



# MARCOM+

---

Integrating Marine & Maritime Science Communities

**Policy Interface**

**1<sup>st</sup> panel meeting**

**Report**

**14th February 2011**

**IMARES, Ijmuiden, the Netherlands**

**Chaired by: Fritz Köster and Adi Kellermann**

The meeting commenced with a welcome statement by Luc Van Hoof, Executive Secretary of the European Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization followed by an introduction by Adi Kellermann, presenting the MARCOM+ initiative's background and goals, specifically to establish a sustainable and long-lasting partnership forum (European Marine and Maritime Science and Technology Forum) utilizing tested dialogue and cooperation mechanisms allowing for more intense communication in marine and maritime research. The agenda was presented and adopted by the group.

Fritz Köster presented the Policy Interface Panel objectives to:

- 1) **present and validate project conclusions and recommendations**, i.e. to provide information to the wider marine, maritime and coastal community about the project, to re-iterate findings with marine and maritime stakeholders and to advise the Steering Committee and WPs in finalisation of conclusions and recommendations of project;

- 2) contribute to the development of a consensus between scientific community, industry, policy and decision makers on **implications of MARCOM+ project findings** for the European Maritime Policy and the European Strategy for Marine and Maritime Research;
- 3) Suggest actions to strengthen marine and maritime research in support of integrated ocean governance and linking it to technology development, including suggestions for funding **mechanisms and processes** identifying specialised infrastructures, data collection and handling system and information management technology.

Finally Fritz Köster reminded of the main question throughout the project being ‘how the Marine and Maritime Science and Technology Forum can be established and sustained after the project’s life cycle’.

The panel questioned whether the European parliament should be involved beyond the commission services from relevant directorates? - The Coordinator replied that links are already being established with the European Parliament Intergroup on Seas and Coastal Affairs.

Willem Laros explained the relations between EMAR2RES and MARCOM+ (EMAR2RES initiative being focused on maritime transport). The two projects have a number of common partners and what is developed in the EMAR2RES project is in line with the MARCOM initiative. There will be a combined ‘final’ conference of the two initiatives. Both the projects started with the issue of the EU Maritime Policy document.

The EMAR2RES workshops show that there is common interest in establishing links between the marine and maritime community. These work best when discussing concrete topics, leading to further work with underwater noise and Impact of climate change. The experience of the EMAR2RES should be analysed to draw conclusions for the MARCOM process.

The European Platform on Biodiversity or EPBRS was mentioned as a model for cooperation.

Niall McDonough presented the state of work in Work Package 4 (Developing and sustaining the partnership of marine and maritime research representative organizations) and its two major outcomes to date: Deliverable 4.1.1 (The identification of existing European marine and maritime research representative organisations) and 4.1.2 (A matrix of commonalities amongst European organisations representing marine and maritime research organisations).

Niall McDonough pointed out that the mapping exercise of organisations might need an extension of second level organisations as for example maritime organisations are represented at present by rather overarching organisations and that the catalogue will be updated continuously throughout the MACOM+ lifetime.

Furthermore, the conducted analyses on services provided and needs to do so, should be interpreted carefully as needs identified by service providers do not necessarily correspond to

needs required by the customers. In any case, services most offered comprise: i) Marine research, ii) Marine conservation and protection and iii) Training and education, while services least offered are i) Structural mechanics, ii) Production processes and iii) Navigation.

Feedback from the panel:

Andris Andrusaitis: information and data handling networks could be considered in the chart (e.g. EMODNET), as well as biodiversity networks.

As a potential biodiversity network to be included is the ESFRI project LIFEWATCH dealing with e-science and technology infrastructure for biodiversity data and observatories was mentioned.

Willem Brugge: more info on the coverage of geographic regions would be an asset, as an example he mentioned Regional Advisory Councils. Fritz Köster in response: regional info is available in WP3 and will be presented later.

Martin Pastoors: social and economic science organizations representing the maritime issues could also be included (e.g. the MARE network social sciences (<http://www.marecentre.nl>) or EAFE the European Association of Fisheries Economists (<http://www.cedem.eu/eafe.php>)).

PIP members were encouraged to provide further suggestions after the meeting by contacting the panel coordinators.

