



First Annual Workshop

PLATFORM

*Platform of Knowledge Based
Bio-Economy relevant ERA-NETs*

26-27 June 2012, Copenhagen

MEETING REPORT



Report of the First Annual Workshop, 26-27 June 2012, Copenhagen

FINAL, 2012.08.08

Notes on the summary: The participants have received the power point presentations from the workshop which address the agenda issues. Hence the summary only includes the discussion points which are not included in the power point presentations.

Participants

Peter van Velzen (PLATFORM), Niels Gøtke (PLATFORM), Christine Bunthof (PLATFORM), Per Mogensen (PLATFORM), Steffen Syberg Hansen (PLATFORM), Iver Thysen (ICT-AGRI), Carina Madsen (ICT-AGRI), Rowan McKibbin (ERA-CAPS), Paul Wiley (ERA-CAPS), Kees Kwant (ERANET BIOENERGY), Karen Görner (ERA-IB-2), Egizio Valceschini (RURAGRI), Christian Listabarth (ETB), Ulla Bertelsen (CORE Organic), Mads Peter Schreiber (SAFEFOODERA), Marie Russel (SUSFOOD), Niels Halberg (CORE Organic), Sylvia Bluemel (EUPHRESKO-ERANET), Rocio Lansac (FORESTERRA), Anabel de la Peña (INIA), Steinar Bergseth (CSA MARINEBIOTECH), Mike Collins (STAR-IDAZ, Defra), Mika Kallio (WoodWisdom-Net), Andy Boyce (ERASynBio), Dennis Lisbjerg (COFASP), Jasper Dalhuisen (ARD), Xavier Le Roux (BiodivERSA), François Constantin (EC-DG R&I), Jörg Niehoff (EC-DG R&I).

Summary day one

1. Opening

Niels Gøtke welcomed the participants and presented the programme. PLATFORM is the first project that gathers all ERA-NETs of one topical area. The workshop focuses on strategic issues and mutual learning.

2. PLATFORM state of play

Christine Bunthof gave a presentation of PLATFORM, the new homepage and status of the activities. PLATFORM is not exclusive but open to new ERA-NETs who are interested in participating. The activities target a larger group of KBBE actors, including the KBBE relevant JPI's, SCAR CWGs, and preparatory actions for ERA-NETs. The project has three pillars; PLATFORM as a network forum, a forum for mutual learning, and a strategic forum. PLATFORM develops a vision paper and a roadmap. This deliverable is planned towards the end of the project. To contribute to the current discussion on the ERA-NETs in Horizon 2020, it is proposed to write a position paper which contributes to the discussion of how to efficiently manage and develop ERA-NETS. This will address some of the EC's questions on this matter but will also be valuable to (KBBE) ERA-NETS.

Later during the meeting, in the discussions of other agenda points, the idea of a position paper to be written over the next few months materialised further. It was agreed that PLATFORM would prepare a response to the Commission's proposals for ERA-NETs in Horizon 2020. A working group was established. The position paper will reflect, from the view of the KBBE ERA-NETs, on issues discussed in this workshop, possibly extended to other matters as deemed relevant by the writing group.

3. The future of research coordination between member states

Jörg Niehoff gave a presentation of the role of the ERA-NETs in the new Horizon 2020. He explained the Commission's proposed approach for the new ERA-NET instrument under Horizon 2020. This approach is being developed and will need to have the agreement of the Member States. The core element is top-up funding for a joint call. The funding instrument that will be used in Horizon 2020 for ERA-NETs is Programme CO-FUND. This is not a new funding instrument, it is used in FP7 for Marie Curie actions¹. In Horizon 2020 it will be used for ERA-NETs, Marie-Curie co-fund and possibly other actions co-funding activities between national programmes. For ERA-NETs the reimbursement rate will be similar to the one of ERA-NET Plus under FP7. In FP7 ERA-NET Plus, the Commission contributes up to 33% of the total call volume. He stressed that not all ERA-NETs will continue as they are today, but they will continue to support public-public partnerships between national/regional research programmes. The ERA-NETs should be able to continue to apply national rules for funding research within the calls they launch. In the topic selection for the KBBE area, SCAR will probably continue to play an important role. There will be Programme Committee(s) for Horizon 2020.

The Commission is looking into possibilities to verify the status of organisations that participate in ERA-NETs once (upfront) so that organisations do not have to verify their status as programme owner or programme manager for each ERA-NET in which they participate.

