



1st Foresight Panel meeting

17 January 2011

Mediterranean Science Commission (CIESM)

Monaco

Chaired by: Frederic Briand (CIESM) and Adi Kellermann (ICES)

Frederic Briand and Adi Kellermann welcomed the meeting participants.

Adi Kellermann, the MARCOM+ Coordinator presented the history and progress of the MARCOM+ process, policy background and the project's objectives.

Frederic Briand made a presentation of the key issues facing the MARCOM+ Foresight Panel, which he saw as revolving around a central question 'How to keep Europe competitive in marine / maritime science within a multipolar world? There were numerous, serious challenges - he said - to take into consideration. For example the discussions should pay attention to (a) the need to invest not only in smarter people but also in employment and in smarter infrastructure systems; (b) to the emergence of a knowledge-based society with brand-new sectors, actors and communication tools; (c) to reducing the many bureaucratic obstacles

remaining in old Europe between scientific innovation and a globally marketable product. All this will likely require new modes of thinking and working. To begin with, new types of cross-sector partnerships - some of them currently tested by CIESM within the MARCOM+ context - were called for between academic, corporate and industrial research, and also between EU and non-EU neighboring countries based on a certain dose of risk, a greater spirit of entrepreneurship and on joint ventures. In closing his preliminary remarks, Frederic Briand invited the participants to make pragmatic suggestions, exchange success stories (and failures) and also explore the possible value of new tools (such as social networks, role video games) in order to enhance awareness, bottom-up and top-down communication, and so prepare the way for a more transparent, increasingly shared, and in the end smarter sea governance.

Highlights of open discussion

Pierpaolo Campostrini opened the discussions by stating that the MARCOM+ community should indeed build upon success stories and endeavor to support implementation of EU policies (Marine Strategy Framework Directive for instance). There the tourism sector is of special importance (we should target tourists with our communication / dissemination activities).

Antoine Dosdat: much of the hitherto work has been organized around commonalities. The suggestion is to also look at gaps and to the findings from national documents such as OCEAN 2025 in UK, IFREMER Strategic plan 2020 in France, which he will forward to the Panel group. Efforts should be also oriented towards a critical analysis of the R&D sectors where there is societal demand in Europe.

Ana-Teresa Caetano: It is also important to take into consideration the ‘Innovation Union’ communication which introduces the ‘European Innovation Research Partnerships’ as an emerging new tool. This tool, which includes more issues than the FP7 public private partnerships (e.g. the innovation property rights issues) will soon substitute them. .

Jean Paul Ducrotoy: We need to integrate our approach with the Venice Platform and communication should be at the roots. The tools for partnerships exist, the incentives are scarce though. Big EU programmes are good to have but we would benefit more from regional research programmes. Regions are depository of local relevance, which tends to be reversed by actions aiming exclusively at global excellence. The challenge is then to integrate these small research programmes into the global scale. One cannot ignore the global market and geopolitics.

An important question is: how do we use the knowledge for the economy? We can sell the knowledge and knowledge tools / models to developing countries. We should look at the economic value of the marine ecosystem services.

Frederic Briand: this was exactly the theme of CIESM Monograph 37 published in 2008

Joop Marquenie: the Wadden Sea is a regional EU sea bordering 3 countries (NL, D and Dk). The social differences between the countries and between the stakeholders even on a national scale made it extremely difficult and complex to develop an agreed common goal for the future despite regular Trilateral Ministry Conferences (www.waddensea-secretariat.org/). A breakthrough was reached in 2002 by bringing all major (5) stakeholders from the 3 countries together (3x5). The process consisted of a scoping of targets, followed by a multi-dimensional scenario analysis. The operation was successful in leading to a common policy for the Wadden Sea and the constitution of the Wadden Sea Forum which is still active and brings together the environment-oriented NGOs and the industry (<http://www.waddensea-forum.org/>). One of the accomplishments involved an oil&gas company allowed to drill in the German sector of the park, based on relocation, as it demonstrated the capacity of the various stakeholders to communicate over an environmentally friendly process (discussion based on facts and willingness to listen). The Wadden Sea recently became a natural World Heritage Site despite the presence of oil and gas production. The regional model of the Wadden Sea, might be applicable to other European Seas and the process of joined stakeholder scoping and scenario analysis, including the constitution of a “European Seas Forum”, may also be of interest to MARCOM+.

Gerhard Schemewski: one can get an impression that the MARCOM+ initiative is focused on biological sciences and technical innovation, while paying not enough attention to the coastal issues covered by the socio-economic sciences. MARCOM could provide a structure that enables inclusion of these issues and sciences, and at the same time enables information flow between the local and pan-European levels. Perhaps one way is to translate some of the information to avoid language barriers.

Geoff Boxshall: Marine protected areas are an emerging tool. So in terms of foresight better governance of such areas in international waters ought to be improved. Another obvious marine and maritime overlap is the aquaculture. As the population develops, managing the growth of aquaculture is an area where the MARCOM Forum can find a niche. Production of aquaculture feed is a global, not a regional problem.

Willem Laros: With the development of the EU Maritime Policy there a science and industrial / commercial stakeholder platform was to be created. The initial platform idea comprised five axis with NGOs having an important role. Here in MARCOM we talk about a science Forum only. We learnt that maritime research is much focused than marine research and that industry here is not necessarily the maritime industry (e.g. cosmetics or medicine). The MARCOM Forum should be created around areas of common interest (like the Wadden Sea common approach). We need to find a form of the forum like a traffic centre. When stakeholders have a question of struggle this can be the place to acquire solutions. You take a

problem and pick up the best people from your pool to deal with an issue. A high level annual conference on success stories and a foresight element should be conducted.