Aage Damsgaard presented Work Package 1 (Setting the Policy Scene): Deliverables 1.1. (Synthesis of the policy scene) and 1.3. (Priorities and commonalities report). The conducted literature review of EU documents and scientific articles, revealed a red thread through EU policy documents from the Lisbon Strategy to the publication of the European Strategy for Marine and Maritime Research in 2008. However, the challenge of establishing mechanisms for acquiring marine and maritime scientific and technological expertise has hardly been addressed. Only a few attempts to integrate the marine and maritime research agendas exist and there is a clear need for an integrated marine and maritime research.

The review of existing scientific and technology interdisciplinary knowledge exchange between the marine scientific and maritime technology communities identified four main focus areas and commonalities: i) Interdisciplinary knowledge exchange, ii) data collection, iii) sustainable exploitation and iv) dissemination and enlightenment of European citizens. . However, the study revealed only a very limited number of projects with existing databases with the potential for interdisciplinary research.

Feedback from the panel:

Andris Andrusaitis: sector specific policies like Common Fisheries Policy and the Common Agriculture Policy seem to be missing in the review.

The Work package leader should also ensure that the search include relevant council and parliament documents. Also, some international level agreements e.g. on biodiversity influence EU level policies.

Albert Salman: from the need of policy perspective there is a reason for the Consortium to look at the Marine Strategy Framework Directive, as the work towards Good Environmental Status (GES) will foster collaboration and be important in setting the policy scene.

Willem Brugge: ICES database should feed the implementation of the MSFD.

Adi Kellermann in response: ICES is a part of the EMOD-Net initiative and the ICES data centre is publicly available and open to join efforts in any MSFD-related initiative.

Ana-Teresa Caetano: the next Ocean of Tomorrow call will be focused around the MSFD implementation.

Ana-Teresa Caetano: The Green Paper: From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding (COM(2011)48), released earlier this month calls for position papers on future EU research organization and funding.

Wojciech Wawrzynski: The mentioned Green Paper aims to maximise the contribution of EU research and innovation funding in the process of the Innovation Union policy implementation. The important thing is that it goes down to detailed practicalities level like:

- Simplification of European procedures in the innovation chain (the issue was raised in the MARCOM+ video).
- SME / industry participation supported under the FPs and the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme – at the same time it aims at integrating the ESFRI initiatives into the ERA context – so it covers the work of MARCOM+ Research Infrastructure Development Panel.
- It deals with inefficiencies of the research governance system.

That is why the MARCOM+ Consortium should take part in the stakeholder consultation process. A position paper from the marine / maritime scientific communities channelled through the emerging MARCOM+ Forum sounds like a brilliant test case for our endeavour.

Mike Mannaart presented the goals and achievements of Work Package 3 (Strategic activities and regional links): Deliverable 3.1 (Review of regional research governance frameworks and partnerships) for the purpose of future articulation of maritime governance at the EU level. The inventory included case studies, interviews at all regional seas as well as internet and literature search. An extensive list of recommendations from external experts to the Consortium has been created, which includes inter alia the following:

- A marine and maritime research governance plan should be written and regarded as the major goal of the future MARCOM Forum.
- This plan has to be the basis for regional plans reflecting the needs of the regional sea basins, including not only EU member states, but neighbouring countries as well.
- To achieve that, key organizations should connect under one EU marine stakeholder platform, integrating regional platforms for each regional sea.
- Regional Research Governance Frameworks (RRGF's) need to be established.

- It should be investigated what funding mechanisms can sustain such a RRGF's with administrative loads being minimized.
- It should be investigated how stakeholders could contribute and participate in RRGF's.
- An integrated approach for data management of the regional sea is needed and should be based on already existing programmes, e.g. SEADATANET and EMODNET.
- Insufficient regional capacity building needs to be addressed in a coordinated way.

Feedback from the coordinator:

Adi Kellermann: We should focus on creation of our within-science' bottom-up driven forum as this is our major task to be completed within the next 10 months. The governance plan we should develop as far as possible, and will be a part of the future Forum's terms of reference. Efforts to include other fora that are being created in parallel should be of secondary importance; otherwise we could fail by trying to be over-encompassing.