Following the presentation and some questions and answers, five points for discussion were introduced to take up on a number of points concerning the ERA-NETs in Horizon 2020:

- 1) Focus on the ERA-NETs instrument under Horizon 2020
- 2) Typology of ERA-NETs and JPIs in relation to each other
- 3) Governance/future calls
- 4) Funding for which ERA-NET activities?
- 5) Scope for future support and learning platform

Points 1-3 were discussed on the first day. Points 4 and 5 on the second day for the sake of time. The summary is included on page 7-8.

4A. The ERA-LEARN Toolbox applied by KBBE relevant ERA-NETs

Ulla Bertelsen presented the preliminary results of a survey conducted within Work Package 3 on the use and usefulness of the ERA-LEARN toolbox for KBBE relevant ERA-NETs. A few ERA-NETs have not yet replied to the questionnaire and Ulla called upon those to still do this and send her the

¹ COFUND as used in FP7 for Marie Curie actions in brief: Type of action: Co-financing. Who is qualified: public bodies, research and funding organisations, international organisations that offer fellowship programmes. Requirements: international publication of fellowships, open and transparent selection process, international peer-review; at least one type of transnational mobility (outgoing, incoming, reintegration); normally fellowships only with working contract; Duration of the funding: 2-5 years. What will be funded: 40% of the fellowship costs, max. EUR 10 million

completed questionnaire. Their answers will be added to the final analysis. Among the set of questions it was asked which call documents have been developed. Does the ERA-NET make use of the formats / examples of call text, guidelines for applicants, FAQs, etc, that are available on NETWATCH? Harmonizing call procedures and documents could make life easier for call secretariats, funders, applicants, and evaluators. Although a complete harmonization would not be fitting to the individual needs, ERA-NETs do not need to re-invent the wheel and can make use of call documents from other ERA-NETs. Organising calls was the topic selected as the most important for deepening work in the Task 3.1.

A targeted workshop for the individuals that are managing the call secretariats is being considered.

4B. Indicators for impact assessment

Christian Listabarth highlighted key features of the tool developed by ERA-LEARN for cost-benefit analysis of ERA-NETs and introduced some other indicators that could be used to assess more aspects of the impact of ERA-NETs. He summarized the discussions and conclusions of a thematic preparatory workshop on this matter organised by PLATFORM WP3 and ERA-LEARN on May 16th in Berlin in which eight KBBE ERA-NETs participated. The presentations and the report of the thematic workshop in Berlin are included in the meeting binder and have been sent by email. Christian proposed to extend the cost-benefit analysis to more ERA-NETs requesting input from the KBBE ERA-NETs that have organised calls, and proposed furthermore to focus on a limited number of other indicators that would be most relevant to the KBBE ERA-NET actors.

The tool for cost benefit analysis developed by ERA-LEARN requires that 'raw data' such as the number of participating funding programmes, number of (pre)proposals, number of funded projects, amount of project funding, and efforts (pm) and other costs of call planning, preparation, call secretariat, evaluation, funding decision and monitoring, be filled in in an excel worksheet. The tool then calculates indices such as the call effort/call partner/call, call effort per funded project, and costs per call. The costs of an ERA-NET's first call can be compared with those of later calls. Examples showed that later calls have lower costs than a first call as the person months needed to develop later calls is generally lower than those for the first call, but how much less was different between ERA-NETs. Comparison between calls, and comparison between ERA-NETs in factors such as costs per call or costs per funding amount are of interest but it is not clear how this could be used in identifying the impact of ERA-NETs. Another cost benefit indicator that could be of interest is the leverage factor. A leverage factor can be calculated on call level, but that is only valid if one may assume that the results of all projects funded in a call will be available and of use to all countries similar to own produced research results. In most cases it is better to approach leverage on a project-by-project level calculating the funding leveraged for each euro that a funding organisation invests in joint projects. As with the other indices for cost-benefit, one should be careful with drawing conclusions from numbers as the context is important.

Leverage-on-call level is an indicator that could be built in the tool. The better approach - leverage calculated project-by-project requires entering a huge amount of data: the financial contributions of each individual funding organisation to each individual project. WP 3 is going to look into the possibility of providing an example and an explanation on how to calculate the leverage effect that can then be used by ERA-NETs themselves.

