



Nutri2Cycle

D.8.1 Report of the kick off meeting

Deliverable:	Report of the kick off meeting
Author(s):	Evi Michels, Ghent University
Quality review:	Final version
Dissemination Type	Public
Date:	29/01/2019 (revised 15/12/2020)
Grant Agreement N°:	773682
Starting Date:	01/10/2018
Duration:	48 months
Coordinator:	Prof. Erik Meers, Ghent University
Contact details:	Erik.meers@UGent.be





1. Table of Contents

1. Table of Contents.....	2
2. General introduction & agenda	3
3. Minutes of meeting.....	5
3.1 Work package 1.....	5
3.2 Work package 2.....	6
3.3 Work package 3.....	8
3.4 Work package 4.....	9
3.5 Work package 5.....	10
3.6 Work package 6.....	11
3.7 Work package 7	12
3.8 Work package 8	13





2. General introduction & agenda

The kick off meeting of the Nutri2Cycle project took place on 22-23/11/2018 in Ghent at the Faculty of Bioscience Engineering of Ghent University.

All partners were represented at the meeting. The following delegates attended:

	Institute	Participant
1.	Ghent University	Erik Meers Evi Michels Ivona Sigurnjak Angela Sainz Arnau Hongzhen Luo
2	Universita Degli Studi Di Milano	Fabrizio Adani Ambrogio Pigoli Bruno Rizzi Giuliana D'Imporzano
3	Politechnika Czestochowska	Krystyna Malinska Małgorzata Kacprzak
4	United Experts	Filip Raymaekers Lies Bamelis
5	Fundacion Cartif	Dolores Hidalgo Francisco Corona
6	Johann Heinrich Von Thuenen Institut	Alexander Gocht Jorg Rieger Yusuf Nadi Karatay
7	Soltub	Zoltan Hajdu
8	Stichting Wageningen Research	Oene Oenema Piet Groenendijk JanPeter Lesschen
9	Instituto Superior de Agronomia	David Fangueiro
10	Kobenhavns Universitet	Lars Stoumann Jensen Sander Bruun
11	Terra Humana	Edward Someus
12	Chambre d'Agriculture	Jean-Philippe Bernard
13	Zuidelijke Land- en Tuinbouw organisatie vereniging	Peter Parea Ivonne De Bruijn Rembert Van Noort
14	Institut De Recerca I Tecnologia agroalimentaries	Assumpcio Anton August Bonmati Zein Kallas (CREDA)
15	Teagasc	Patrick Forrestal
16	European Biogas Association	Gregory Reuland
17	IPS Konzalting	Ana-Marija Spicnagel
18	Inagro	Anke De Dobbelaere
19	Consorzio Italbiotec	Ilaria Re





The following meeting schedule was respected. All partners were asked to present a 3' pitch in which they explain their key expertise and role in the project (WP and tasks). All work packages were presented by their respective WP leader. All work package leaders were asked to give a short introduction into the overall goal and methodology of the work package, followed by a strong focus on the first project period (M1-M18): key moments, who is involved and what is their role, how to cooperate, interactive partner discussion,... Work packages with deliverables early in the project were granted more time.

Thursday November 22, 2018	
09:30 – 10:00	Arrival and coffee
10:00 – 10:15	Welcome (UGent) + Who is who- Introduction Round
10:15 – 10:55	Setting the mind: the Nutri2Cycle project (UGent)
10:55 – 11:20	Introduction partnership (UGent, WR, PCz, UE, THUENEN, IRTA, SOLTUB)
11.20 -12.50	Work Package 1: Mapping current CNP flows (WR)
12.50-13.30	Sandwich Lunch
13.30- 13.50	Introduction partnership (UMIL, CARTIF, CA17, ZLTO, TEAGASC, INAGRO)
13.50-15.20	Work Package 2: Innovation Funnel for optimizing farm systems (UMIL)
15.20 – 15.40	Coffee break
15.40-16.00	Introduction partnership (UCPH, ISA, TERRA, EBA, IPS, ITALBIOTEC)
16.00-16.45	Work Package 7: Communication and Community management (UGent)
16.45-17.30	Work Package 6: Theory to action (TEAGASC)
19.30	Consortium Dinner @ Het Pand

