



BIOBORD
PLATFORM

TRANSNATIONAL ONLINE WORKSHOP 23.04.2020

Deliverable 3.2.1

Published on 14.05.2020



 **Interreg**
Baltic Sea Region



EUROPEAN UNION

EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Work Package 3 – Developing Smart Bioeconomy Clusters/Innovation Ecosystems.....	2
1.2 Group of Actions 3.2: Transnational Learning Process	2
2. Regional Pilots	3
2.1 Main discussion points regarding the Regional Pilot Cases.....	4
2.2 Feedback regarding the Impact Report vs. 01	4
2.3 The workshop supporting materials.....	5
3. Joint Action Plan Workshop.....	5
3.1. Main discussion points regarding the Joint Action Plan	5
3.2. Main decisions and agreements achieved during the workshop.....	6
3.3 Workshop supporting materials.....	6
4. Biobord and Network Agreement Workshop.....	7
4.1. Preparations and implementation.....	7
4.2. Main discussion points of Biobord platform	7
4.3. Main discussion points of Biobord Operating Model.....	8
4.4. Main discussion points of Biobord network.....	9
4.5. Workshop supporting materials.....	10

1. Introduction

This report aims to describe the Transnational Online Workshop of RDI2CluB-project that was held on 23.04.2020. The report includes information of the work package and a group of activity behind it. It also introduces all parts of the workshop: the session on Regional Pilots, the session on the Joint Action Plan and Biobord, the session on the Network Agreement, and its results.

Initially, the workshops were supposed to take place in the RDI2CluB's partner region Vidzeme in Latvia on same day and time. Due to the COVID-19 restrictions, the Latvia benchmark visit and the transnational workshops were rearranged. The online workshop included the same elements as the original workshop and the event was successful.

1.1 Work Package 3 – Developing Smart Bioeconomy Clusters/Innovation Ecosystems

The main thread in WP3 is to improve the innovation systems of rural RDI2CluB partners with the help of transnational cooperation. The improved innovation systems would support new business development in the field of bioeconomy, create new bioeconomy products and services with the higher added value and knowledge-based jobs in the Baltic Sea Region (BSR). The third Work Package is led by PP6 Tretorget from Norway.

In WP 3 the RDI2CluB project has developed a Bioeconomy Cluster/Innovation Ecosystem hub of four BSR regions participating in the project, namely, Finland, Norway, Latvia and Poland. The Hub has been established on the results of WP2 - Promoting S3 for developing the bioeconomy - and on the new knowledge created by innovation actors in joint activities.

Actions in WP 3:

- Develop a joint Operating Model for Innovation Management (OMIM) for the hub
- Design Biobord platform to manage the hub and the Operating Model
- Support innovation management, cooperation, and transnational learning process of the hub
- Support end-user involvement in the hub
- Ensure durability, finance and expanding of the established hub
- Publish the outputs and disseminate the results of RDI2CluB to end-users.

1.2 Group of Actions 3.2: Transnational Learning Process

GoA 3.1 Developing the operation model for innovation management in rural BCs/BIEs is led by PP6 Tretorget. GoA 3.2 "Transnational learning process is led by PP1 JAMK. The main output for GoA 3.1 is the Biobord Operating Model and for GoA 3.2 the main output is the Biobord-platform, an Open Virtual Bio-Business Hub.

Activities in GoA 3.2

- 3.2.1 Two succeeded transnational workshops in Norway and Poland, and Transnational Online workshop for analyzing the results of GoA 3.1, GoA 3.2, WP 4 (Joint Piloting in Transnational Cooperation) and for giving the feedback to partners. The workshop aims to agreement of necessary improvements to the Operating Model and to the Biobord-platform.

- 3.2.2 Three benchmarking visits (to NO - SE (Paper Province), PL, FI) along with the activity 3.2.1, including visits to the premises of partners and to bioeconomy clusters/bioeconomy innovation ecosystems.
- 3.2.3 Screening existing transnational networks and platforms relevant to develop transnational cooperation in rural bioeconomy businesses
- 3.2.4 Agile/Iterative designing of the Biobord-platform
- 3.2.5 Giving incremental feed-back (based on the results from GoA 3.2) to GoA 3.1, and to WP2 and WP4. Analyzing the feed-back received from stakeholders and from WP2 and WP4. Making the necessary improvements to the main outputs of WP3.
- 3.2.6 Developing future cooperation plans. Documenting the plans.