Wojciech Pelczarski: Renewable energy and its impact on the living systems should be considered as one of the future MARCOM Forum issues. Companies got permission to construct wind farms in certain sea areas but we do not know what will happen to these constructions in 50 years or so. Perhaps MARCOM+ can encourage the common use of infrastructure of highly sophisticated equipment.

Adi Kellermann: These issues could be properly addressed within the MARCOM+ Research Infrastructure Development Panel.

Dennis Lisbjerg: infrastructure will be built at sea, not only in the coastal zones. Another issue to tackle could be what kind of impact they will have on the ecosystems. Huge international companies have huge research budgets and we need to make an attempt to collaborate with them.

Karl Stromsem: from the offshore energy industry point of view the innovation and entrepreneurship often originates from small or medium-size companies or even individual people. Unfortunately SMEs can go bankrupt when facing cash flow problems related to their participation in EU FP projects as the money is reimbursed only after a long period of time. As innovation often comes from small scale, local enterprises, a small but fast injection of money could go a long way to help. A good model to consider is a tax relief scheme for companies dealing with R&D. A program is needed to encourage young Europeans to move, for example go to the Far East and get their education there and so come back with different points of view. SME mobility is too scarce in Europe.

In the US the results produced from public money projects are free to use; this system should be copied in Europe. The FP7 'MyOcean' initiative is an example of such action. A link to the 'MyOcean' project should be put into the MARCOM+ webportal (Kostas Nittis to be contacted).

Afternoon discussion on formalization of the future MARCOM Forum, its roles and functionality

The morning session discussed clear examples of success and concrete propositions to enhance inclusion of SMEs, and industry into research processes, to faster connect ideas with market innovation and how to bring the money where the ideas are.

The future MARCOM+ Forum style should become an effective partnership for a more competitive Europe. Integration of younger generations in the Foresight exercise (in particular to optimize communication strategy, among others) was highly recommended. As there will be no long-term Commission funding for the forum, a financing scheme should be developed to maintain access to this large pool of expertise from which to draw specific expert groups on specific issues. Providing advice should preferably be upon request: when

people gather and offer advice hardly anyone will listen to it, but when you are asked for advice it will be heard. The Forum should be a ‘phone number for Europe to call’ whenever a sensitive, cross-sector issue is to be resolved.

For the time being Europe has various groups providing advice in ocean governance issues but operate in isolation from one another. We can consider creating a joint working group providing requested advice and unsolicited advice (published).

The MARCOM+ group comprises a rich, very diverse pool of expertise – and so can carry a cross-sector voice that is wiser and more authoritative than individual voices of single organizations. Perhaps MARCOM+ could be a central portal (hub) where you could get answers on who is doing what (done what) and where can experts and knowledge be found. The party requesting advice will have to finance a meeting of the expert group to acquire a collective answer.

A model of contracting a specific group to make a report / advice and only then seek the review of the whole Forum is not acceptable. A coherent collective view of the stakeholders can be acquired only by involving the whole group from the beginning of each consultancy process. This way the Forum will not ‘carry any national flag’ or represent any particular sector / industry’s business. Collective advice means a considered synthesis of views, not a collection or compilation of different points of view.

A coordinating body / secretariat will be needed to organize the processes. The question of which organization will be willing to do that on their own funds can be tackled on a later stage. In the ICES model an inner member-state can come up with a request for advice – here we can have the same thing: when one network has a question it can consult the whole group.

There is a need of a soft secretariat. MARCOM should not only focus on providing advice but on providing foresight as well. An annual conference would enable the partners to find the proper expertise for their issues. There is no one else doing a foresight activity so cross-wide and interdisciplinary. This is done locally only.

Various financial contribution models failed in the past. A successful financing model is where organizations allocate time / effort to organize a Forum. With a rotating secretariat, partners will be able to allocate time (e.g. half a person) for a certain period of time. Another idea is a rotating chair function instead of a secretariat, thus avoiding the problem of reallocating people each time the secretariat would change venue. A problem may occur with rotation: once you allocate the secretariat in one place you lose the ownership from other players. Then you can abuse it for your purposes. Rotating Chairmanship sounds better.

A successful model of a search engine like Google or Wikipedia can be followed. An online directory of experts can be created. It would have a ‘MARCOM+ quality stamp’ on it.

Annual meetings could be held within the EU Maritime Day (even though it is not a science-driven event) which could become the annual meeting for the Forum. There we could report to relevant communities that we have success and failure stories of cooperation between science and science - industry. An 'auction style' exercise could be profitably added – each interested researcher would have a condensed (5 minutes max) opportunity to present a new concept to ventures and businesses assembled in quest of potential new joint ventures.

There is a gap for a comprehensive platform to provide the EC with relevant consultancy on marine science/ policy issues. The final Forum model could be developed with that in mind.

Meeting participants:

- Geoff Boxshall (Natural History Museum in London)
- Frederic Briand (CIESM)
- Ana-Teresa Caetano (EC DG RTD)
- Pierpaolo Campostrini (Managing director of CORILA)
- Antoine Dosdat, (MARINE BOARD, IFREMER)
- Jean-Paul Ducrotoy (Venice Platform)
- Laura Giuliano (CIESM)
- Adi Kellermann (ICES)
- Willem Laros (Chairman of CESA, secretary of Waterborne)
- Dennis Lisbjerg (EFARO)
- Joop Marquenie (Ex advisor for Shell, Trilateral Commission for the Wadden Sea)
- Wojciech Pelczarski (Sea Fisheries Institute)
- Gerald Schernewski (Baltic Sea Research Institute, President of German EUCC)
- Karl Stromsem (European Ocean Energy Association)
- Wojciech Wawrzynski (ICES)