Friday November 23, 2018	
09:00 – 09:30	Work Package 8: Coordination and Management (UGent)
09:30 – 10:30	Work Package 3: Impact assessment (UCPH)
10:30 – 10:50	Coffee Break
10:50 – 11:40	Work Package 4: Macro-economic impact (THUENEN)
11.40 -12.30	Work Package 5: The Human Factor (IRTA)
12.30-13.20	Sandwich Lunch
13.20- 14.20	Wrap up + planning next year (UGent)
14.20-15.00	Coffee+ goodbye





3. Minutes of meeting

The main outcome of the discussions following the presentations on the kickoff event are summarized below, structured per work package. Prior to work package deliverables a comprehensive overview and brief 'bird view' on the project was presented by the coordinator as a reminder to all partners. The rationale, main objectives, expected results and related deliverables and milestones were highlighted.

A strong focus was put on the work plan conform the Grant Agreement. Special attention was drawn on the tight timeline early in the project, specifically with regards to D1.1, D1.2, D2.1 and D2.2. These deliverables 1) set the baseline for which an appropriate framework needs to be determined and 2) form the start of the project innovation funnel (longlist of 60 technical/management solutions/scenarios shortlisted to 24 solutions/ scenarios which later will be split in tier 1 and tier 2 and linked to research lines of 5 PhDs (page 30 of DOA))

3.1 Work package 1

Work package 1 focusses on the mapping of current CNP flows in European farming systems. WP1 is aimed at comprehensively assessing CNP flows and losses, their stoichiometry and drivers in main European farming systems for baseline determination and to derive a set of indicators for enhancing the efficiency of CNP flows. WP1 is led by Wageningen Research.

Key points:

- Outline and timing of WP1, with specific attention for the early deliverables
- Attribution of leads and involvement per task, specific attention was paid for cross-integration between WP1 with WP3
- An overview was given on the potential modeling tools and data sources

The following was discussed:

- Partners were reminded that although the WP has a duration until M36, all deliverables need to be submitted by M16. M16-M36 is dedicated to updates on deliverable and the writing of scientific manuscripts based on the obtained results in WP1.
- The lead partners reminds the consortium and the WP1 leader that the submission deadlines need to be respected
- To define the agro typologies linkage also needs to be made to the other WPs.
- A discussion was held on the system boundaries, baseline, scale (farm size) and data sources. A series of dedicated meetings will be put in place with the involved partners.
- For the "processing" pillar we might face a lack of statistical data, for biogas processing data is available, but not for other byproducts?





- It was agreed that for the D1.2 protocol progressive assessment will be necessary.
- For the task on legal framework discussions were held on how to acquire the legal framework from national legislations, how deep do you want to go? Do we go bottom down or top down- other words all members states do a first screening or UE does it (the last one is not feasible). Every partner country has a national task force that could be used for data gathering on this (inventory of facilitation + barriers) after which a comparative table can be made?

Next steps:

- The following timing is proposed for the WP1 D1.2 deliverable:
 - o Annotated outline of protocol 14/12 WR
 - o Comments all partners 21/12 ALL
 - o First draft 18/01 WR
 - o Review 25/01 ALL
 - o Submission of final version 31st January 2019
- For D1.4 on legislation contact will be made with the SYSTEMIC consortium and deliverables to see how their work on this has evolved as it has no point in duplicating work. Perhaps a questionnaire could help in collecting the required national data
- The WP1 leader will set up a set of dedicated meetings to shape the deliverables directly with the involved partners. One of the key issues will be to look into which solutions can be modelled and to agree on the common approach

3.2 Work package 2

Work package 2 entails the innovation funnel and is aimed at performing research activities on selected innovations. WP2 is led by UMIL. As WP2 already has a first deliverable in M4 and M6 the discussion at the kick off meeting were predominantly orientated at Task 2.1 (longlist 60 potential solutions for closing the gap by M4) and Task 2.2 (shortlist solutions for closing the gap by M6).

Key points:

- The overall workpackage and partner involvement was presented
- The deadline for the long list and the short list is very short, so need for a clear roadmap (see next steps)
- Use of a uniform factsheet is desired for D.2.1. to have comparable information and a base to select on.
- A discussion was held on the required items in this factsheet and on the selection process
- Attention should be given on the interlinkage between WP2 and WP1 and WP3

The following was discussed:

- UGent will prepare a template for the factsheets, with due attention for GDPR.





