farm but budget is also an important factor. Cross visits only on demo activities on task 3.2. No sense to organize extra cross visits. One and the same farm can participate in different



ones. We need details of plans of demo activities in beginning of 2019. How many we can carry out each year, needs to be planned. Physical demonstrations or video based: then it will be easier to have one extra demonstration. We need to have an action plan with a number as orientation.

Principal challenges within period 1 (M1-M18)

The WP3 will begin in month 13. However, in the first 18 months we have to deal about several main points linked with the first work packages. The first step of this work package is to organise in a similar way the demo activity. Also we have to be clear with the partners on three main points: the demo activity definition, the balance between this definition and the countries situation and the engagement of each partner to be supporting by Nefertiti.

1. To build together a concrete definition of a demonstration activity which will be accepted by all. In relation with the WP1, WP2 and the H2020 projects Agridemo and Nefertiti we have to characterize what kind of demo activities will be supported during NEFERTITI. The networks and the hubs in relation with the WP2 have to fix a wide range of characteristics for demo activities as occurrence, duration, number of attendees, number and type of demonstrators, budget, methodology (bottom up VS top down, physical VS online) and role of stakeholders...
2. To understand the situation of demo activity in Nefertiti member's countries. The inventory made in Agridemo and Plaid could help, but we need to confront it with the expert view and partner's expectation to find the right balance between Nefertiti goals and stakeholders potential. The demo activity success will depend on this right balance.
3. To clarify the type of support that Nefertiti will provide to the partners: what kind of methodology and tools? What is the financial support (communication, in kind contribution...)? Also, we have to explain clearly the engagements of each partners to be supporting by Nefertiti.

WP4 Knowledge reservoir on Demo-activities and project platform

Presented by Milica Trajkovic (BIOS)

Questions/comments on presentation:

Milica would like to receive feedback from WP leaders on first version of platform. One of the questions raised is will we end up with 2 platforms? Milica answers that we will have our own NEFERTITI platform based on data in rural projects. We will need input from WP1 in which data will be gathered from the 2 projects (AgriDemo and PLAID). First stage we will need to duplicate the entire database of FarmDemo or several parts? This needs to be discussed! Also for actors it is no use to have 2 platforms, either we stop and you take over what we have. ACTION!!! Meeting Fleur. Boelie Elzen comments to ask the users first what is useful, then to talk and discuss about the platform. At sub regional meetings we also foresee feedback from farms. But it is clear that we cannot communicate 2 platforms to our users.

ACTION: to discuss possible merge or takeover platforms AgriDemo/PLAID and NEFERTITI and how to communicate 1 clear message to users

What about the database? 45 hubs, 1000 partners by Luis. By month 9 we need to publish all data. Between now and month 9 we suppose to identify hubs so important to work together to find out what kind of info to collect. More mature hubs are thinking of data protections officers in their institute. Regarding the translation into the national languages: we have at least 2 automatic tools we can use. We cannot check the quality of that translation which will be up to the partner to validate. National pages will be managed by national partners for which no translation is required.

Principal challenges in period 1 (M1 – M18)



1. To gather all relevant user requirements for Platform development. The main contributors:
 - WP1, WP2, WP3, WP7, WP8 leaders
 - 1 network leader representative
 - RUR-11 projects
 - Farmers (end-users) representative

This process will be iterative, partners will be contacted via email and some Skype meetings will be organized during the first three months. This topic was analysed during the Kick off meeting, so relevant partners are informed about following steps regarding T4.1. Nevertheless, some challenges related to deadlines of each iteration are expected as well as difficulties with meeting different partner's requirements.

