Written summaries by workshop convenors

Compiled by Chris Blackmore

Boru Douthwaite for WS 1.2: Monitoring and evaluation for learning and innovation

The workshop asked the question: "How does monitoring and evaluation work to help understand and foster learning and innovation?"

Eleven papers clustered to given an answer: "By fostering and supporting reflexive learning through specifying and revisiting program theories of change during implementation, helped by measuring changes in capacity to innovate."

Four cross-cutting issues generated discussion:
- How to be simple about complexity in monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems?
- Who should carry out MEL and the pros and cons?
- What should we measure? How? And who?
- What is the learning in MEL and what is its use?

Next step: special issue of a journal?

Simon Fielke for WS 1.3: Using a co-innovation approach to improve innovation and learning

Here are four key points from session that were shared across the multiple co-innovation projects presented:
- Appropriate facilitation of co-innovation projects/programs is critical
- The time involved in including relevant stakeholders is significant in these iterative projects
- Collaboration depends on individual social skills and personalities - as Jeff explained some people just 'get' co-innovation and thrive off the uncertainty and others cannot handle it
- The issue of how co-innovation continues to be resourced after the project life (how the organisations involved are able to find the commitment after the project end) was raised by all presenters as a concern

Thomas Aenis for WS 1.4: From farmer to "eco-preneur" in multifunctional agriculture and sustainable regional development: Participatory curricula development and implementation of educational measures

We had 4 papers from a broad field of educational settings: one on farmer mentoring in Norway, one on strategic and activity planning of a school farm in Italy, one on a transdisciplinary spring school for students in Italy, and one on extension programming in the MENA Region.

It is quite clear that curricula development needs case-specific forms of participation, of those who teach and those who learn

What seems to be the key to success is to carry out a need analysis or situation analysis in an early phase of curricula design, in which target groups should be involved. Further research is needed to find out good practice and models on how (methods) to involve whom (multipliers, learners) in this need assessments and hoe to carry these out in a way that there are useful for curricula design (the factor time seems to be important...)

==> Somehow similar results of the two workshops (1.4 and 2.6): how to manage early involvement of "end users" in project planning and curricula development...

Friedrich Leitgeb for WS 1.5: Pathways towards sustainability in the agricultural knowledge and innovation system: The role of farmers' experiments and innovations

Lighting flash key messages:

- Farmers look for info on their own, using Internet or social media, so important for researchers to use these techniques – Sara
- Inclusive methods and tools fostering participation – lady
- Relations between farmers and researchers?
- Farmers experiments – Quentin
- Innovations need to consider research traditions, results, models from psych on creativity – Christian
- Role for farmers in existing agro research and complementary to traditional research – Jon
- Understand and discuss farmers' experiments – Maxine
- Informal farming learning and knowledge - formal and informal – Talis
- Seeds forge development of resilient food system – Sylvia
- Antibiotics and farmers in French - not explored by many actors – Natalie

Marianne Cerf and Boelie Elzen for WS 1.7: Scaling up and Scaling out

There is a lot of innovation going on in agriculture. For a variety of reasons, many of these innovations, are only used on a small scale (in niches), many even by a single farmer. Workshop 1.7 addressed understanding why this is the case and how we can stimulate wider use (upscaling). In 'old' terms from innovation studies this is addressed by Roger's concept of 'diffusion' of innovations but recent insights have shown this framework is too rigid and to linear. But what can come in its place? This is an understudied aspect in innovation and transition studies and our workshop tried to explore some first ideas on this.

Some main findings from presentations and discussions

- Experience from many presenters indicated is that it is always possible to find a small group of 'innovative farmers' that are willing to try new things. The main issue is to find the 'followers' and to inspire them to adopt a 'novelty'.
- Younger farmers seem to be more open to innovation than older farmers so it may be useful to target them specifically. But some young farmers can also be embedded in what they learn from their parents and in the need to be accepted by their neighbourhood.
- These first two points bring in the general issue of understanding farmers' decision-making processes regarding novelties introduction. We need to better identify where they get their knowledge from and how they make use of it in their decision and action processes. In

exploring this we need to acknowledge that it varies a lot across farmers so we need to distinguish different 'types' of farmers concerning their 'access to innovation' , their willingness and capacity to engage in its implementation on farm. We also acknowledge that supporting this process is supporting farmers in on farm design-implementation loops.

- It was recognised that farmers have a large number of sources where they get their knowledge from which is still poorly understood.

- Farmers are under larger economic pressures with slim profit margins. This makes it difficult for them to try something new which usually is risky. How to develop means to overcome this hurdle. New types of policy instruments may play a role here.

