



# European Rural Development Network

## Organised Session 8.5.

# Networks, Social Innovations And Short Food Supply Chains

**Time: Friday, 01/Sep/2017: 3:30pm - 5:00pm**

Moderator: dr Paweł Chmieliński, ERDN

**Location: Small Plenary Room - Congress Centre**

Discussant: professor Jerzy Wilkin, IRWiR PAN

**Session Overview.** The modernisation of rural economies depends on the capacity of rural actors to cooperate successfully to form efficient value chains which will deliver competitive products and services. The greater interest being shown in short supply chains provides opportunities to re-think and improve value chain organisation so as to turn specific assets into economic, environmental and social benefits.

The new forms of value chain organisation in rural areas are influenced by a plurality of components referring to aspects of technical, technological, cultural, economic, organizational, legal and institutional nature. A transition to new business patterns requires an approach that takes into account these system dimension. We observe a shift from traditional, farm- and place-based, to modern Short Food Supply Chains (SFSCs), which are more complex, consisting of collaborative networks of producers, consumers and institutions but often seeking to sustain traditional farming practices through social innovation in chain organisation and food marketing. Thus, modern SFSCs can be characterised as re-embedded, re-spatialized, based on transparency and trust, being part of local community development and representing shared values and life style.

Contributions in the session will bring an evidence-based view on the different aspects of short food supply chains development in different EU countries. This includes the characteristics of individual and collective businesses, investigation of networks, interaction and cooperation between different stakeholders but also changes at organizational and managerial as well as conceptual level of SFSCs in the context of implementation of rural development policy. In the session we will also look at the EU funding to fostering marketing of food products, importance of socially driven strategies. They often emphasise voluntary, bottom-up processes and quality control, and are embedded in the local community and economic development efforts. This leads to new forms of governance that could be seen as future models, implemented in other rural businesses and also in rural communities.

Finally, we try to identify a comprehensive set of good practices leading to growth of SFSCs and thus the creation of SFSC facilitates also diffusion of the most sustainable production models in the close relation to consumers' needs (demand).

Good practises in this field will help to enable different groups of stakeholders among Congress attendees to plan their actions towards supporting or creating new SFSCs.

The comments and insights from the discussant will be an introduction to open discussion on the development paths of SFSCs in the context of:

- new forms of social innovation and collaborative networks,
- institutional and policy support,
- new forms of governance introduced in SFSCs organisation and be seen as one significant contribution to the current transitions in rural areas across European countries.

\*\*\*

This session is organised by members and supporters of the **European Rural Development Network (ERDN, [www.erdn.eu](http://www.erdn.eu))**. Established in 2002, the Network is meant to encompass the leading research centres studying rural development in Europe, and in particular in its central, eastern and south-eastern countries.

The Network takes efforts aimed at common elaboration of research topics in the fields strategic for rural development and wining new institutional partners. The cooperation involves exchange of knowledge data, joint initiatives to raise funds from the EU Framework Programmes (H2020), exchange of scientists and numerous meetings during seminars, conferences and scientific workshops. The annual conferences are the basis for the ERDN development, knowledge sharing and the source of its future research ideas.

XV European Rural Development Network Conference: *Innovation and Cooperation in Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Rural Regions* will take place in Eisenstadt, Austria, 3-4 October 2017 (Main organiser: Federal Institute of Agricultural Economics, Vienna. See: [www.erdn.eu/15erdn2017/](http://www.erdn.eu/15erdn2017/)).

Outcomes from the scientific events, jointly conducted research and other works of our members can be found in the ERDN yearbook *Rural areas and development (Est. 2003)* as well as a number of scientific journals that we cooperate with.

*If you and your institution would like to become a member of the ERDN contact us at [www.erdn.eu/contact](http://www.erdn.eu/contact), or check our website for the next ERDN event and join us there!*

**Book: Networks, Social Innovations  
and Short Food Supply Chains**  
CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS – see back page!