2. To build the Platform according to user requirements and to make it fully operational by M09 (September 2018.) This task will be performed with similar group of partners as T4.1 and similar iterative process will be performed, meaning that when one demo segment of the Platform is finished, BioSense will present it to contributors to gather opinions, feedback and selection of places that need to be improved. The biggest challenge is to mobilize contributors to provide their input on time, but this risk will be mitigated with detailed procedures and clear and unambiguous requests.
3. To initiate the process of assembling relevant data that will be presented and transferring them to the Platform, in order to have ready-to-use platform on M09. This process is planned to start at M06, but if we (BIOS and ILVO) foresee that the workload is too high, the process will start even before M06.
4. Platform translations – BioSense will provide all the templates for translations to local languages, and contact list of communication officers will be used to distribute the English texts (with templates)

WP5 Fostering learning, reflection and monitoring processes

Presented by Charlotte Dockes (ACTA)

Questions/comments on presentation:

A question was raised about the evaluation of the network and/or the demonstration activities. The evaluation is twofold: it is self-reflecting and to find out what is achieved through the networking activities. Are we going to ask them to evaluate the demonstrations activities and elements of networking? It involves networking between demo farms but evaluating throughout the end. Focus should be on networking and activities so we have to look at the whole chain. It is a way to have more feedback and quantitate assessment midway through. So focus on networking as well. We will provide all tools to use when relevant. Adrien agrees on starting earlier in Task 5.1.

Principal challenges in period 1 (M1 – M18)

Our ambition is to improve the impact of demo activities and stimulate learning. This will be done by capturing, selection and developments of methods to improve peer to peer learning and by improving reflection and self-monitoring in the hubs and networks with focus on continuous improving of this peer to peer learning.

Important challenges of the first 18 months are:

- The selection and development of methods that fit to this ambition but above all fit to the needs and competences of the Demo-farmers. For this, cooperation will be realised with PLAID and AgriDemoF2F and input will be given to produce the dynamic action plans in WP1;
- Improve the awareness of Hub leaders/network coordinators on the importance of this improved peer to peer learning and on their role and potential to stimulate this. For this, WP5 will organise a session during the Annual meeting in Toulouse;
- Making monitoring-tools suitable for use in Nefertiti linked to the dynamic action plans.



WP6 Policy dialogue and network sustainability

Presented by Lieve Prins (PZH)

Questions/comments on presentation:

Is there any interaction of WP6 and other WPs? Brainstorming on thematic networks will happen on be network level. Adrien adds that goes for hubs and networks and on other hand build on ERIAFF network. So same layers so challenge to connect different layers together with one on the political level as frame is not the same. To connect to region is very important for having added value for farmers and to show to other colleagues from different regions. Demonstrations funded by regions is the plan.

Principal challenges in period 1 (M1 – M18)

Before the annual meeting in June, we want to have a first version of the methodology for the set up of the network. In cooperation with Technopolis, we want to come up with indicators for a region, so that we can measure if the region would be a good partner to connect to the network. Depending on the outcome, we will think about the shape of the network.

The ERIAFF conference will also be in June. At that conference we will announce the start of Nefertiti and we will connect partners of Nefertiti with partners of ERIAFF. We will also connect partners of S3 thematic networks to partners of Nefertiti, so that they are aware of the activities of each other.

WP7 Communication on demo-farm activities and dissemination of practical-oriented outcomes

Presented by Dimitar VANEV (NAAS) and Ivana Horvat (BIOS)

Questions/comments:

Target groups actively involve young actors (farmers) so please think of Snapchat and Instagram. What is the numbers of videos, photographs of partners to supply to you? We need to know targets! All partners should be involved, all hubs should contribute. So need to find easier procedures and mechanism. This will be addressed in the parallel sessions tomorrow. Adrien: 2 levels: deliverables in proposal so produces 2 per hub is an average. We promised a minimum of 50 videos so Thomas Alfödi from FiBL will be responsible for that. It is not difficult to take pictures, through social network it only takes a few minutes. Also the mentality of the network: some will be stronger than others. It is also added value for your organisation. Ivana is explaining that you either send it to me or you use the link yourself.

Principal challenges in period 1 (M1 – M18)

- 1) For WP 7 the biggest challenge for the next 18 months is development and implementation NEFERTITI project Dissemination and Communication plan and Social Media Strategy. They should be developed and implemented in a way which will permit the information about the project (including achieved results and implemented activities) to reach to all stakeholders and targets groups in all partners' countries. The coordination implementation and collection information and reports for communication and dissemination activities for all 32 partners will also be the big challenge.
- 2) One of other big challenges will be translations of the social media posts and consequently reaching local stakeholders in their native language through this channel of communication and also big challenges will be development and functioning website on all project partners' languages.



