LIVING LABS AND MAPS IN RURAL AREAS: CONCEPTUALIZATION AND CASE STUDIES

13-14 June, Pisa

Polo didattico delle Piagge, Via Giacomo Matteotti

Link to attend online:

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89545126987?pwd=TUVSM21aK2dEZ0Y2bENVRkFyTzgrUT09

13 | June 2022

Morning session

9.00 – 9.30	**Welcome and coffee**
9.30 – 9.45	**Introduction** *Gianluca Brunori (UNIPI)*
9.45 – 10.15	**Keynote speech:** *Living Labs and Multi-actor platforms: what is their contribution to scientific knowledge?* *Guido Caniglia,* Scientific Director of the Konrad Lorenz Institute for Evolution and Cognition Research (KLI) in Klosterneuburg close to Vienna.
10.15 – 10.30	**Discussion**

10.30 – 10.45	**COFEE BREAK**

10.45 – 13.00	**Invited presentations**

Dominic Duckett - Leanne Townsend (DESIRA) - Lies Debruyne- Daniel van der Velden - Scenario building and participatory theory building

Maria del Mar Delgado - Sherman Farhad (MOVING) - Participatory assessment of value chains

Jorieke Potters (SHERPA) - Building science-policy interface for a future vision of rural areas

13.00 – 14.00	**LUNCH BREAK**

Afternoon session

14.00 – 15.30	**Living Labs and MAPs share their experiences (parallel sessions)**
15.30 – 15.45	**COFFEE BREAK**
15.45 – 17.00	**Living Labs and MAPs share their experiences (parallel sessions)**
17.00	**End of the first day**

14 | June 2022

Morning session

9.00 – 10.00	**Main messages and questions from the first day**

Facilitators of working groups of day 1

10.00 – 10.45	**A research agenda for LL/MAPs**

During this session we will develop, based on the findings of the working groups, a research agenda on collaborative research in rural areas

10.45 – 11.00	**COFFEE BREAK**

11.00 – 13.00	**Living Labs / MAPS assessment**

During this session we will discuss the draft questionnaire for self-assessment of LL/MAPS

13.00	**End meeting**

ANNEX 1 - PARALLEL SESSIONS - PROGRAMME

Group 1, 1st session (Monday 14:00-15:30)
Digitalisation in Flemish Livestock Farming
Daniel Van der Velden (ILVO)
Digital marketing strategy for beef cattle production sector
Mikelis Grivins (Baltic Studies Centre)
GIs as territorialized living labs ? The case of Tête de Moine PDO in Swiss Jura
Luca Piccin (Origin for Sustainability)
Managing a Living Lab with a private-public institution: The experience of Consorzio Toscana Nord in the DESIRA project
Livia Ortolani (AMIGO)

Group 2, 1st session (Monday 14:00-15:30)
The LL as a format to address challenges in the sustainable water management
Eleni Toli (ATHENA RC)
Can Living Labs effectively contribute to developing relevant recommendations for policy-makers?
Sylvain Quiédeville & Olivier Ejderyan (FiBL)
Keeping living labs alive during the pandemics: lessons learnt at the University of Macerata
Chiara Mignani (University of Macerata)
Stakeholder participation in food system research – reflection from two case studies in Switzerland
Isabel Jaisli (ZHAW)

Group 1, 2nd session (Monday 15:45-17:00)
Aligning strategies for tackling climate change challenges in rural areas through local Multi Actor Platforms
Sandra Karner (IFZ, Graz)
DigiFarmTour – experience of Croatian Living Lab
Silvio Simon (MofA_CRO)
Collaboration Platforms and the uncertain legacy of time-bound EU projects
Teresa Pinto-Correia, Catarina Esgalhado and Maria Rivera (University of Évora)
Doing Digitalisation Research with Living Labs During Covid-19: The case of the Scottish crofters
Leanne Townsend (James Hutton Institute)

Group 2, 2nd session (Monday 15:45-17:00)
Organising Living Labs in Greece, lessons from successes and failures: The cases of Trilofos and Goumenissa
Filippos Papadopoulos (American Farm School)
Traceability in the Italian wood-energy sector: a Living Lab on role and impact of digitalisation
Eleonora Mariano (PEFC Italia)
Knowledge economy in sustainable livelihoods - a Hungarian case study
Nemes Gusztáv (KRTK)

ANNEX 2 - OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

Living Labs / Multi-actor platforms are increasingly considered by innovation policies as drivers of transformative change. In fact, interaction between stakeholders is supposed to generate innovation tailored to the needs of users and to their context and to promote inclusion. They are also supposed to have an important side-effect as the improvement of social and human capital in rural areas. Research is increasingly looking to Living Labs as an integrative method to conventional scientific research, which is based on isolation of the observed parameters and on representative samples for statistical analysis. Participation of researchers to Living Labs improves their capacity to define research problems and fosters interdisciplinarity. However, critiques to Living Labs come from the scientific world claiming that Living Labs can at most provide anecdotal evidence, and that its finding cannot be generalized.

After some years of experience in this field, a reflection is needed, both on the effectiveness of Living Labs as drivers of transformative change, on the validity of the knowledge created through them, on the methodologies to make them more effective and efficient. The workshop, organized jointly between DESIRA, MOVING and SHERPA projects, will be an opportunity to share experiences in this field and reflection on how to consolidate methods and concepts around this approach. Presentations will answer the following questions:

Living Labs as drivers of change
- Can Living Labs be drivers of transformative change in rural areas?
- What are the preconditions for the LL approach to generate the benefits associated with the approach?
- Do Living Labs have a life cycle? How can the life cycle of living labs be conceptualized?
- What is the trigger for the formation of an LL or a MAP? a project? a governmental initiative? an own initiative? how does it relate to governance?
- Does the specificity of rural actors affect the characteristics and the dynamics of Living Labs?

- How can Living Labs influence the policy cycle?

Living Lab methodology
- How to set up a LL or a MAP in a way that ensures:
- Representativeness
- The results are representative of the society under study
- How to improve scaling of results and comparability between groups?
- How to Improve the group's temporal vision of the problems and the search for solutions?
- How to ensure the duration and stability of the group's work?
- What is the added value of the work of the LL or MAP for the individual member?
- What alternatives do we have to pursue MAA? Are there any methods that have proved to be bulletproof (or just more promising than others)?

Living Lab assessment
- How should Living Labs be assessed? How can the effectiveness and efficiency of Living Labs be measured?
- What are good ways to facilitate and monitor the LL work?