AgriSPIN Deliverable 1.2

Report on a methodological guide for documentation and selection of AgriSPIN innovation cases

"Insights into the proto framework, innovation portfolio scheme and innovation selection guide in AgriSPIN.

Hycenth T. Ndah[1], Andrea Knierim[1,] Alex Koutsouris[2], Syndhia Mathé[3], Ludovic Temple[3], Bernard Triomphe[3], Eelke Wielinga[4]

[1]*University of Hohenheim (UoH),*
Department of Rural Sociology, Schloss, Museumsflügel, 70599 Stuttgart, 70593 Stuttgart Germany

[2]*Agricultural University of Athens (AUA),*
Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Iera Odos 75, Athens, 11855, Greece

[3]*UMR Innovation – Cirad,*
Environments and Societies / Joint research unit INNOVATION, TA C-85/15 - 73, rue Jean-François Breton, MONTPELLIER Cedex 5, 34398, France

[4]*Dutch Southern Farmers Organisation (Netherlands) (ZLTO),*
Vakmanschap & Ondernemerschap, Onderwijsboulevard 225, s Hertogenbosch, 5223 DE, Netherlands

Content

1   Introduction

This deliverable reports on a methodological guide developed with the aim of documenting and selecting a wide diversity of innovation cases for the cross visits within the AgriSPIN project as they can be found in different European rural regions (including overseas), farming and agro-food systems. The activity has been under the responsibility of the science team of AgriSPIN led by UHOH in close collaboration with AUA, CIRAD and ZLTO. Like the case of Task 1.1 (Conceptual framework), mentioned templates in this deliverable have been developed and finalised by the science team after obtaining and integrating feedback from practice partners.

2   Innovation case documentation: Proto-framework and innovation portfolio scheme

The process of candidate's innovation cases documentation in AgriSPIN followed a systematic approach starting with a request on practice partners to document 5-10 innovation cases of their choice. This documentation was guided by: 1) an innovation **proto framework** (template 1) (see Annex 1) and, 2) an **innovation portfolio scheme (template 2a and 2b)** (See Annex 2). The purpose of the templates developed and reported on in this deliverable have been, to systematically guide the case identification and documentation process. The following sub section reports on the various templates developed by the science team in consultation with practice partners, highlighting their respective objectives and role in guiding the case description process while detail outline of the complete versions are found at the Annex of this document.

Proto-framework (template 1)

The proto-framework is a template focused on capturing information with regard to the specific innovation suggested by the practice partner. Main objective is to assist the partners in characterising their innovation cases in a way that gives insights into specific features of the set innovation. The template consists of an item column (innovation scope and scale, actors involved, innovation process description, cross visit conditions), a category column (with a total of 19 questions grouped under the respective items) and a description column (with spaces for answers to questions under the category column (see Annex 1 for a complete template).

Innovation portfolio (Template 2a and b)

In order to have possible combinations for suggested innovation cases, partners were asked to fill out a portfolio scheme (template 2a and b). It consists of sample combinations to the suggested innovation cases under the proto-framework. Provided combinations in the table are just examples and partners are expected to replace this with real examples according to their judgment based on provided information for cases under proto-framework. This is divided up into two types: templates 2a and 2b.

While 2a brings out the possible combinations during a likely Cross Visit from the perspective of the practice partner in terms of **organisational suitability**, **2b r**eveals information with regards to **content suitability** – a quick step ahead to assisting in the case selection process (See Annex 2 a and 2b)

3   Innovation case review process: selection guide

In order to carry out a systematic and bias free selection process, the science team started by first drafting and agreeing on a selection guide (see Annex 3, template 3) as basis for reviewing the submitted innovation cases from partners – a first step to selecting the submitted innovation candidate cases for processing during the cross visit.

This selection guide has a very close link with the conceptual framework of the project (1.1), hence the intention has been to create a systematic and harmonious link between the final selected innovation cases and the conceptual background of the project. Embedding understanding behind scientific concepts to the selection of innovation cases therefore serves as a science - practice grounding of "cross visits" (based on these innovations) which is as well a key element for the entire project.

This was followed by the allocation of received cases to different institutions/members of the science team for a detailed cross examination using the selection guide (Annex 3). In this

regard, two partners of the Science Group examined cases from one country individually and in parallel, following this set of previously agreed upon guide (see Annex 3). Care was taken to safeguard against the possibility of partners reviewing their own cases.

First feedback by reviewers was then exchanged in a joint Science Group and Steering Committee meeting in Paris (26.06.2015) followed by a second selection meeting in Brabant, Netherlands (11.09.2015). In cases where more information was needed, the responsible partners were directly asked to complement the case by providing more information to assist in the decision process before a final suggestion to reject or accept the innovation case.

Main purpose of this review-selection-dialogue[1] procedure was purposely meant to ensure a simple and understandable as well as transparent measure of judgment, against the different innovations cases provided by partners - a necessary precondition for deciding on suitable cases for the AgriSPIN "cross visit".

