

**Table S1.** Level of engagement / activity within each of the 19 networks as perceived by the network's facilitator during the final workshop (May 2017).

	Not completed	Low	Moderate	High
<b>General indicators relevant to the function of each network</b>				
0.1 Level of participant enthusiasm and energy of the network	0	1	4	14
0.2 Level of participant trust and knowledge sharing within the network	0	1	4	14
0.3 Level of facilitators intervention (rate of intervention facilitator)	0	7	8	4
0.4 Level or frequency of interaction with support actors (engagement of the relevant actor at the right time)	0	5	6	8
<i>Overall general engagement</i>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>14 (18%)</b>	<b>22 (29%)</b>	<b>40 (53%)</b>
<b>Step 1 Problem identification</b>				
1.1 Level of clarity of purpose and shared objective as a network	0	0	4	15
1.2 Level of agreement on network function (e.g. decision making, common rules, reaching consensus etc.)	0	2	4	13
1.2 Degree to which the problem identified was based on shared need (common problem)	0	1	5	13
1.3 Market or other actors value the problem (relevance)	0	0	3	16
1.4 Capacity of network to find practical solutions to the problem identified (perceived capacity of the network by the facilitator)	0	1	6	12
<i>Overall engagement in step 1</i>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>4 (4%)</b>	<b>22 (23%)</b>	<b>69 (73%)</b>
<b>Step 2 Generation of ideas</b>				
2.1 Level of which the idea/solution is shared by the network	0	1	3	15
2.2 Feasibility of the idea (includes financially viable, based on ADAS tool)	10	0	4	5
2.3 Level of diversity of knowledge (resources) used: science, advisor's input, practical experience etc.	0	2	3	14
2.4 Capacity of network to trial the practical solutions selected (perceived capacity of the network by the facilitator)	0	1	4	14
<i>Overall engagement in step 2</i>	<b>10 (13%)</b>	<b>4 (5%)</b>	<b>14 (18%)</b>	<b>48 (63%)</b>
<b>Step 3 Action planning &amp; resource mobilization</b>				
3.1 Robustness of innovation action planning including time-frame and task division (everyone knows what is happening, when and by whom)	2	4	4	9
3.2 Level of clarity on anticipated result (research question) and system or criteria in place for to measure and monitor the results (e.g. viability)	1	1	9	8
3.3 Level of resources the members within the network commit towards trialling.	1	4	7	7
3.4 Level of external support (whether scientific, from industry or technical)	1	4	5	9
<i>Overall engagement in step 3</i>	<b>5 (7%)</b>	<b>13 (17%)</b>	<b>25 (33%)</b>	<b>33 (43%)</b>
<b>Step 4 Practical trialing and development</b>				
4.1 Level and rate of innovation - action plan leads to action.	5	1	4	9

4.2	Willingness to discuss and share within the network successes and failures (to learn from failures)	4	2	3	10
<i>Overall engagement in step 4</i>		<b>9 (24%)</b>	<b>3 (8%)</b>	<b>7 (18%)</b>	<b>19 (50%)</b>
<b>Step 5 Implementation and up-scaling</b>					
5.1	Level of satisfaction of members with regard to relevance and affordability of solutions developed.	9	0	1	9
5.2	Number of network members applying the innovation as common practice across their farm.	14	0	2	3
5.3	Network members' pride of what they achieved (wanting to share and scale -up the innovative idea).	9	1	0	9
<i>Overall engagement in step 5</i>		<b>32 (56%)</b>	<b>1 (2%)</b>	<b>3 (5%)</b>	<b>21 (37%)</b>
<b>Step 6 Dissemination</b>					
6.1	Network has actively sought to disseminate innovation beyond network members	12	2	1	4
6.2	Innovation has been subsequently adopted by other actors and bodies	19	0	0	0
<i>Overall engagement in step 6</i>		<b>31 (82%)</b>	<b>2 (5%)</b>	<b>1 (3%)</b>	<b>4 (11%)</b>