## THE FOOD CHAIN IN THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE ITALIAN REGIONS: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO PROGRAMMING PERIODS 2007-2013 AND 2014-2020

**Piermichele La Sala, Mariantonietta Fiore, Francesco Contò**

*University of Foggia, Department of Economics*

### Introduction

The food chain has undergone considerable changes at organizational and managerial as well as conceptual level, because of implementation of rural development policy. In fact, in the 2007-2013 programming period, with the development of the Integrated Supply Chain Projects (ISCPs) funded by the regional Rural Development Programs (RDPs), the chain concept has taken shape from theory to practice, according to the logic and different characteristics in different regions, sub-funds and implementation instruments governed by the regions and Member States. In the 2014-2020 programming period, the supply chains have undergone a new impetus to the development in relation to new tools in support of the cooperation provided by the RDPs. The aim of the work is to investigate the support tools for the development of food chains and the cooperation approach by means of an analysis and comparison of the RDPs implemented in Italy regions for the two periods programming that are 2014-2020 and 2007-2013. It is expected this work can give insight and shed some light on understanding the nature and real contribution to the development of the different productive sectors.

### Approach to the problem

While theory considers the supply chain simply as the chain organizational form composed by actors involved in the realization of a final product, regardless of strategic considerations, agricultural policy assigns the supply chain organization the role of driving force of rural development. RDPs also for the first time identify the food chain with the legally recognized partnership among production, transformation and marketing companies and other stakeholders engaged in the development of ISCPs. Due to the importance of the policy approach to rural development policy, the qualitative comparison starts from the analysis of the RDPs of the 21 Italian Regions in the two programming periods 2007-2013 and 2014-2020, in order to verify:

- the purpose and organization of chain projects;
- the support and development tools for regional chains;
- the sectors that are organized in chain;
- the investments implemented during the period 2007-2013 and those planned for the period 2014-2020.

### Outcomes

ISCPs were relevant and crucial in the 2007-2013 programming both from the quantitative point of view, that are the invested resources, and the qualitative ones, that is the importance of the integrated approach within the RDPs strategies. In this period, 14 of 21 Italian regions chosen this tool, by developing 373 chain projects involving 18.000 enter-

prises and by committing € 803.118.873 (about 5% of programming funds for rural development) with an average funding of € 2.153.134 per project. In the 2014-2020 programming period, this approach is implemented by 13 Regions. However, because of the widespread delays in implementing the programs, data on new programming is not yet available. For this reason, a qualitative comparison was based on the analysis of regional programs during the two programming periods.

### *The aims and organization of the ISCPs*

In the 2007-2013 RDPs, the development of the chains principally pursued the objective of ensuring, through greater horizontal and vertical integration between the economic operators involved, better market conditions and adequate and harmonious development of the territory, as well as growth of the occupational levels. ISCPs also have the task of promoting a fairer redistribution of agricultural added value among the various segments of the agri-food or forestry chains. In the 2014-2020 RDPs, these goals are resumed and the instrument is fully justified within Priority 3 "Promoting the organization of the agri-food chain" - Focus Area 3A "Improving the productivity of primary producers through the integration of supply chains". The main reference is Measure 9 "Establishment of Associations and Producer Organizations" and Measure 16 "Cooperation". The ISCPs, although not explicitly provided for in Regulation (EU) 1305/2013, fall within the category of collective and integrated projects, initiated at the discretion of the Member States and the Regions. In the Italian case, the 13 Regions refer to ISCPs in the RDP Implementation Strategy by envisaging its development under Measure 16 through sub-measures:

- 16.0 for the development of projects aimed at enhancement of the more structured agri-food chains;
- 16.1 and 16.2 for the establishment of partnerships aimed at the development and transfer of innovations;
- 16.4 for the creation and development of short supply chains and local markets.

### *The tools for supporting and developing the chains*

In the previous programming, there were no support instrument for co-ordination of ISCPs, in the current programming support for partnerships is directly funded by Measure 16 of the RDP. Both programs attributed the major role to the Lead Partner. The tool aimed at governing the partnership's internal relations remains the Supply Chain Contract, where all stakeholders share and subscribe to the objectives and operational strategies of the Project, the commitments and obligations each has to respect, as well as the roles and responsibility.