Day 2

Project management

Presented by Lian Lomax-Hamster (IT)

The daily administrative management and the handling of the project logistics is explained by Lian:

- *Governance*
- *Management procedures*
 - o Reporting
 - NEFERTITI is divided into 3 reporting periods (RP)
 - RP1: M1 – M18 (18 months)
 - RP2: M19 – M36 (18 months)
 - RP3: M37 – M48 (12 months)
 - Technical & Financial reports as well as final report is explained
- *Deliverables and milestones*

A reminder for a deliverable will be sent to the responsible partner 2 months in advance. The report needs to be sent to the respective WP leader no later than 1 month before so both Adrien and Lian will have 2 weeks to check and validate before submission to the EC. Please inform them on time if there is any delay or problem with the deliverable.

Means of verification of the milestone: to send short text (few lines) to be sent by e-mail to the Coordinator and Project Manager 2 weeks before the due date at the latest
- *Financial issues*

Tips are given to prepare Form C, especially to use timesheets to record hours spent on the project and to be transparent and follow your accountancy rules!
- *Communication*

When you disseminate/communicate about the project, make sure to:

 - Display the project logo;
 - Display the EU emblem;
 - Include the following sentence:

“This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Programme for Research & Innovation under grant agreement n°772705.”
- *The First Annual Meeting will be held in Toulouse, France on 5 – 7 June 2018*

Several questions were asked and explained about specific financial issues.

H2020 project management

Presented by Project Officer Grazyna Galazka (REA)

- *Research Executive Agency (REA) & Horizon 2020*
- *Call overview*
- *REA/EC staff*

REA Project Officer (PO): Grazyna GALAZKAGrazyna.GALAZKA@ec.europa.eu

REA Administrative/Financial Officer (AFO): Danielle Epis Danielle.Epis@ec.europa.eu

Our role:

- o To provide you with support and good service
- o (Preparation and) follow up of your grant agreement
- o Advise on project problems, changes, etc.
- o Guide you on GA amendments
- o Assess periodic reports and deliverables



- Order interims and final payments
- *Grant Agreement (GA)*
- *Project Lifecycle*
- Project review:
 - An-depth examination of project technical and financial implementation by the consortium
 - Organized systematically after each reporting period
 - Carried out with the support of external experts
 - The Review Report is sent out to the Consortium – Contradictory Review procedure

Audits and controls

Reporting payment requirements both technical as financial report explained, how to write them and online submission of Periodic Reports

- *Financial aspects*
 - Eligible and ineligible costs explained
 - Keep time records:
 - hours worked on the tasks,
 - collect signatures of meeting attendance
 - Subcontracting not foreseen in ANNEX 1: ask advice and approval to the PO beforehand

Invoices:

Reference to the name of project, deliverable & description of the content, date and terms of payment, proof of payment & registration of the invoices in the bookkeeping

- *Legal aspects*
- Subcontracting versus contracting explained

Amendment:

- Prepared electronically
- Requesting party will encode the amendment request
- Indicate the reasons
- Upload the supporting documents
- Get validations done before submitting the request
- (e.g. new legal entity, new bank account validations)
- Submitted & signed electronically (by PLSIGN)
- Countersigned electronically by receiving party (by PLSIGN)
- *Dissemination, communication and exploitation*
- *Ethics*
- *Tips & tricks*
 - Read EC documents related to the project
 - Read the report guidelines, ask for advice to the PO/AFO
 - Keep records and other supporting documentation in order to prove the proper implementation and the costs declared as eligible
 - Never wait until the last minute for reporting to the coordinator/REA = there are time limitations
 - Communication is essential for everybody
 - If there are problems = share them!
 - If there are positive aspects (success stories) = share them too!

Please note that dissemination deliverables (PU = public) will be published automatically, please change this beforehand if you do not prefer this.