Feedback from the panel:

Niall McDonough: we need to take on board what is happening in the landscape and be open to collaborate with other frameworks. In the specific governance plan we should tackle issues like how the Forum should work and what it should deliver.

Torgeir Edvardsen: The Joint Programming Initiative on 'Healthy and productive seas and oceans' will be much larger than the ERANET SEAS-ERA. As a top-down driven approach, it already now needs an influence from the bottom-up level, specifically it's scientific Board needs a forum to meet different scientific views.

Albert Salman: One should not forget that we do strive to create new forms of research governance (which is stated on page 1 of the MARCOM description of work).

Andris Andrusaitis: a new model of research governance must come as a result of this project. If MARCOM+ is not able to deliver a new marine and maritime research governance model than it would have failed. BONUS experience shows that these tasks are very challenging and especially stakeholder consultations are difficult. The creation of the BONUS Forum of Sectoral Research was a tough job.

Danielle Dessi: The regional approach to research funding issues should be taken into consideration. It should involve non-European countries.

The current FP has some topics covering regional aspects, and the rationality is also an issue in future funding mechanism ("new FP"). For the MARCOM process we need an overview of regional funding, that can support RRGF. It could be considered if more lessons could be learned from the BONUS experience.

Isabel Sousa Pinto: important to have both regional and pan-European level, as it is relevant to tackle issues at different level. Also, the MSFD operates with 8 regions.

Willem Laros: Regions are typically an irrelevant level to address issues for the industry as most issues are at least pan-European.

Niall McDonough: We could also consider a structure that is problem-oriented, not region oriented, but has regional scales and components.

Albert Salman: the MARCOM Forum structure should not have regional sub-components as there might raise a funding issue, but we need a pan-European platform which will address regional specificities.

Fritz Köster: Low cost is not the goal in the future MARCOM+ Forum structure. The issue is what kind of success measures do we recognize and how to achieve them. Summarising the tendency in the discussion: establish forum and let forum draft governance plan, which should be problem oriented and on European level, however, with regional components.

Adi Kellermann presented the up-to date results of Work Package 2 (Testing cross-sector links between research and industry), Deliverables 2.1 (Blue biotechnologies and nanotechnologies in maritime transport), and 2.3 (Blue biotechnologies for biomedical sectors) and partly 2.2 (Marketing opportunities for jellyfishes) on behalf of the Mediterranean Science Commission. During respective workshops, the maritime industrial sector reacted most pragmatically to the opportunities presented by marine science. Obviously intrigued by the broad range of blue (bio)nanotechnological potentials for enhancing performance and eco-compatibility of maritime transport, the industry representatives quickly moved towards concrete collaborative research projects. The biomedical sector response appeared more fragmented, and also less open, due to the diversified, and often competing, range of objectives among the pharmacology industry representatives.

Complex, inappropriate national bureaucraties, and the lack of harmonized, transparent regulations on issues such as access rights, benefit sharing and intellectual property, were seen as hampering innovation and slow down research/ industry cooperation in Europe. Participants expressed the need for new national policies that should be more flexible and inspired by market analyses rather than by top down rigid planning.

Feedback from the panel:

Willem Laros: during the WP 2 workshops we found that marine / maritime scope is only a part of the discussion. The medical industry is an example of something going beyond what the consortium had perceived (and the industry not recognising themselves as “maritime”).

Adi Kellermann: There is a conflict of timing. Industry and other stakeholders (users – also decision makers) work on a short timescale. Scientists are used to longer time frames for their projects. The industry was perceived as re-acting not so much pro-active, the dilemma is that they are reluctant to reveal what they are working on. Also, time is perceived as money, and thus especially SMEs look for concrete results from meetings.

Ana-Teresa Caetano: SME involvement is requested in FP7 cooperation projects now and there exist also other FP programmes which finance science – industry cooperation, likely to increase programme succeeding FP7.

Niall McDonough presented the outcome of the Marine and Maritime Partnership open fora (Task 4.2.). This was followed by the presentation of an initial model for the Future MARCOM Forum (developed under the task 4.3 ‘Assessment of the modalities and instruments to best address the sustainability of the Partnership’). The big question mark of this task and the whole project is how do we organize the future structure and engage the other stakeholders to deliver concrete recommendations. This should be a central point of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Open Forum agenda. The initial model foresees a high level steering committee of the Forum and several thematic lines (e.g. transport / food /energy). The Forum would work upon request choosing experts relevant to a specific theme. An annual meeting has also been envisaged.