Impact assessment should go beyond call cost benefit analysis because running transnational calls cost-efficiently is not the only success factor for ERA-NETs. Impact assessment is of interest to the ERA-NETs themselves, the EC and the national funding agencies. Other actors discuss impact assessments as well – e.g. the EC and ERA-LEARN. Their efforts have resulted in a large number of

questions, some of which are more of a qualitative nature. The criteria of success of ERA-NETs and the target group of the impact assessments tools were discussed. These questions need to be addressed before the impact indicators can be selected. It was stressed that calls were not the only outcomes of ERA-NETs. Hence it was suggested that the impact assessment not only focuses on calls but also include other indicators e.g. project level, transaction costs, coordinated fraction of research in the area, or other indicators. ERA-NETs can be benchmarked, but the choice against what you benchmark is not trivial. Some ERA-NETs operate in very specific domains, and while their call budgets may be small, they may coordinate a large proportion of the national budget for that topic.

There was general agreement that impact assessment is important but difficult. Within PLATFORM focus points for analysis should be chosen that are most relevant for the KBBE ERA-NETs.

It was agreed: i) to do the call cost – benefit analysis as developed by ERA-LEARN, and that each ERA-NET who has not yet done this will provide raw data for each of the calls his/her ERA-NET has done to Christian for the analysis; ii) in collaboration with ERA-LEARN, WP3 will look into other impact assessment indicators iii) the way how to use the outcomes will be a topic for the next Workshop.

Summary day two

Introduction second day

Peter van Velzen gave a short wrap up of the first day and introduced the items on the agenda of the second day.

6A. Opportunities for collaborations among networks - provisional analysis

Kees Kwant presented classifications of the PLATFORM ERA-NETs and how they relate to each other. There were some comments on the classifications of the different ERA-NETs. The presentation is a draft and the following speed dating activities elaborated the classification of the ERA-NETs.

It was agreed that the ERA-NETs will submit additional information to Kees, who will analyse the information and will provide further results in September or October with new results.

Additional item: Overview of relevant Technology Platform with relevance for KBBE

Karen Görner distributed at the meeting a draft paper that presents an overview of Technology Platforms and other private sector driven initiatives relevant for ERA-NETs in the KBBE area. It was agreed that the participants will review the paper and submit necessary information to Karen regarding technology platforms with relevance for KBBE ERA-NETs – e.g. if the ERA-NETs already cooperate with a technology platform or have some ideas of alternative ways to cooperate with technology platforms. Deadline 15th September.

6B. Common Calls

Niels Gøtke gave some comments on the issue of common calls. The main concern is how to proceed strategically with this issue. All ERA-NETs develop independently and therefore have different call mechanisms.

Harmonization requires top down definition. Hence we need a common model. This could be an issue at the next PLATFORM workshop. All ERA-NETs could describe how they make calls. A discussion of an individual case could be interesting. This work could be done in the frame of T3.1 and we can work with ERA-LEARN. Overall this could provide the necessary input to develop a common model which the partners could agree on. A risk noted is that harmonization might exclude individual partners due to individual needs.

Another issue touched upon concerns the national research strategies influencing and being influenced by the European collaboration in ERA-NETs. It was generally recognized that the national coordination and strategies have some implications for the ERA-NETs. It is a common issue to what extent and how to integrate the strategies developed in the ERA-NETs into the national strategies and how to integrate the national strategies into the strategies developed in ERA-NETs. Are ERA-NET strategies based on the national strategies or are they developed independently and influencing the national strategies afterwards? It was remarked that national strategies should not necessarily exactly mirror those of ERA-NETs. We need to take into consideration that there is still need for research to be carried out at a national level to address particular national priorities, geography-specific topics, etc. The ERA-NETs should be addressing common research priorities or issues where the critical mass of several countries is needed and these should be reflected in a common research agenda. This issue could be addressed further in the next PLATFORM workshop.

7. Outlook beyond The Copenhagen Bioeconomy conference

It was stressed that conclusions of the Copenhagen Bioeconomy conference are important to the work in PLATFORM. Under the next EU presidency (Ireland) another bioeconomy conference is planned. Niels Gøtke will liaise with the organisation to create a good link for the KBBE ERA-NETs. The Declaration from the Copenhagen Bioeconomy conference reflects on the EC Bioeconomy Strategy and Action Plan, and gives ten recommendations distilled from the discussions at the conference. A number of the those points are relevant for the ERA-NETs. It was proposed to reflect in the PLATFORM position paper on the Strategy and Action Plan and on the recommendations of the Copenhagen Bioeconomy from the ERA-NETs viewpoints. The writing group will take this up.