WP parallel sessions



Session 1 – Action plans & Learning process WP1+WP5

Minutes: Fleur Marchand - Chairs: Fleur Marchand & Boelie Elzen

Also involved in WP1 and WP5: Heidrun Moschitz, Annie McKee, Charlotte Dockes

Goals

- Share ideas and get a common ground for 4 tasks (that should start at short term)
 - T1.1 – Identify key factors behind successful network establishment. M1-M6
 - T1.2 – Characterising the needs of the actors from the NEFERTITI networks. M3-M12.
 - T1.3 – Selection and fine-tuning of best practices to improve peer-to-peer learning. M4-M18.
 - T5.1 – Monitoring and evaluation approach and methods. M10-M16.
- Smart appointments about first 6 months

Participants: 8 people

Time	What	How
10.30	Learning to know each other	Round: mention name, country, links with PLAID & farm demo, scientific background versus practitioner, experiences with monitoring of facilitation
10.40	Key factors, needs and learning ambitions	Conversation mapping. 1 group, everyone has a pen with different colour. 1) First question: Key factors and important needs? 2) Dynamic learning agenda: What is it, what do expect, what do we need to learn? Group conversation, everyone writes his/her argument/issue/element on the flip (see example below)
11.25	Actions for the first months	SMART appointments about first 6 months: who is doing what and when? Who should be involved
11.45	close	

- 1) Flipchart of the first discussion: what are the main key factors and important needs related to the development of on farm demonstration networks.

We have to be very clear on the value for all actors, on the objectives and on the goals, Clearly define multiple goals, when organizing the cross visits, communicate that actors will learn on the topic/farming system of the network they belong to, and on the question “how to demonstrate”, what are best practices for organizing on farm demos.

Take into account the farming system, take into account cultural differences, think clearly on what to share, between peers.

Create dynamic networks, something needs to happen, not the network for the network, take into account the different levels and what are the goals/objectives on these different levels, what works at region/local level, what works at the cross visits? How to organise interaction/what's the value there?

Be aware that we develop networks of farmers and other actors involved in on-farm demonstration, people that do organize or are involved in any way in organizing on farm demonstrations, not the regular farmers.

Use established media to communicate to create awareness, these are the media farmer that are involved in organizing demonstrations use, don't create very new media. Take care of the language issue

Build resources, budget, and structures, personal.

- 2) Flipchart on the Dynamic learning agenda: What is it, what do expect, what do we need to learn?

The basic idea of the DAP is that for learning towards better actions a reflexive process needs to be included. The DAP will be based on the key factors, needs and best practices developed in the first tasks of WP1. They



will be individual to each network, and the hub-level will be included. It will closely interact with WP5, since there the tools to do the reflection will be developed and the process will be supported. The DAP will be adapted each year of on farm demo activities.

3) Flipchart on actions for the next 6 months

We drafted a time line and discussed the main links and the input requested from all network and hub leaders.

Session 2 – Networks & Demonstrations WP2+WP3+WP5

Goal of the session: Identify needs and opportunities to better integrate WP2, WP3 and WP6.

Session facilitators: András Ver, Fabio Boscarelli, Lieve Prins, Luís Mira da Silva, Maria Cordeiro, Mathieu Merlthe and Stefano Migliore

Room disposition: 6 groups, each with a flipchart and coloured pens

Methodology:

1. Parallel group discussion

- 2 tables for each WP pair (WP2-WP3, WP2-WP6, WP3-WP6), one table per question (total of 6 tables); one leader/rapporteur per table
- Participants join the question which interests them most: 6 mix groups with people from research & practitioner 2-6 persons/group
- Each group answers the question
- The 2 groups of each WP pair join together and prepare 1 common conclusion/proposed actions slide/paper board sheet for the two questions

Note: Due to time constrains it was not possible to do the reporting and wrap up from the parallel group discussions, as planned. Participants in the WP pairs discussed both questions.

WP2 – WP6

Question 1.1. - How to shape the networks of demo-farmers to potentiate the exchange of best practices and knowledge among EU regions?

Moderator: Luís Mira da Silva

Question 1.2. - How to shape the networks of demo-farmers to connect them with existing S3 Agri-Food sub-thematic Platforms?