Feedback from the panel:

Willem Brugge: what existing groups/committees does such a new model replace or integrate institutional wise? We should avoid the creation of more structures without deleting existing once.

Niall McDonough: a new structure has to be created as we were challenged in the project to develop one. It can be a challenge approach with a light structure specifying the appropriate regional/sectorial/pan-EU level for each challenge.

Willem Laros: per definition the new structure will add opportunities so it is not to replace anything but to create added value.

Danielle Dessi: future experts for the Forum work should not be chosen on a national basis not to ‘hold any flag’. Danielle also noted that, the MARCOM consortium should consider how to measure success and performance of the mechanism.

Albert Salman: the ‘Group of 10’ is still available and could also play a role in the Future Forum.

Andris Andrusaitis: a regional approach to the Forum work would require some thinking but is workable. Another thing is: the Open Forum lists of participants do not show a significant number of end-users. It is suggested to intensify invitations to the industry when the second Open Forum is organized.

Isabel Sousa Pinto: In the biodiversity field they try to include policy (and to a limited extent) also industry in planning of research. The conclusion is that it is difficult to get the policy makers on board, and therefore recommend focused topics and focus on policy needs.

Adi Kellermann presented the outcome of the 1<sup>st</sup> MARCOM+ Interdisciplinary Dialogue Across Science (IDDAS) / Research Infrastructure Development Panel (RID) and the 1<sup>st</sup> MARCOM+ Foresight Panel (FS) meetings.

The mission of the IDDAS panel is to explore links and synthesize capacities and priorities of various actors/components of marine and maritime research in Europe in order to:

- identify initiatives and potential for synergies that could lead to more interdisciplinary research,
- explore mechanisms to implement this interdisciplinary approach,
- identify priority issues that call for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral research.

The mission of the RID panel is to provide a coordinated approach to development of marine research infrastructure by:

- mapping and analyzing the existing initiatives and identifying synergies and gaps,
- proposing new mechanisms for joint investments and sharing infrastructures between marine and maritime research organizations including the industry,
- establishing a dialogue with the funding agencies (through SEASERA) in order to harmonize with national priorities and secure implementation,
- coordination with various marine related ESFRI projects.

The IDDAS and RID panels had a back to back meeting and conducted a SWOT analyses for reaching their objectives. Some intersessional work was initiated, e.g. on oceanic and coastal observatory priorities, considering cross-sectoral needs. Both IDDAS and RID Panel are in preparation for next meeting (4-6. April), so feedback is timely.

The mission of the FS Panel is to review project findings and collect broad stakeholder views on current and future marine and maritime science development. It should help decision makers to formulate new policies in the marine /maritime sectors (e.g. restoring and preserving environment; improving public health; providing renewable energy), including to:

- promote technological/ methodological breakthroughs,
- ensure research funding, e.g. from setting safe levels to reviewing how publicly funded biotech patents can be administered for greatest societal benefit.
- suggest new instruments to coordinate actions at regional level and improved mechanisms for sharing regional maritime governance with non-EU countries.

The FS panel conducted a brainstorm session on success stories (and failures), the possible value of new tools (such as social networks) in order to enhance awareness, bottom-up and top-down communication to prepare the way for a more transparent, increasingly shared, and in the end smarter marine research governance. Furthermore, the FS panel discussed the set-up of the future Forum, specifically processes needed to generate collective and objective advice, the needs for a secretariat and chairmanship.

Feedback from the panel:

As the panel had a discussion about the set-up of the future forum already in relation to the Open Forum presentation, the feedback focussed on IDDAS and RID.

The panel members expressed the need to include more representatives from the maritime research world including industry into the IDDAS and RID panel.

Torgeir Edvardsen: business professional exhibitions would be a model to bring in industry in spite of scientific conferences. The question ‘what are your obstacles for the industry to get engaged in research projects’ should be asked, and solutions should be sought.

Peter Ehlers: a reversed ‘auction style’ could be applied on such meetings: industry would make specific requests and scientists could present what research is needed. Peter also mentioned that it could be relevant to explore what “bureaucratic obstacles” the industry perceives in participating in EU/government funded projects.