- factsheets will contain information on the area/TRL/short description + picture/ geographical spread/ scalability/link to the research line/ agro typology. The short description will be accompanied by specific questions regarding potential to close C/N/P loops (numbers based on previous research if possible) and innovation value. It was also agreed to look into the willingness of sharing economic data as this will be important for WP3 (CBA analysis).
- The task leaders (Teagasc, ZLTO and UGent) are responsible for collecting the factsheets:
 - factsheets on the potential solutions that were already discussed during the period of project writing need to be delivered by the respective partners and are collected by TEagasc
 - factsheets by Operational Groups are collected by ZLTO. ZLTO will provide instructions
 - factsheets on novel research is collected by UGent
- All factsheets should be delivered to UGent by 11/01/2019
- On 21/01/2019 (one day prior to the ESNI event) a Nutri2Cycle bootcamp will be organised in Brussels to make the final selection for the longlist and already discuss the shortlisting due in M6. The longlisting is seen as an inventory process. However, if the provided information is not strong enough in the opinion of the consortium, additional questions for input will be asked. If at that point the quality of the factsheet is not sufficient to be considered, the solutions can be excluded from the longlist. For the shortlist the following criteria will be considered: pragmatic assessment (partner expertise), availability of data, access to infrastructure, and potential to close the CNP loops. For the latter it seems we will also have to rely on the consortium expertise as no real data will be available at that timepoint. Ideally, also a good geographic distribution is pursued as well as reflection on the scalability.
- For interlinkage between WP1 and WP3 the monthly WP leader meetings will be effective. It might be good to have a sort of “minimal data set” that will need to be provided for in WP2 to feed into WP1 and WP3

Next steps:

- UGent prepares a factsheet template by 3/12/2018 according to the agreed set-up
- The 3 task leaders will lead the information collection for their specific group, but all partners are expected to actively participate for their region
- A first draft of titles/topics is given by 21/12/18
- All factsheets are delivered by 11/01/2019
- UGent will compile all the factsheets and perform a first quality check
- 17/01/2019: partners provide a first evaluation of the listed solutions
- UGent makes arrangements for a selection bootcamp on 21/01/2019, associated to the ESNI event. Here all WP leaders should be present + as many partners as possible. The longlist will be shared before the meeting so everybody can provide input
- 21/01/2019: bootcamp – a physical partner meeting in Brussels in which all described long-listed solutions are discussed and based on agreed criteria prioritized in a short-list of suitable solutions





3.3 Work package 3

Work package 3 is aimed at impact assessment, this is determining the environmental, economic and agronomic impact of innovative solutions for closing C, N, P loops and benchmarking these against the current baseline. WP3 is led by UCPH.

Key points:

- The baseline will be crucial to obtain good LCA results
- An in depth discussion between the dedicated LCA partners will be necessary, to be able to compare results. One should think about a peer review strategy
- Also here the timeline is crucial. LCA needs to be started as soon as possible to obtain good, reliable results.

The following was discussed:

- Although this work package only starts later in the project it is crucial that also WP3 members are deeply involved in WP2 and WP1.
- The decision on agro-typologies is deemed to be crucial. Eurostat categories and available data should be taken in consideration. The available statistical models were shortly presented and discussed.
- It would be beneficial to try to connection the central Nutri2Cycle triangle figure and the Eurostat farm typology data.
- Targeted discussions are needed to discuss the boundaries of LCAs.
- CBA will be performed on farm scale level: data collection will require the help of local partners (worst case-best case scenario's). The current level of implementation of technology among farmers and extrapolate level of one farm to the number of similar farms in regions should be considered. Interaction with WP4 for data gathering will be necessary.
- Ideally a ranking from best performing solutions comes out of the assessment to feed in WP6, time issues are expected here, definitely with respect to availability of the LCA timely for the selection.