Moderator: Lieve Prins

Main conclusions:

- Follow a participatory approach when shaping the hubs
- Identify a co-coach for each hub and a co-leader for each network
- Use stakeholders' groups that already exist to shape the hubs and networks, such as associations and producers' organisations, etc.
- Identify and engage European level organisations to potentiate exchange of knowledge, such as ERIAFF, COPA-COGECA, Plant Intercluster and others
- Identify and engage international companies and/or international associations of private companies (e.g. Syngenta), assuring participation is unbiased?
- Connect the S3 networks with NEFERTITI hubs and networks for exchange of information and cross activities
- Connect the networks leaders of the 4 thematic networks in the S3 Agri-food platform and the 10 thematic networks in NEFERTITI project
- Possibly organise side event for S3 and NEFERTITI network leaders at ERIAFF conference in June

WP2 – WP3



Question 2.1. - How to shape the architecture and governance model of the hubs in order to successfully carry out the demo-activities?

Moderator: András Ver

Question 2.2. - How to assure that demo-farms/demo-farmers and other innovation actors are able to support and facilitate on-farm demo-activities?

Moderator: Mathieu Merlhe

Main conclusions:

- Key actors inside the hubs: coach, advisor, farmers
- Hub activities should 1) use multi-actor approach, 2) bring together AKIS actors and demo farmers in demo activities 3) promote peer-to-peer learning and learning by doing, 4) improve science-practice interactions
- Hub model: Farmers/demo-farmers are in the centre of the hub and with a strong link with other stakeholders: coach, farmers' organisations; education (next generation farmers); managing authorities and administration (ministry's, etc.); advisors; applied research; commercial companies
- Need to choose from one of the existing governance models (one-tier system, two-tier system, ordinary system) and find a solution which is clear to all nationalities participating in the project
- Differences in governance models translate in the decision making process and approach towards management and supervision control
- As all hubs include several decision makers, a board of directors should be chained together for the project lifetime - in most cases these ties already exist as demo-farms are already working units
- Hub members to define what kind of demo activities will be supported during NEFERTITI.
- A wide range of characteristics for demo activities will be established by the different hubs and aggregated at the networks level
- Hub members to build on the results of AgriDemo and PLAID, namely the inventory of best practices for demo activities, to define what are demo activities
- Farmers should have a central role in the organisation of the demo activities as demonstrators, organisers (farmers organise themselves the demo VS an organisation (like chamber of agriculture) or funders (farmers have the budget to do the demo VS an organisation (public or private) funding it)
- Variables of demo activities to be defined: occurrence, duration, number of attendees, number and type of demonstrators, budget, and methodology (bottom up VS top down, physical VS online)
- Hub members to find a definition of demo activity and establish criteria that NEFERTITI's demo activities need to comply with



WP3 – WP6

Question 3.1. - How to use the demo action plan to exchange with the EU networks and policy?

Moderator: Stefano Migliore

Question 3.2. - At the end of the project how to shape a EU funding for the demo activity?

Moderator: Fabio Boscareli

Main conclusions:

The answer is already in the WP6 structure:

- Involve group of stakeholders, from existing networks in the cross-visits
- Questionnaires directed at stakeholders' groups, managing authorities for rural development and EIP-Agri operational groups
- User friendly annual report and adapted to policy stakeholders
- Importance of high quality videos to better disseminate technical/practical demonstration knowledge at EU level for policy stakeholders
- Involve the Committee of Regions in NEFERTITI's events



- Involving the right partners in NEFERTITI's activities will result in a strong interest from policy makers to support demo activities as a specific policy instrument
- Demo activities are already funded through Rural Development Policies, particularly via training and visits. Nevertheless, they are not really built around the concept of "Demo farm". It is important to better address this specific role of farmers in future Rural Development policies, for example, by funding not only visits but also the demo capacity of "receiving farms" or having some mandatory Demo action by those who receive funding for developing innovative actions).