3.1 Applicability and limitation of the selection guide

After applying the selection guide (see Annex 3) for submitted innovation candidate cases by partners, the Science Group members realised that this guide was very useful for having a deep insight and understanding of the submitted cases. However, it was not fully effective in arriving at a point of suggesting which case should be selected and which to be rejected.

It was in this regard that during the Paris joint Science Group and Steering Committee meeting (25 and 26-6-2015), the Science Group further proposed a number of much stricter criteria that would necessary lead to the exclusion of cases as well as take on board those that offer much to see and exchange on during the cross visit. These criteria ensured a simple and transparent selection procedure. In some cases where necessary, final decision on selected cases was to be arrived at after a close dialogue with the responsible partner (see footnote). For those with promising features but limited information, partners were asked to further fill in this gap.

Specifically, **cases were to be excluded, if**

1. they do not portray or have a multi-actor approach/component (< 3 different actors) with at least one farmer / farmer org.

2. they do not have a minimum history and no implementation by the time of the Cross visit

3. they do not have an innovation support component and, the 'innovation angle' is not clear .

---

[1] Review-selection-dialogue: procedure where science team members first reviewed the submitted cases, arrived at a tentative decision, dialogued with the practice partners where necessary before concluding on rejection or acceptance

4 Concluding remark

Worthy to note is the understanding that, the Science Group's role here was seen as making proposals/suggestions only, while on these bases, the Steering Committee had to then strongly recommend choices for partners. Partners were expected to take this as a feedback on what was interesting to be investigated in the frame of the AgriSPIN action and research project. But at the end, it was the practice partner who organised and decided where to take the entire AgriSPIN Group after having received all the necessary guidance leading to this decision. In situations where nobody was interested in what the partner proposed, the set partner had to reconsider the offer made. The Science Group remained ready at any point to enter into dialogue about specific cases where necessary.

5   Annex 1: Proto-framework template

Hosts: Please propose at least 5 cases for innovations that may be visited in the frame of AgriSPIN - 'Success' isn't a must, 'failures' are equally welcome!

 Please note that we have a very broad understanding of 'innovation' (*something that constitutes a lasting change for the better within a social system*) and that all sorts (technical, organizational, production, process, incremental, radical etc.) may be included.

Your ' AgriSPIN partner name':……………………………………………………………………………

Name and E-Mail address of person in charge for this case:

Name………………………………..email………………………….

Template 1: Proto framework for characterisation of innovation cases		
Items	**Categories**	**Short description**
	1. **Acronym** and or **short name** of the innovation case and Country / location	
Innovation scope and scale	2. **What is it all about?** Please give **a short description** of the case in 3 – 5 sentences; if not evident, explain link to agriculture.	
	3. Time span from the beginning of the innovation: • a long time ago and is recently finish • a long time ago and is still ongoing • of recent and is ongoing	
	4. Geographical scale of innovation (local, regional, national, international)	
Actors involved	5. Main actor initiating and/or driving the innovation process (private sector, advisory services, farmers' organization, research, etc.)	
	6. Multi-actor at some stage (please describe actors as e.g. researchers, policy makers, advisors, farmers (small, medium, big)) If possible, give a rough number of how many people are involved in the innovation process	
	7. Advisory service systems (public, private, farmer based, NGO) involved?	
	8. Were/are there support services in the innovation	

	process, which?	
Innovation process description	9. To what is the innovation responding? or what is mainly driving the innovation?, e.g. technological or political change?	
	10. Were/are there challenges throughout the process? Which one(s)?	
	11. How widely is it used? • In terms of geographical scale • In terms of frequency of application (e.g. training courses) • In terms of numbers of adopters • Or type of farmers (e.g. small, med., big)	
	12. What effect(s) are produced by the innovation? (Note, it needn't necessarily be a success case)	
	13. What do you expect to become of the innovation in the near future?	
Cross-visit conditions	14. Documentation available (a lot, some, little) in what language? Describe briefly the type of media	
	15. Why do you think this is a case worth visiting?	
	16. What would you like to get out of the visit for you/ for the hosts?	
	17. Are there potential synergies of the cross visits (financial, material resources…) with other projects or initiatives?	
	18. Are there limiting conditions for visiting the innovation?	
	19. Indicate accessibility (material conditions, travel time, language requirements etc)	
	20. What is the best time of the year for the visit? (weather conditions, availability)	

6   Annex 2: Innovation portfolio scheme

Host: Please indicate for all the innovation cases that you propose for the Cross Visits whether and how they could be combined for organisational reasons and/or for content reasons.