- Try to identify specific actors (not only farmers) that have a specific interest in upscaling and develop a joint strategy with them. The role of intermediaries (humans but also material objects and concepts) has been pointed out and the need to better understand how they contribute to upscaling processes

- One of the main frameworks in current innovations studies is the so-called 'multi-level perspective' (MLP) that sees innovation as the interplay between various levels, especially between 'niches' (the breeding space for novelties) and 'regimes' (incumbent socio-technical systems). In this framework the first step in understanding upscaling would be to analyse and understand how niches link up to regimes. Two paper specifically addressed this using the concept of anchoring that seems to be a fruitful concept to explore this further.

- Upscaling and outscaling are two faces of a same coin but are not so often analysed together. The concept of anchoring is a good candidate to address this issue, also it has mainly be use to address upscaling processes. Looking at both upscaling and outscaling processus and building an enabling environment of change and how this can be supported by various actors and policy instruments is still to investigate.

- We acknowledge that it is important to look at different niches or initiatives in parallel and the way they all contribute to a transition while studying transition in the making and upscaling or outscaling processes.

- We also acknowledge that some niches actors can be reluctant to the upscaling and outscaling of the niches as they view it as a process of alteration of the transformative intention which drives their involvement in the niche.

Margaret Lelea for WS 1.9: Inclusive Innovation

- We discussed the meaning, implication and practice of inclusive innovation for food security with approaches from Inclusive Business, Agricultural Innovation Systems, and Transdiscipli-narity for innovation co-creation.
- Different strategies we considered for creating inclusive innovation ranged from technical innovations with new products designed for smallholder farmers to social and organizational innovations for on-farm experimentation and improved value-chain coordination.
- An example of a synergy that emerged is that papers that discussed theory and methods of how to identify stakeholders and facilitate their active participation were complemented by a case study that clearly showed the consequences of not doing this well.

All papers will be revised and expanded to be submitted to academic journals shortly after this conference.

WS 2.3: Well-being in rural areas – how is it affected by different farming systems?

- Well-being is becoming a new measure of development and progress but needs to be defined more clearly
- The field of relations between farming systems and well-being of rural community is largely unexplored
- A wider application of systemic and transdisciplinary approaches are needed to understand and foster well-being of rural community

Thomas Aenis for WS 2.6: Management of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research processes

Three papers from different transdisciplinary project settings: sustainability assessment involving researchers and farmers associations; a consortium on sustainable land use in Northern Germany; and an "innovation group" in Germany. The main point of discussion was on how to manage integration:

- integration is most important in early project phases and late phases and needs to be managed
- Experience shows that the basis for integration should be laid in early phases of the project (joint problem analysis using constellation analysis, situation maps etc.; project designs which foresee integration activities, specific units which facilitate integration processes)
- the main question remaining is how and whom to involve in these early phases

==> somehow similar results of the two workshops (1.4 and 2.6): how to manage early involvement of "end users" in project planning an curricula development...

Paul Burgess for WS 3.3: Pathways for land-use: the sustainable avenue of agro-forestry and Field Trip 2: Agroforestry and forestry

We ran two agroforestry sessions (which were attended by about 15-20 people) and one field trip (with about 30+ people). Agroforestry, put simply, is farming with trees.

There is an increasing interest in agroforestry in Europe; for example the French Government has established a national agroforestry plan. There are also national plans in the USA and Brazil.

In the workshops we discussed systems and practices in Italy, Portugal, France, Germany and the UK.

The first part of the field visit included a visit to Peter Aspin silvopastoral system which comprises a wide range of tree species and dairy cattle. Peter introduced trees into pasture to provide shelter, shade and fodder for his cattle. In a time of substantial volatility in the UK agricultural system, it is interesting that Peter developed his innovative systems without grant support. The visit generated much discussion and perhaps demonstrates that the most important "component" in any farm system is the initiative and enthusiasm of the farmer.

Julia Wright for WS 3.4: Boundary spanning between agroecological and conventional production systems: implications for pathways towards more sustainable production

- There is a large diversity of agricultural models that are sustainability oriented
- Farmer equipment sharing could be a starting point for agroecology

www.ifsa-europe.org

12th IFSA Symposium – 12-15 July 2016 at Harper Adams Univ.

- In the participatory research approach, ensure that all stakeholders are fully informed from the start.
- The use of legumes, reduced tillage and land ownership can facilitate agroecological trials
- There exists misinformation and misunderstanding about conversion to organic and about being an organic farmer

Ruth Nettles for WS 5.1: Developing agricultural advisory systems for innovation: Governance and innovative practices

Overview: 7 papers (6 presentations), providing case studies of privatised and privatising extension and advisory systems from: Australia, Norway, Germany, Peru and New Zealand, Sudan, Malawi

Themes of papers:
- Divergence and diversity of farming systems brings new challenges for the advisory system
- Governance and funding models to support strong advisory networks are often lacking: particularly co-ordination platforms at territorial, national and sectoral scales.
- A key question in all: How to establish new systems for maintaining and growing advisor networks, skills and capacity?