Session 3 – Knowledge platform & Dissemination WP4+WP7

PARTICIPANTS from ACTA, ILVO, BIOS, WR, FIBL, CEMA, NAAS

Goals

1. To share ideas regarding several important aspects for the beginning of the project:
 - target groups of the project
 - KPIs
 - project visual identity
 - information flow (e.g. interaction between social media and platform; content creation);
 - Dissemination and communication plan
 - Website

Topics

1. Presentation of the participants
2. Target groups of the projects and KPIs
3. Information flow between WP4 and WP7
4. Project website and dissemination & communication plan

Discussion

The participants briefly introduced themselves, the institution they represented and the connection with the project. The discussion started with identifying the target groups for communication and dissemination. List of the target groups are included in the description of the project task 7.1. The list could be extended by including some additional groups, such as farmers associations. The industries are among other important target groups that must be included in the platform.

It was explained that the experience from other projects showed that the end users would like to have the option to choose and filter the themes of interest to them on projects' websites. For NEFERTITI project website and platform one possible option is the 10 thematic networks to be located on the centre place that could allow to be chosen the network and then information for network will be searched. According to studies completed during previous projects this option is not working well in practice. The most successful platforms are the ones attracting attention on emotional level.

A good example of website was presented. The information on the website can be searched by type, filters and tags. The information can be searched also by country or network.

It was discussed that there is a difference between the main target groups for the social media and dissemination and communication plan.

Discussion on WP 4 Knowledge reservoir on Demo-activities and project platform

It was explained that the structure for the NEFERTITI platform was being drafted and that the knowledge base platform architecture and the type of information needed for upload on the platform should be decided within next 3 months. It was discussed, that the platform content should be tailored to different visitors using different type of filters. Combination of filters should narrow down specific content interesting to the visitor: e.g. per stakeholder type, network theme, etc. It was also discussed that maybe a broad range of stakeholders should be regrouped into the following three categories: advisors, researchers and farmers.



Translation of the content will be done in all languages represented by consortium. One person per language will be appointed.

WP 7 Social media strategy and engagement

Social media strategy will be prepared up to Month 3. During the workshop, some of the aspects were discussed, such as how to engage more farmers. Participants suggested the following: finding farmers with innovative approaches in communication, e.g. producing podcasts (an example from Belgium), or farmers who are actively using social media (an example from France), potentially attracting more users.

It was also suggested to be used or amplified channels of communication they already use. The list of partners' social media accounts should be made, as well as list of journalists following topic in agri sector in each country. It should be identified trustworthy persons for farmers and they should be used for providing information. For example: machine sellers and technology providers enjoy high level of respect among farmers.

It was also discussed translation issues. For social media, it may be the best to take upon mixed approach:

- 1) Centralised – Social media manager creates posts in English, while appointed partners translate posts in their own language and post it through their institutional social media accounts
- 2) Partners themselves create posts in their own language, mentioning or tagging NEFERTITI in posts.

Other issues

One of main focuses of the social media strategy and dissemination and communication plan should be farmers. There are different ways to reach the farmers, some of them are not active in searching information unlike young farmer or the journalists in the sphere, that can be used to promote the materials and information of the project activities. Farmers' circles, podcasts used by farmers are other examples of active farmers that use innovative technologies to reach more farmers.

It has not been decided yet how the websites of related projects (PLAID and AgriDemo) will be incorporated into the NEFERTITI website.

It was also discussed how to be organized website on all partners languages.

Because of lack of time it was not discussed the structure of dissemination and communication plan. It was decided the structure to be sent by email to all participants in session for comments and proposals.

Main conclusions and outcomes:

- We started activities for development knowledge platform, social media strategy and dissemination and communication plan;
- Stakeholders should be regrouped into the following three categories: advisors, researchers, farmers;
- One of the main focuses of the social media strategy and dissemination and communication plan should be farmers;
- The person for each language should be appointed to coordinate the flows of information and translations from the social media and the activities within WP7;
- Each partner should appoint a communication officer.

The meeting ended with a visit to “Las Palmerillas” Experimental Farm, a technological centre and part of the Cajamar cooperative bank foundation. It was founded in 1976 by farmers, for farmers, to carry out research and experimental trials for the new type of F&V greenhouse agriculture being taken up in the area.

NEFERTITI

F | A | R | M | D | E | M | U



THIS PROJECT HAS RECEIVED FUNDING FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION'S HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH AND INNOVATION PROGRAMME UNDER GRANT AGREEMENT N. 772705

NEFERTITI PARTNERS