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the activity 3.2.2 "Three benchmarking visits to NO-SE, PL and LV", could not be implemented as planned because the benchmarking visit to Latvia was cancelled. The aims of the benchmarking visits are to support the transnational learning process and to add value to the project outputs. The program of each benchmarking visit includes visits to the responsible partners' premises. The program also includes participation in a suitable event or a workshop. In the case of Latvia, the transnational workshop was held in an online form on 23.04.2020. The content of the program was the same.

2. Regional Pilots

The Regional Pilots workshop was held in an online form on 23.04.2020. at 8:15-9:45 CET / 9:15-10:45 EET. The report was prepared by Inese Suija-Markova, PP10 Institute for Environmental Solutions

In addition to the activities defined in the Joint Action Plan, the RDI2CluB project partners have been implementing four Regional Pilot Cases:

1. Mobile Application for Connecting Rural Entrepreneurs with Services and Workforce (Finland);
2. Building a Platform for International Network for Grouse Monitoring and Research (Norway);
3. Public Engagement to Solving Air Pollution via Use of Mobile Devices and 5-helix Approach (Poland);
4. Development of Data-based Service to Support Farmers' Decision Making (Latvia).

The purpose of the Regional Pilots Workshop was threefold:

- to share the progress of regional pilots' implementation;
- to discuss the lessons learnt concerning the applicability of Open Model for Innovation Management and the Biobord;
- to share the first prototype of Interactive Impact Story and gather the feedback for its improvement.

The Regional Pilots Workshop was organized according to the following structure and time-schedule:

- 8:15 Introduction by Inese
- 8:20 Presentation of Case Finland by Tiina
- 8:30 Presentation of Case Latvia by Dainis
- 8:40 Presentation of Case Norway by Halgrim
- 8:50 Presentation of Case Poland by Monika
- 9:00 Questions and answers session moderated by Inese
- 9:15 Short introduction to the Interactive Impact Story by Riikka and Inese
- 9:25 Discussion concerning possibilities for strengthening the Impact Story
- 9:40 Conclusions and closing of the meeting
- 9:45 The end of workshop

2.1 Main discussion points regarding the Regional Pilot Cases

1. How to increase the number of users of the tools developed in the frame of Regional Pilots (e.g. Waakku mobile application, the Biobord as a platform for Grouse monitoring and research network)
 - a. Feedback from the Norwegian partners: If compared with other online platforms, the advantage of Biobord lies in its open access. This can be used as one of the selling points for the Biobord. For the international Grouse monitoring and research network, the Biobord is foreseen as the main platform for communication and interaction among the network participants. However, the network participants are quite reluctant to start using this platform. The only strategy for their involvement is publishing all the network related materials like presentations, articles, etc. on the Biobord, thus forcing people to register and get access.
 - b. Feedback from the Finnish partners: So far Waakku developers have received positive feedback from the target groups (farmers, SMEs) who have admitted the need for such a solution. However, there is a need for success stories that can be used for further promotion of the application and convincing of farmers to start using Waakku.
2. What is the motivation of industrial partners (businesses) to become involved in the Grouse monitoring and research network?
 - a. They are interested in discussing models for sustainable harvesting of grouse and for that they need access to researchers' knowledge and data.
3. How has the Regional Pilots working group used the Biobord for cooperation within the group?
 - a. As a project management tool – planning of joint meetings, sharing documents.
 - b. For sharing the progress on the regional pilot cases with other RDI2CluB partners and the Biobord users.
 - c. By establishing regional groups, for example, in the case of Finland and Poland, thus increasing the overall number of Biobord users.

The partners have not utilized the potential of Biobord for co-creation processes.

2.2 Feedback regarding the Impact Report vs. 01

After the presentation of Regional Pilot Cases, PP10 introduced the workshop participants to the first version of the Impact Story which had been published on the Landing Page of the Biobord platform and disseminated through the RDI2CluB project social media accounts (Facebook and Twitter). The plan for further dissemination of the Impact story was also shared.