### *The sectors organized in the chain*

In the 2007-2013 programming, the ISCPs pursue the sole objective of strengthening and expanding entrepreneurial initiatives geared towards organizational models that go beyond the individualistic approach to the productive market. This especially in the fruit and vegetable, livestock, cereals, viticulture and olive groves for the economic importance

and the employment incidence that each of them in the region context. For this reason, ISCPs have been involved in all the production sectors, although it is clear that the most well organized sectors of Italian agriculture (dairy and fruit and vegetables) have obtained more projects (28% and 19%). Instead, in the case of smaller and less structured supply chains, support for them depended on the capacity of single territories to develop strategies to support them through Local Action Groups. In the 2014-2020 programming period, RDPs, even with the support of more structured supply chains, pay much more attention to the creation and development of local and short supply chains through the partnerships funded by Measure 16.

#### *Investments and Investments Planned*

The ISCPs in the programming period 2007-2013 were a coordinated and organic set of operations referring to several RDP measures, which could have been activated through a negotiating procedure, to which the various operators in a particular production chain gained through the presentation of a collective project (ISCP) presented by a Proponent Subject. Overall, the ISCPs have promoted measures aimed at the modernization of farms and processing (M. 121, 122, 123) and investments in product quality (M. 132 and 133). Many projects include training measures, product and process innovations, technical assistance and advice (M. 111, 114, 124, 331). These interventions have contributed to consolidating relations in the chain. These experiences have led to the 2014-2020 integrated design to promote and strengthen forms of cooperation among chain operators.

In the ongoing programming, the 13 Regions involved in the development of the supply chain have foreseen the use of measures for investments in agricultural and agri-food businesses (M. 4.1 and M. 4.2). In addition, some RDPs have envisaged measures for the quality of agri-food products (M. 3), training and information (M. 1 and M. 2) and for the development of product, process and technology innovations in the sector Agro-food (M. 16.2).

#### **Discussion**

In the 2007-2013 RDPs, the ISCPs is a chain management tool through which to manage the investments and relationships between the various actors involved, promoting the implementation of a multisectoral and partnership approach. The results were greater in the presence of the following conditions: a) already stable relationships between operators and Projects promoted by partnerships already established; b) collective investment in training, information, technical assistance and innovation development. In such cases, the implementation of ISCPs has been instrumental in better organization and management of the chain, in the implementation of strategic agreements between internal and external actors in the chain and in improving the competitiveness of companies.

Through the analysis of the 2007-2013 programming, it is possible to obtain useful insights into the development of ISCPs in 2014-2020 programming. In particular:

a) the need to promote the building of a stable partnership so by recognizing the importance of the function assigned to

the Lead Partner and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of administrative procedures to encourage collaborative practices and integrated planning modes;

b) the importance of stimulating more investment in intangible and coordination measures, preferring collective action than individual ones and activating new networks around innovative projects.

At least in part, 2014-2020 programming is trying to keep these factors in mind.

#### **Conclusions**

ISCPs are an important tool for implementing 2007-2013 rural development policies. It is an Italian choice that is based on the idea that the aggregation and interaction between the actors involved in the chain can provide better results in terms of the growth of the competitiveness of agricultural and forestry supply chain.

In order to enhance the experience gained in 2007-2013 and increasing the competitiveness and sustainability of regional supply chains, the chain approach in the 2014-2020 RDPs should focus on developing sectors of the regional productive sectors by providing support in terms of services, stimulating and encouraging the creation of stable networks among the people in the chain. The supply chain in the RDPs 2014-2020 does not have to pursue the investments of individual companies but aims at giving added value through the concentration of production, transformation and marketing. Starting from the 2007-2013 experience that has promoted broadly representative partnerships and the definitive recognition of the main productive sectors of Italian agriculture, in the 2014-2020 programming period, the chain approach should focus on the actual value added and on the ability to attract "Chain investments". It is therefore necessary to stimulate the catalyst effect of the chain approach that in the past has allowed to shorten the gap between primary producers and access to EU funds for individual investment, by causing insufficient attention to the cross-sectoral activities of the supply chains.