8. Meta Knowledge Base

Iver Thysen presented the meta knowledge base; a tool for mapping, partnering, partner search, call submission, call administration. This was developed for ICT AGRI and is now also applied in SUSFOOD. Other ERA-NETs may be interested as well. It will become available as open source for further development. He demonstrated the functionalities of the Meta Knowledge Base, including search for scientist profiles and projects.

9. Forward look and to do

For each Work Package the actions agreed were summarized. See page 9-10.

Discussion points ERA-NETs in Horizon 2020

Discussion topic 1) Focus on the ERA-NETs instrument under Horizon 2020

Questions are: who inspires, who decides on new and continued ERA-NETs? Role of SCAR, PC, other actors? How to ensure broad participation (new MS)? Sustainability of network and actions by ERA-NETs? Which activities can/should an ERA-NET do? (need to *versus* nice to)?

The national level will continue to play an important role in the future ERA-NETs because the ERA-NETs require national funding. SCAR will continue to have a role regarding ERA-NETs. SCAR identifies areas where coordination is needed and where there is a volunteer country to coordinate, and establishes a SCAR Collaborative Working Group to take this forward. The CWG may have a particular task and be short-lived so finish when this is completed, or may end due to a lack of interest or more commonly apply for EC support and become an ERA-NET. The focus is thus on *new* ERA-NETs with relevance to the SCAR priorities. SCAR also advises the Commission on needs for follow-on ERA-NETs. Joint programming becomes increasingly important. In Horizon 2020 ERA-NETs may become more uniform in the sense that a joint call is central. There is also room for self-sustained networks and ERA-NETs that organise one call with programme co-fund and other calls with national budgets, but the proposed approach is likely to push towards short-term one call ERA-NETs. They will manage more tasks, such as performing mappings, developing IPR frameworks and building contacts with technology platforms, but coordination will always be needed. In addition the future individual ERA-NETs may focus more on partners from outside the European Union and global initiatives with relevance to their area.

Discussion topic 2) Typology of ERA-NETs and JPIs in relation to each other

The typology of ERA-NETs and JPIs depends on the organization and the level of analysis. Some JPIs have a wide scope of interests and topics while others have more narrow perspectives. JPIs see ERA-NETs as one potential mechanism for implementation of their Strategic Research Agenda so there will be stronger links between ERA-NETs and JPIs, for example, to make sure that activities already covered by the ERA-NETs and JPIs are made known to each other. In KBBE area the relevant JPIs include FACCE-JPI, HDHL-JPI and Oceans-JPI. Under any circumstances ERA-NETs are vital for networking. The partners are more inclined to fund the calls if they have participated in the process of development of the calls. Lack of ERA-NETs will probably reduce the financial funding. This makes sustainability of the ERA-NETs important.

In conclusion it was stressed that there is an obvious relation between JPIs and ERA-NETs. But due to the variety of scope and topics within the JPIs a general one-size-fits-all approach for interlinking is difficult to develop. It is important for the ERA-NET to remain connected to the JPIs to make sure that two parallel systems do not occur.

Discussion topic 3) Governance/future calls

To get an idea of future calls organised by ERA-NETs till 2015 a small survey will be done by e-mail later. It is realised that it may be difficult to give a reasonable estimate of number, size, and topics of calls for the next three years. Nevertheless, if we have some idea, it may help the ERA-NETs and the Commission to better prepare for the future.

Discussion topic 4) Funding for which ERA-NET activities

Three scenario's had been sketched by the Commission (in the workshop two weeks earlier in Brussels, and in the presentation given by Jörg Niehoff in the PLATFORM Workshop). Scenario 1 *Real costs for call funding and networking*, was presented as very unlikely. Scenario 2 *Only output based, top-up of calls* would be simple but disadvantageous effects are recognized. Therefore scenario's in which output-based top-up for the call is combined with support for other activities are being explored. Jörg introduced this scenario as *'output based for the call + scale of unit for networking'*. It is not yet clear to what extent and for which other activities the Commission is planning to give support. A working group within the Commissions is looking into the costs of such activities in current ERA-NETs to come up with a plan.