Martin Pastoors: was the job of the RID panel really to identify priorities for future infrastructure or to contribute to the design of a process allowing this prioritisation in more transparent and objective was.

Fritz Köster in response: the work programme certainly focuses on the latter.

Torgeir Edvardsen presented the outcome of the 1<sup>st</sup> MARCOM+ Technology Transfer panel meeting.

The mission of the TT Panel is to investigate appropriate mechanisms to support technology transfer:

- identifying cross cutting synergies with respect to research and industrial implementation/application of knowledge,
- possibilities of technology transfer between the sectors and mechanisms to accomplish such transfer (e.g. maritime ↔ offshore work platforms (oil/gas) ↔ aquaculture and vice versa).

The TT Panel concluded that MARCOM deals more with knowledge than technology transfer and this term should be used to describe the three-hump model process (basic-applied knowledge – technology development). The Panel made an effort to work out an inventory of areas/issues where input from marine and maritime science is needed. For more information please see the ‘conclusions from the TT Panel meeting presentation.

Feedback from the panel:

Willem Laros: There is a difference in what we are trying to build up here and a technology platform. The TPs are more focused on a topic. There is no conflict because in the MARCOM Forum we do try to bring TPs together.

Willem Brugge: The mentioned Green Paper: From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding is of great

importance to the MARCOM group. No response to the Green Paper will be regarded as lack of interest and can lower funding for marine and maritime research in the future.

The group agreed that not responding the Green Paper consultation process is not an option. In practice a common position paper from the marine and maritime research communities with a 'stamp' of the MARCOM Consortium should be compiled within 3,5 weeks. ESF-MB and ICES will begin drafting the position paper.

#### Finalising the meeting

The second MARCOM+ Policy Interface Panel meeting has been scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> of November 2011, in Lisbon, inviting the same members including DG ENV.

On the basis of the conclusions from this panel meeting and other panel meetings the Consortium will work out the model of the future Forum (on its next Steering Committee meeting in June). This model will be presented to the communities outside of the Consortium on the 2<sup>nd</sup> MARCOM+ Open Forum in September. The November PIP meeting will give the model its final shape to be considered at the final Steering Committee meeting at the end of 2011.

The Coordinator will make sure the PIP members keep receiving information that have a relevance to sketching the final MARCOM Forum structure.

The PIP members were generally positive towards structuring the future mechanism around major Challenges and recommended that MARCOM+ consortium elaborate more on that model, ensuring flexibility in the approach for each challenge, based on the regional, sectorial relevance of the themes that are elements of the challenge. The PIP members were encouraged to initiate discussions in their own network – own policy environment - to provide ideas and recommendations back to the project on how the future research governance mechanism should look like. PIP members were also encouraged to provide further feedback to the project deliverables. Any feedback can be communicated to either panel leaders.

#### Meeting participants:

- Andris Andrusaitis, BONUS 185 programme;
- Willem Brugge, EC DG MARE;
- Ana-Teresa Caetano, EC DG RTD;
- Aage Damsgaard, European Council for Maritime Applied Research, FORCE Denmark;
- Danielle Dessi – Italian Ship Model Basin, National Research Council Italy;
- Torgeir Edvardsen, European Aquaculture and Innovation Platform, SINTEF;
- Peter Ehlers – EuroGOOS;

- Courtney Hough, Federation of European Aquaculture Producers, European Aquaculture and Innovation Platform;
- Adi Kellermann, ICES Head of Science Programme, MARCOM+ Coordinator;
- Fritz Köster, EFARO, DTU AQUA;
- Willem Laros, Secretary of Waterborne Technology Platform, chairman of the European Shipbuilding Association – CESA;
- Dennis Lisbjerg, European Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization, DTU AQUA;
- Mike Mannaart, Coastal and Marine Union;
- Niall McDonough, European Science Foundation Marine Board;
- Martin Pastoors – Centre of Marine Policy Netherlands;
- Albert Salman, Coastal and Marine Union;
- Isabel Sousa Pinto, Centre of Marine Environment Research, University of Porto MarBEF, MARS, EUROMARINE;
- Wojciech Wawrzynski, ICES Scientific Cooperation Secretary.