The suggestions for further development of the Impact Report can be summarized as follows:

1. The language must be made easier. In the current version, there are too many professional terms that might scare away some user groups, e.g. farmers.
2. The navigation within the Impact report (moving forward and backward between the slides) must improve.
3. In some parts, the text covers the visuals, for example, project logos, thus giving a messy view.

4. The joint story must emphasize more how different groups of society can benefit from Bioeconomy and contribute to the development of Bioeconomy.
5. One of the channels that can be used for the dissemination of Impact Report and the Latvian Pilot Case is EIP-AGRI.
6. It would be good if the Impact Report were structured around different stakeholder groups – farmers, researchers, policymakers.
7. It would be good if the Impact Report included the list of references.

2.3 The workshop supporting materials

- Link to the presentations of Regional Pilot Cases - <https://forum.biobord.eu/t/materials-for-transnational-online-workshop-on-23-april-2020/1268>
- Link to the suggestions for the improvement of Impact Report - <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1YDK5t9rSx6Xe2Cg7zYh0ibAZovDWKi-CsR144zBS6hg/edit?usp=sharing>
- Link to the 1st version of the Impact Report - <https://www.impactreport.app/biobord/index.html?view=Home>

3. Joint Action Plan Workshop

The Joint Action Plan (JAP) related workshop was held in an online form on 23.04.2020 at 10:00-11:30 CET / 11:00-12:30 EET. The report was prepared by Irīna Kulitāne, PP11 Vidzeme Planning Region.

The purpose of the Joint Action Plan Workshop was:

1. To share among partners information about the progress of the JAP implementation;
2. To discuss the main lessons learnt and challenges identified concerning the planning and implementation of the joint actions;
3. To agree on the further approach to be used for implementation of the JAP – extension or reduction of the number of the joint actions, to specify methods and approaches to be taken for the progress achievement.

During the workshop the progress regarding the actions planned for the achievement of each of the three objectives, as they are defined in the JAP, the main challenges identified and the main lessons learnt by partners (according to the information provided by the partners prior to the workshop) were presented.

The Workshop was organized according to the following structure and time-schedule:

11:00 Introduction and instructions: by Irīna
11:15 Review of progress made with JAPs since last benchmarking visit
11:40 Thematic table discussion on JAP objectives, agreement of updating process
12:15 Conclusions and next steps: by Irīna
12:30 The end of workshop

3.1. Main discussion points regarding the Joint Action Plan

1. Which measures partners consider as joint measures:
 - a. activities among partners of RDI2CLuB consortium from at least 2 different regions?
 - b. activities among any stakeholders from at least 2 different regions, if they originate from or are grounding in RDI2CLuB initiatives?
2. How do partners understand “an action facilitation”? Is it realistic and possible to facilitate an action where a large number of stakeholders from different regions and measures are ongoing simultaneously?
3. How to feed Biobord.eu with knowledge shared and/or created within the joint actions in order to increase Biobord.eu recognition and use by external stakeholders?
4. Whether and what new measures partners would like to initiate and integrate in the JAP (are there any) and coordinate?
5. What to do with the joint actions which implementation has not been very successful up to now?
6. How the JAP implementation progress will be reviewed and how the JAP will be updated after the formal end of the project?

3.2. Main decisions and agreements achieved during the workshop

1. Joint measures are measures/activities among stakeholders from at least 2 different regions if they originate from or are grounding in RDI2CLuB initiatives.
2. An action facilitation cannot be considered as a requirement to a facilitating partner to propose and provide leadership for “in life” implementation of all measures within the action. Facilitation means regular highlighting and reflection of actions in the Biobord.eu.
3. There are no new measures proposed for the Joint Action Plan.
4. Due to limited resources (time, human resources, funding), partners decided to reduce a number of joint actions in the plan to those where the progress covers regional activities, is not demonstrated at all or is rather small and it is not foreseen to achieve significant change within the project lifetime. These actions are:
 - i. Business & cooperation models
 - ii. Knowledge for stakeholders
 - 2.2.1 Availability of change promoters
 - 2.2.2 Tools for brokerage and access to RDI facilities
 - 2.4.2. Digitalisation connecting stakeholders and resources
5. To postpone the questions related to review and updating of the JAP after formal end of the project to the newt WP2 meeting.