Discussion/observations:
1. Theories, concepts and tools in researching advisory systems - is a growing field, strengthened by discussion and comparison amongst IFSA researchers
2. The session highlighted the importance of research about changes in advisory systems and their governance because:
   - Many changes are not seen/observed without research/analysis
   - Rapid changes in some countries
   - With diverse farming systems – different roles and needs of advisory services in innovation
   - Research can identify gaps, allow for reflection/purposeful action to counter-act negative impacts.
3. Co-ordination of advisory actors: platforms seen as important at local/territorial, sectoral and national arenas.
4. There are some "different outcomes than expected" occurring with privatisation in terms of farmers access to and use of private advisory services.

Future Research topics: (AS = advisory system)
- Value of accreditation schemes for advisers? do they address quality/deliver what is desired?
- With the socio-economic transformation of farming – how are advisory systems changing? Are they adapting/are farmers facing gaps: Do different farming systems need different advisory types.
- What pathways to grow the needed roles of private sector?
- Where is government expenditure and roles going? The emergence of more public-private partnerships with declining government expenditure – what impacts?
- What are the specific effects of privatisation – fragmentation of advice? Who and what is driving whole farm systems interest and capacity?
- How are short terms farm needs vs longer term needs progressed?
- How develop the prospective advisory system? How facilitate? (especially in relation to the point above).
- How strengthen advice/sustainable agriculture
- New funding mechanisms – what novel arrangements?

www.ifsa-europe.org

12th IFSA Symposium – 12-15 July 2016 at Harper Adams Univ.

- Better consider social and economic transformation of farms in research about AS: consider farm workers, book-keepers, etc.
- Under assumption public funding will decrease even more – what's the impact for AS?

Brian Leonard for WS 5.2: Farm succession, inheritance and retirement: Challenges for agricultural futures

- Presentation one illustrated succession planning intervention in Australia. With results indicating that family farms were able to take positive steps towards succession as a result of intervention.
- Presentation two investigated the potential of farm partnerships to facilitate succession in Ireland. The main findings note that partnerships are more economically feasible for dairy farms, however non-economic benefits should be promoted in the case of beef systems.
- The group discussion found that succession and inheritance issues are similar in many countries.
- The group called for more concrete evidence that young farmers would benefit the sector, given the drive to attract new entrants by some governments.

Emiliana Leonilde Dinis Gil Soares Silva for WS 5.3: Rural development policies in the peripheral Southern and Eastern European regions

- From the 6 submitted abstracts were presented 4 communications
- The participants made suggestions for future research projects regarding the themes of the papers
- Some proposed questions for the workshop were discussed in the communications.

Susanne v. Münchhausen for WS 5.4: Exploring farmers' conditions, strategies and performances in a context of multi-dimensional policy requirements, market imperfections and globalisation: Towards a conceptual model

This workshop had a very interesting concluding discussion. We reflected on the further development of the CSP-concept that is expected to provide the theoretical framework for the EU-Horizon2020 project SUFISA. For that reason, the conference contributed significantly to the project. The contributions of non-project partners (authors and audience) were very helpful.

Janice Jiggins for WS 5.7: There are other options: boundary issues in innovation system governance

- States of systemic crises with dysfunctional structures and institutions: What is the way forward?
- Different histories and starting points.
- Transformation emerging outside, bypassing, or in collaboration but not driven by existing structures.
- Critical questions for any transformation: who benefits? who participates in shaping the transformation? Does the result contribute to resilience and wellbeing under climate change?

www.ifsa-europe.org

12th IFSA Symposium – 12-15 July 2016 at Harper Adams Univ.

Mark Stein for **WS 5.9: Public food procurement**

This workshop was highly successful. We had a lively and well-attended discussion over three sessions. There were nine papers - three from Italy, two from the UK and Germany and one each from Canada and Latvia.

The main subject was local and organic food procurement – the policies and practice within municipalities which influence greater introduction of these foods.

There was also discussion of how catering managers can encourage their customers to eat healthier and more sustainable foods"

John Reade for **'Field Trip 6' Special workshop and demonstration of Harper Adams Robotics**

Six major points from the session that Peter Kettlewell and I carried out on robotics and automation today:

- There are lots of exciting robotic, sensor, autonomous, and UAV technologies in development
- It is good that much of this development is in conjunction with SMEs
- Development requires collaboration between engineers, IT specialists, agronomists and biologists. No one group can develop these technologies alone.
- Many positive and negative implications can be identified for these technologies. The risk is how humans use them though, rather than inherent risk with the technologies themselves.
- Use of Responsible Innovation will ensure risk in development is reduced. This requires a large change in how innovation is approached.
- The identified positives and negatives of these technologies are very similar to positives and negatives of previous technologies developed over the last 100 years or so. The way we focus on them is just framing us in our 'now'.