The KBBE ERA-NETs considered support for other activities in addition to top-up of calls as extremely important for the functioning of ERA-NETs and examples of such activities were discussed. It was agreed to clarify in the before-mentioned position paper that ERA-NETs require financial support for a range of activities other than the joint calls, including the facilitation of initial discussions through meetings and workshops, exchange of information through mapping, foresight activities, and activities in the preparatory phases of joint calls, in which funders come together to discuss and agree the priorities and modalities for a call. Lack of such 'glue' funding might result in the national funding agencies being less able to participate in coordination activities and less likely to participate in joint calls in which they are not part of the development. Besides calls and call preparation, it is important to stress the importance of other ERA-NET activities - e.g. guidelines for data sharing or open access. No one else provides these activities. Other examples are scoping IPR needs, developing mechanisms to work in international calls (beyond Europe), and engaging the general public. Another example might be science communication where funding organisations participating in an ERA-NET could exchange good practices (e.g. in contributing to public debate) in addressing emerging fields such as synthetic biology.

The EC wants the member states to allocate more funds to P2P, such as ERA-NET calls. The support modality as presented in the third scenario and the implications are not yet fully clear however, so it is difficult to give a reflection. We will resolve open questions from day 2 by contacting the Commission before preparing the position paper. An idea is to list other ERA-NETs activities valuable in addition to, preparation of, or following on, joint calls— e.g. infrastructure or data sharing. This will help to calculate such costs for activities that are part of continuation and sustainability of ERA-NETs. The considerations can be included in the position paper.

Discussion topic 5) Scope for future support and learning platform

Topics that could be included in the scope for future support and learning platform(s) include: good practices for call preparation, management and follow-up; indicators for impact; networking the ERA-NET actors; e-forum; participation of national programmes; networking of ERA-NETs around themes. In one of the workshop introductions in the ERA-NET event two weeks ago in Brussels it was proposed to consider a broad support action joining up ERA-LEARN, JPIs TO CO-WOPK and Platform of KBBE related ERA-NETs. At the PLATFORM workshop today the strong country commitment, coordination, and interlinkage for the ERA-NETs in the KBBE are was emphasised and the role of SCAR in this respect was acknowledged. This area is organised stronger than other areas with regard to ERA-NETs.

Due to the changes that Horizon 2020 aims to bring about, learning activities are important as well as the role of ERA-NETs in connecting research to the market in cooperation with the industry. Alignment of ERA-NETs will continue to be important in the future. In addition the impact indicators are very important.

List of actions by Work Packages

Coordination, Management and Communication (WP1 and WP5)

- Contact new ERA-NETs to join PLATFORM activities, in particular workshops.
- Project intranet. Create accounts and send login to partners. Due 15th July
- Documents, information and discussion uploaded at discussion forum / Intranet (Annette and Christine will look into what is to be placed where)
- Keep website updated
- Create newsletter and leaflet

WP 2 Networking KBBE Actors

- Planning of the next workshop. The second annual workshop will take place in April 2013 in France. Date and location to be decided. (Egizio Valceschini)
- Interlinkage / outreach. List of upcoming meetings such as from SCAR, EURAGRI, etc. and plan for interlinkage (Due 15th of August)
- Information exchange on important events from the KBBE ERA-NETs. WP5 is asked to look into the possibility to use the discussion forum or the project intranet as an announcement board of important meetings and workshops within the ERA-NETs.
- **Position paper.** Purpose: to give ideas and comments from the view of KBBE ERA-NETs regarding ERA-NETs in Horizon 2020. The discussions in the workshop form the basis for the position paper. Draft group: Peter van Velzen, Niels Gøtke, Egizio Valceschini, Christine Bunthof, and Mike Collins. The draft will be sent for comments to the whole Steering Committee by the end of August. Peter van Velzen will present the points of the position paper in SCAR WG 19 September. The position paper will be finalized in October.

WP3 Mutual Learning

Good practices in ERA-NETs (T3.1)

- ERA-NETs who have not yet done so, please answer the questionnaire (email from Ulla Bertelsen on May 8th). Additional contributions will be included in the compilation
- T3.1 will perform further desk study on efficient call management. A focussed workshop for the persons heading the call secretariats as target group may be organised (suggestion positively received). The focussed workshop could do a case analysis of a call.
- Findings and recommendations will be presented at the next Annual Workshop.