Next steps:

- The following follow up meetings were agreed on:
 - o Agree on baseline conditions to be covered in the baseline simulations, distribution of scenarios and farm-level model to use – with WP1 – meeting between WP1 & WP3 partners, particularly WUR, Feb-Mar 2019- D1.1 M4, D1.5. baseline M16, D3.1 solutions M24.
 - o Agreement on LCA methodology and approach (env. & soc.) with IRTA & CARTIF – meeting Mar-Apr 2019 – D3.4 M36.





3.4 Work package 4

Work package 4 focusses on the macro economic impact of the project and wants to extrapolate the potential farm level impact (WP3) to regional and European impact in comparison to the baseline. Work package 4 is led by Thuenen.

Key points:

- As this work package only starts in M20 of the project the discussions were mainly focused on task description and workload division.
- A comprehensive overview of the possibilities of the CAPRI model were showcased

The following was discussed:

- How to work with very promising low TRL level techniques towards transferability as compared to high TRL commercial and competitive marketing strategies?
- How will mineral fertilizer replacement value be considered under market competitive conditions?
- How will key important commercial and market competitive criterions be incorporated for transferability and potential uptake of innovations (material safety, REACH)
- Should we set mitigation targets? What do we want to achieve and what are the costs for certain mitigation targets?

Next steps:

- Thuenen will attend as much as possible also the WP1 and WP2 meetings. This will be crucial to collect the needed information and insight to feed into the modelling
- Once a shortlist is available Thuenen will perform a “testrun” on a selected strategy. This will help to identify caveats and problems in the future
- To integrate the effect of consumer behavior, a dedicated meeting will be set up with WP5 to see how these elements can be incorporated in CAPRI. This will make it possible to move faster in future





3.5 Work package 5

Work package 5 is dedicated to the human factor: Understanding (and influencing) consumer behavior, perception and acceptance and is led by IRTA-CREDA.

Key points:

- The lead partner presented an overview of the work package.
- The lead partner emphasized that this WP is not an independent WP, but needs info from other WPs. For task 5.1 input will be needed from the other WPs to be able to select focus groups.
- With regards to the questionnaires and surveys, they will always be centrally prepared, but translation in the local language will be necessary. It will also be the local partners that are responsible to recruit and conduct the focus group.

The following was discussed:

- Partners will have to use their contacts for outreach, potentially a linkage could be made to the recently started project Nutriman for outreach of the survey (EFOST).
- In preparation to have a good overview of existing labels in Europe, partners are asked to provide pictures of relevant labels they might encounter in the supermarket in their home country. Examples were shown during the meeting.
- In surveys there is always the risk of colored answers, as respondents are not fully aware of the consequences when responding (hypothetical nature): there will be optioned for a discrete choice experiment.
- There will need to be a good cooperation between partner THUENEN and CREDA to assess the impact of consumer behavior on nutrient flows and agro-economics (percentages of change (elasticity, quantity of change). This will need to be fed into the CAPRI model).

Next steps:

- Partners should send relevant labels in their region to the WP5 leader
- CREDA double checks the consent forms with the data officer
- WP and WP4 leads will set up a dedicated meeting to see how consumer behavior could be taken in account in the modelling.





3.6 Work package 6

Work package 6 is oriented towards putting the theory in practice by having lighthouse demo's for the most promising solutions following the work in the previous work packages. WP6 is led by Teagasc. During the kick-off meeting a general presentation was given on how this WP will be approached.

Key points:

- Officially this WP starts in M20, but it is important to start the groundwork
- Already in the shortlisting in WP2 the scalability and demo potential should be considered.
- Attention should be given not only at the technical aspects but also the communication aspects

The following was discussed:

- If project partners feel that a certain practice has high potential for a demo a factsheet should be prepared for the longlist with the appropriate information.
- It could be useful to seek contact with the recently started project Nefertiti project (<https://nefertiti-h2020.eu/>) which is orientated at supporting professional organization of demo's.

Next steps:

- Teagasc will develop a demo protocol. This will enable to give a good idea on the expectations towards a demo site. This demo protocol will not merely focus on technical aspects but will also take in account communication requirements. This will be done in cooperation with WP7.- Teagasc will take a closer look into the Nefertiti project and provide feedback





3.7 Work package 7

Work package 7 focusses on communication and is led by UGent.