Your 'AgriSPIN partner name':

Name and E-Mail address of person in charge for this portfolio:

Name…………………………………………email……………………

Template 2a: Possible combinations for **organisational suitability**							
Innovation Acronym	Inno. A	Inn. B	Inn. C	Inn. D	Inn. E	*Insert more columns if necessary*	*Comment and/or explain in a few words reasons for your combination*
EXAMPLE 1 Possible org. combination ***(Inno.A, Inno.C, Inno.E)*** **COMBINATION 1**	X		X		X		
EXAMPLE 2 Possible org. combination ***(Inno.A, Inno.B, Inno.C)*** **COMBINATION 2**	x	X	x				
EXAMPLE 3 Possible org. combination ***(Inno.B, Inno.D, Inno.E)*** **COMBINATION 3**		X		x	x		

Notes:
In order to have possible combinations for your suggested innovation cases, with regards to organizational suitability, please fill in the areas above mark in yellow. The abbreviations (Inno. A, Inno.B, Inno.C, Inno.D, Inno.E) all represent the different innovation cases which you have described in the proto framework. The combinations in this table mark yellow (Table 1) and X X are just examples and you will have to replace this with real examples according to your judgment. From the above combinations, which one will you preferred most suitable in terms of organisational issues?.............................

Innovation Acronym	Inn. A	Inn. B	Inn. C	Inn. D	Inn. E	*Insert more columns if necessary*	*Comment and/or explain in a few words reasons for your combination*
Template 2b: Possible combinations for **contents matching suitability**							
EXAMPLE 1 *Possible well matching contents combination* ***(Inno.B, Inno.C,& Inno.D)*** **COMBINATION 1**		x	x	X			
EXAMPLE 2 *Possible well matching contents combination* ***(Inno.A, Inno.B, & Inno.E)*** **COMBINATION 2**	x	x			x		
EXAMPLE 3 Possible well matching contents combination **(Inno.B, Inno.C, & Inno.E)** **COMBINATION 3**		x	x		x		

Notes.

In order to have possible combinations for your suggested innovation cases, with regards to ***content matching suitability****, please fill in the areas above mark in yellow. The abbreviations (Inno. A, Inno.B, Inno.C, Inno.D, Inno.E) all represent the different innovation cases which you have described in the proto framework. The combinations in this table mark yellow (Table 2) and* ***X X*** *are just examples and you will have to replace this with real examples according to your judgment.*

From the suggested combinations (table 2), which one will you preferred most suitable in terms of ***matching contents?……………………………..?***

7   Annex 3: Innovation case review guide

Link D1.2	Q N°	Selection questions/criteria and link with the innovation framework and portfolio	Inno.A	Inno.B	Inno. C	Inno.D	Inno.E	Inno.F	etc

Innovation characterization, scope and scale	Q2	1) From the case description: does it reveal the innovation's key characteristics? Please insert dominant characteristic(s):
		  a. Technological(TN)
		  b. Social (SC)
		  c. Institutional (IT)
		  d. Organizational (OZ)
		  e. Others (OT)							

	Q2	2) Which further characteristics fit to the innovation? Please insert the abbreviation (s):
		  a. Plant Production (PP)
		  b. Animal Production (AP)
		  c. Processing of products (PC)
		  d. Marketing of products (MK)
		  e. Others (OT)							

	Q2	3) Does the innovation reveal its key category?
		  a. Incremental (IC)
		  b. Radical (RD)
		  c. Transformational (TR)							

	Q3	4) What is the state/time span of the innovation?
		  a. Recently finished
		  b. Ongoing for a long time now?
		  c. Recently started?							

	Q4	5) What is the scale of the innovation?
		  a. Local?
		  b. Regional?
		  c. National?
		  d. International?							

	Q11	6) What are estimated numbers of adopters? Specify if possible							
Multi- Actor processes, system innovation processes and AIS/AKIS	Q 6	7) Does the case involve a multi actor component? (Yes or No)							

	Q7	8) If answer to the question 7) is yes, if possible specify who plays a leading role:
		  a. Researchers?
		  b. Farmers?
		  c. Policy makers?
		  d. Advisers?							

	Q 1 / 5	9) Are farmers / farmers' organisations involved? (Yes or No)							

Innovation intermediation process	Q7	10) Are advisory services involved? (Yes or No)								
	Q8	11) Any identified support services in the innovation process for the innovation case? (Yes or No), if yes, what was the configuration of actors that provide support services in the innovation process? a. One actor? b. Pluralistic actors? c. Not applicable?								
Cross visit conditions	Q 17	12) Are there synergies related to the cross visit of this innovation with other projects or initiatives? (Yes or No)								
	Portfolio, table 1	13) Does this case fall in the most preferred combination suggested by the partners in terms of organizational matching suitability? (Yes or No, or not applicable: NA)								
	Portfolio, table 2	14) Does this case fall into the most preferred combination suggested by the partners in terms of content matching? (Yes or No, or Not applicable: NA)								
Make your selection decision with an X for selected and R for reject based on provided information										
Rank the selected cases by attributing numbers 1, 2, 3 etc for first, second and third positions respectively										
Any further comments/explanation if necessary										