3.3 Workshop supporting materials

1. The Joint Action Plan (approved edition)
<https://www.jamk.fi/en/Research-and-Development/RDI-Projects/rdi2club/results/>
2. Overview of the Joint Action Plan progress
<https://edms.biobord.eu/#/documents/documents/176/preview/> (Word document)

<https://edms.biobord.eu/#/documents/documents/177/preview/> (Excel document)

3. Link to the presentation of the Joint Action Progress

[file:///C:/Users/irina/Downloads/23_04_JAP_progress%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/irina/Downloads/23_04_JAP_progress%20(1).pdf)

4. Biobord and Network Agreement Workshop

The Biobord and Network Agreement workshop was organized by PP1 and PP9 and the report was written by PP1 Riikka Kumpulainen with the comments of PP9. PP1 planned the timetable and the content for the workshop.

The main thread for the workshop was to discuss the collected results from earlier conducted Network Agreement survey for RDI2CluB partners (02.03. – 30.03.2020) and Biobord survey for all Biobord users (30.03. – 09.04.2020). The aim was to collect enough information for further development of the platform and for the first draft of the Network Agreement.

4.1. Preparations and implementation

Workshop preparations started with the analysis of the survey results. The Network Agreement survey was analyzed by PP1, and workshop questions were created based on the results. Biobord survey results were analyzed by JAMK University of Applied Sciences student with the help of International Business professor Murat Akpinar. PP9 created a presentation of the Biobord survey results and PP 1 created general questions for the workshop about the development of Biobord-platform.

PP1 planned the workshop to be held in a group form, where all stakeholder groups (R&D, Policy and Business) discuss pre-planned workshop questions with the help of a discussion host. Discussion hosts were selected and briefed beforehand.

The workshop questions were as follows:

1. How do you see the future of the Biobord network?
2. How would the Biobord look like as a long-term /sustainable platform model?
3. What should be improved in the Biobord operating model?
4. How do you see the future with the following discussion groups? Open Biobord Forum? On Stage? Biobord Network Actions? User Support?

The discussion hosts presented each stakeholder group: R&D - PP1 Hannariina Honkanen, Policy - PP11 Irina Kulitane and Business - PP6 Ingrid Gabrielsen. The discussion hosts were instructed to take notes of the ongoing discussions and to present the results for the whole workshop audience afterwards.

Results from both topics (Biobord and network Agreement) were summarized by PP1 and shared on Biobord. Results were also discussed further in the meeting of Biobord Developers Group. Platform, Operating Model and Network Agreement development process will be continued based on these discussions.

4.2. Main discussion points of Biobord platform

Biobord survey was conducted in a period from 30.03. to 09.04.2020. 20 respondents took part in it. The results reveal that the users find Biobord useful and they wish to operate with it in the future. The main issue that was raised in the survey was the difficulties of finding relevant content in the Biobord Forum and the navigation in general.

Biobord User Support category was seen as well-functioning and no alterations are needed. Workshop participants saw that Open Biobord should be combined with Network Actions and Network Lounge, with an updated tagging

and symbol or color coding-system. On Stage category was seen as useful but its concept needs further development. These development ideas were discussed with Biobord Developers Group and there will be a poll for other RDI2CluB members to express their vote.

Biobord-platform's future was seen in positive light. There is a need for this platform, but the execution needs more discussion. The following comments were given about the future Biobord:

- **R&D:** The site that can regenerate itself (new users, public funded projects as clients); the use of Biobord is regarded as business as usual for hub network's organizations; news and new services are updated constantly
 - **R&D:** Typical situation for online tools: **difficult to keep in functioning after the project**; public funds to be available (not only project based)
 - **R&D:** The base for the platform is good, and the **network is functioning for future cooperation**; the platform should be offered to new starting projects
 - **R&D:** **Benefits** needs to be presented clearly
 - **R&D:** RDI work – we should get more students involved in international (new specialists when they graduate, show benefits of the network)
 - **Policy:** Tool for partners as a perfect **place, where to search and find solutions and information, as well do project development and MGT**
 - **Policy:** Resource for external stakeholders
 - **Policy:** Need to **feed the platform with valuable content**
 - **Policy:** Point out services across Baltic Sea Region, not only within the hubs.
 - **Business:** **The use of web tools will most likely increase**
 - **Business:** We must use other tools than Biobord for e.g. sharing documents because other businesses are using them. DMS: there have been developed several good alternatives for file sharing after we started discussing this, so we do not see the same need for this as previously. The **DMS is not really user friendly and thus, we should consider if it is really needed to have.**
 - **Business:** We **need to see action and results** of the forum to gain more users
 - **Business:** Biobord should be **more specific on the areas of our expertise than covering bioeconomy as a whole.** Focus more on the specialty of Biobord – more real interaction between partners – making opportunities to all
 - **Business:** **More open communication** on Biobord. It seems as there is much discussion going on in closed groups. More openness about projects partners are about to apply for – they could be of interest to others
 - **Business:** It is **difficult that there are several languages in use**, and that these discussions emerge when you enter the forum
 - **Business:** There is a need for **clarification about the fees**
-
- ➔ The transnational network of Biobord is seen valuable and partners are willing to carry on cooperation
 - ➔ Place for valuable information, solutions and project working
 - ➔ The benefits of Biobord needs to be presented clearly and we should find our own specialty
 - ➔ The use of webtools will arise
 - ➔ Communication should be more open

4.3. Main discussion points of Biobord Operating Model

Biobord Operating Model update was one part of the Biobord workshop agenda. The Operating Model will be updated by PP1 and PP6 during the summer 2020 to its final form. The updating process includes workshop

discussions, best practices collection and RD12CluB commenting round. PP1 and PP6 will update the model to its final form during the summer of 2020.

The Operating Model update gave different perceptions of the document and its purpose. Some thought it was the general guidance for the platform, some for the whole project. The mutual decision was made to have the document mostly for the Biobord network's internal use and an additional shorter guidance for external Biobord users due to the length and information richness of the current Operating Model.

The following comments were given in the workshop's stakeholder groups about the Operating Model:

- **R&D:** We have many forums for the same information. Only content inside RD12CluB. People have presented the same information in many places.
 - **R&D:** More simple instructions needed for SMEs
 - **Policy:** To ease the approach, how a user can find activities in his/her thematic of interest.
 - **Business:** The OMIM has much good information about the hubs and how to use Biobord and is good for we and other professionals joining the network (researchers etc.) to stay up to date on the resources within the network. This is useful information when, e.g., writing project proposals or helping SMEs.
- Easier approach, clearer instructions
- Current Operating Model for Biobord Network's internal use

4.4. Main discussion points of Biobord network

Biobord Network Agreement survey was conducted by PP1 for RD12CluB partners on Biobord in a period from 02.03. to 30.03.2020. All 13 partners answered the survey. Survey results were presented by PP1 in the workshop and groups discussions started after that. As mentioned, the transnational network of Biobord platform has been seen very valuable and cooperation will carry on in future, but the concept of the Network Agreement is not clear. Workshop gave some new aspects for the creation of the first draft of the agreement.

Following comments were given in the stakeholder groups about the future network:

- **R&D:** We see the common future for the network and platform, but we need to **strengthen it, marketing etc.**
 - **R&D:** To maintain the platform, we should be ready to **pay from the service.**
 - **R&D:** We would need a part time person to fix small maintenance work; for example, some new project where this work is included
 - **Policy:** Good tool for cooperation to be continued
 - **Policy:** Possible payment. **Difficult to guarantee funding.** Those who develop contents of the platform, do not pay fee.
 - **Policy:** To talk to higher level stakeholders (ministries, other public authorities, who would be interested in the network activities) about possible funding.
 - **Business:** did not have enough time to comment
- Very valuable network and plans for future cooperation
- Platform's and its network's dissemination need to be strengthened
- There is a need for the platform in future, but funding needs more discussion



4.5. Workshop supporting materials

1. Link to Biobord Survey results: <https://forum.biobord.eu/uploads/short-url/25tGk1dloLzdSGNHoMeh9pWrdYa.pdf>
2. Link to Network Agreement survey results: <https://forum.biobord.eu/uploads/short-url/hb2svbcIM21MrFVvksbQ8h9IO9C.pdf>