Key points:

- Partners were reminded the importance of communication and dissemination and were explained the difference. Communication is aimed to promote the research and the results and can be targeted to multiple audiences. As a consequence this can start from the beginning of the project. Dissemination is aimed at the use and uptake of results and is therefore targeted at specific audiences. As a consequence this can only start from the moment results are available.
- Independent of the type of outreach, it is important to always include the correct logo and referral to the funding: "This project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 773682."
- NTFs are a crucial part of our communication strategy

The following was discussed:

- A proposition for a project logo was presented and approved on by the partners.
- A website will be created on the following address: www.nutri2cycle.eu + a dedicated page on www.biorefine.eu.
- For digital presence partners are encouraged to use the following hashtags: #Nutri2Cycle and @Bioref_Cluster.
- Partners were explained the importance of practice abstracts. On short term 3 practice abstracts are needed by M18. Further 10 in M36 and 10 in M48.
- 12 National Task Forces need to be created and connected to OG of different countries. In M12 physical meeting should take place between NTF and report produced on activities up to then. If there is no OG in country of some PPs then try link to other similar initiatives in your country. EIP-Agri website contains contact points of OG. UGent will distribute the list of OG that have expressed an interest in the project already. 2 regional workshops per NTF are required. IPS will also disseminate information to other Balkan countries in English language.
- The first communication event of the Nutri2Cycle consortium will be the ESNI 2019 event. This is a cooperation of different European funded projects (Interreg and Horizon). Nutri2Cycle will host one of the workshops. This will also be an opportunity to connect to our sister project Circular Agronomics. The ESNI event is scheduled on 21/01/2019 in Brussels.

Next steps:

- UGent will appoint a graphical designer to provide a high resolution logo to all partners.
- UGent will create the website and send instructions to create content





- UGent will create the communication plan, providing a strategy for outreach to all stakeholders. Suggestions and ideas are welcomed.
- Separate templates will be made for the NTFs. The lead partner will send the contacts of the operational groups that already indicated their interest. National partners need to contact their OG: do they still exist, are they still interested,.....?
- UGent further organizes ESNi with a dedicated session for Nutri2Cycle and our sister project.

3.8 Work package 8

Work package 8 is dedicated to management of the project lead by UGent. The management structure as proposed in the application form was reassessed and agreed on.

Key points:

- Administrative status: the Grant Agreement and Consortium agreement have been signed. The first prefinancing is received and distributed to the partners.
- For project implementation partners should always refer back to the ECAS portal to find the latest documents (Document library) and legal data.
- The project coordinator forms the in-between between the consortium and the EU officer.
- Partners were notified on the need for periodic reporting (ends at M18,36,48) and continuous reporting (throughout the project, based on the deliverables, publications etc).
- All submissions are completely paperless and on the EC portal: technical report and all financial statements are submitted by the coordinator.
- The following agreements were made:
 - o M end reporting period + 0: WP leaders submit progress report to coordinator.
 - o M end reporting period + 30 days: submission of financial statement by partners.
 - o M end reporting period + 60 days: coordinator submits periodic report as single package.
 - o From that point 90 days for review report and meeting, assessment and payment.

The following was discussed:

- The partners discussed that a next partner meeting in M14 (November 2019) or earlier is preferred above a meeting in M16 as we have quite some deliverables in that period that will benefit from a physical meeting.
- It is difficult to find an exchange platform which is acceptable for all institutes. The lead partner will look for an appropriate platform.
- The lead partner needs to review the deliverables before submitting. Ideally the lead partner is involved from the beginning to set the outline of the deliverable. A template will be provided. Enough time should be taken in account to enable revisions not jeopardizing the





timeline. This will be of great importance for WP1, as this WP has very early deadlines in the project.

Next steps:

- UGent will contact the data manager officer for the set up of the data management plan. In the meantime all WP leaders should reflect on the type of data to be expected in their workpackage (FAIR data). All partners should identify the responsible for data management and privacy in their institution.
- UGent will organize the WP leader meetings on a monthly basis. This will be fixed on the second Friday of each calendar month at 14.30.
- UGent will also host the next partner meeting, we will aim to have this coincide with the planned summer school, to minimize travelling, this would be then rather be September then November 2019.
- In frame of the first reporting period, UGent will provide templates and clear instructions. WP leaders will be actively involved in the writing process.