Impact assessments indicators (T3.2)

- For the cost – benefit analyses, all ERA-NETs (who have not done so far) to deliver their data to Christian for inclusion in the analysis (Deadline 15th September).
- WP 3 will look into the possibility of providing a guideline and example of how to calculate the leverage that is achieved for individual funding organisations within a call.
- Additional call related indicators and other impact assessment indicators that are more of a descriptive nature will be developed further by WP3, who will work together for this with ERA-LEARN
- The way of presenting and using indicators and the target group will be discussed in the WP3 and with ERA-LEARN.
- The extended call cost benefit analysis, extended set of indicators and plan for use internal and external of impact assessment will be presented and discussed at the next workshop.

WP4 Strategic Vision and Roadmap

WP 4 overall

- Detailed plan of activities within WP4 to be developed
- Task leaders send their plans to Egizio. Deadline 30th August.
- A tele/visioconference will be held after summer holidays for the WP4 task leaders and project coordinator. Alexis will open a doodle to fix a date.

Collaboration among KBBE ERA-NETs (T4.1)

- Participants send the results of the match making talks at the workshop to Kees. And participants send the names of ERA-NETs who you would have talked to but did not have the time. Due 6th July
- Comments on the classification of ERA-NETs (see presentation) to Kees.
- Any bilateral meetings between ERA-NETS are reported to Kees – to get overview of the activities.

ERA-NETs and Joint Programming Initiatives (T4.2)

- Meetings such as the workshop on 5 October 2011 by JPI FACCE can be used to look into possibilities for working together between a JPI and related ERA-NETs.
- Mutual benefits by e.g. making use of each other's research and strategic agenda's and foresight and mapping activities

ERA-NETs and private sector driven platforms (T4.3)

- Meeting participants review the draft compilation paper and submit necessary information to Karen Görner regarding technology platforms with relevance for KBBE ERA-NETs (Deadline 15th September)

ERA-NETs and international research alliances (T4.4)

- Plan to be detailed (Jasper Dalhuisen) and activities to be started up

ERA-NETs and European research and innovation policy (T4.5)

- Look into possibility of having ERA-NETs (or broader: public partnerships) on the agenda of the Bioeconomy conference under the Irish Presidency (Dublin 14 February 2013).
- Promote ERA-NETs and PLATFORM in European forums and use of these forums to sharpen ideas and to check our ideas that we are developing in a position paper (with T2.6)

Steffen Hansen & Christine Bunthof



First Annual Workshop, 26-27 June 2012, Copenhagen

List of Participants

Name	Participation on behalf of	Affiliation	Country
Christine Bunthof	PLATFORM	Wageningen UR	Netherlands
Peter van Velzen	PLATFORM	EL&I	Netherlands
Niels Gøtke	ICT AGRI, ANIHWA	DASTI	Denmark
Per Mogensen	meeting support	DASTI	Denmark
Steffen Syberg Hansen	meeting support	DASTI	Denmark
Jasper Dalhuisen	ARD	EL&I	Netherlands
Dennis Lisbjerg	COFASP (<i>in negotiation</i>)	DTU	Denmark
Rowan McKibbin	ERA-CAPS	BBSRC	UK
Paul Wiley	ERA-CAPS	BBSRC	UK
Kees Kwant	ERANET BIOENERGY	EL&I - AgNL	Netherlands
Karen Görner	ERA-IB-2	FNR	Germany
Andy Boyce	ERASynBio	BBSRC	UK
Niels Halberg	CORE Organic	ICROFS	Denmark
Ulla Bertelsen	CORE Organic	ICROFS	Denmark
Christian Listabarth	ETB	BMWFJ	Austria
Sylvia Bluemel	EUPHRESKO-ERANET	AGES	Austria
Xavier Le Roux	BiodivERSA	FRB	France
Rocio Lansac	FORESTERRA	MINECO	Spain
Iver Thysen	ICT-AGRI	DASTI	Denmark
Carina Madsen	ICT-AGRI	DAFA	Denmark
Steinar Bergseth	MARINEBIOTECH *CSA	RCN	Norway
Egizio Valceschini	RURAGRI	INRA	France
Mads Peter Schreiber	SAFEFOODERA	NICe	Norway
Mike Collins	STAR-IDAZ *CSA	Defra	UK
Marie Russel	SUSFOOD	INRA	France
Mika Kallio	WoodWisdom-Net	TEKES	Finland
Anabel De La Peña	<i>participates in various</i>	INIA	Spain
François Constantin	Commission - DG Research and Innovation E4 Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Aquaculture		
Jörg Niehoff	Commission - DG Research and Innovation B4 Joint Programming		



First Annual Workshop
26-27 June 2012
Charlottenlund Castle
Denmark