#### **Authors**

##### **Piermichele La Sala**



*piermichele.lasala@unifg.it*

Piermichele has a researcher position of Agricultural Economics and he is Assistant Professor in Economics and Rural Development Policy at the Department of Economics, University of Foggia. He graduated in Business Administration at the University of Calabria. Since 2007, he has participated in numerous research activities in rural development topic. Since 2009, he is scientific manager of the Metapontum Agro-food District. He gained a Ph.D. in Economics and Rural Development planning at the University of Basilicata and was Research Fellow and Post-Doctoral researcher in agri-food topics at the University of Foggia. He is author of several international and national publications and he is member of some research Societies in the Agricultural Economics field.



### **Mariantonietta Fiore**

*mariantonietta.fiore@unifg.it*

Mariantonietta is Assistant Professor in Agricultural Economics at the Department of Economics, University of Foggia. She gained a Ph.D. in Economics and Technologies for the Sustainable Development and was Research Fellow and Post-Doctoral researcher in agri-

food topics. She held the position of Junior Expert of Ministry of Environment (2011/2012) and is agricultural economics expert selected by Italian Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Forestry Policies (2014/2020). She is Associate Fellow of the EuroMed Academy of Business. She won an Award for Excellence as Outstanding Reviewer in the Emerald Literati Network and an award assigned to the Apulia Universities as best scientific research idea on the food losses topic.



### **Francesco Contò**

*francesco.conto@unifg.it*

Francesco is full professor and he is Director of the Department of Economics, University of Foggia (Italy). Currently, he teaches 'Economics for the local development and management of EU Funds'. Since 1977 he has held various scientific and professional positions inside and outside the Academia and he

has been responsible for many scientific projects research at national and international level. He is author of over 240 international publications. He has held several teaching positions and as a researcher at international, highly qualified, universities and research institutions. He was coordinator of the Interdepartmental Ph.D. course in 'Health Food Innovation and Management', of the Ph.D. course in 'Economics and Environmental Law, Land and Landscape' and coordinator of the Ph.D. School in 'Environment and Landscape Cultures' at the University of Foggia. He is an ordinary member of several research Societies in the Agricultural Economics field and he is member of several Conference Scientific Committees and Journal Editorial Boards.

---

## **HOW DOES EU SUPPORT SOCIAL APPROACHES TO FOOD MARKETING?**

**Anna Maria Augustyn and Gusztav Nemes**  
*Groupe de Bruges; Hungarian Academy of Sciences*

### **Introduction**

In response to a growing awareness of the consumers across Europe, efforts towards improvements of food marketing have been intensifying during the last decades. Targeted actions to tackle these challenges have been undertaken by rural communities, public and private sector, including large multinational companies. This presentation looks at the various approaches fostered within the EU Rural Development Programmes. We review different types of marketing schemes relevant for EU rural areas, affected by both market and public sector mechanisms. Social components have been frequently added to these, based on voluntary, bottom-up processes and quality control, and embedded in local community and economic development. We claim that social marketing

can be effectively combined with the public support available under the EU rural development policy and help food producers to gain better access to markets. The value that social networking and bottom-up rural development represent in the marketing of local products is essential for food-driven innovation in rural areas. Our paper presents an analysis of projects from the database of the European Network for Rural Development, clustered around different social marketing components.

### **Approach to the problem**

Drawing on academic literature and EU regulatory documents we situate our survey in a specific narrative of global developments affecting the European agro-food system. Local perspectives, through examples of RDP projects, provide complementary and contesting views. Based on the grounded theory approach (Glaser-Strauss 1967), our empirical work is mainly focused on the secondary content analysis of food related project examples included in the RDP projects database of the European Network for Rural Development (ENRD). We first clustered RDP projects according to the criteria of indicating social marketing components. Then, the descriptions of food-related projects in the ENRD database were screened in detail, in order to extract those components indicating the engagement with the society as an element of product marketing approach. Observing the meaningful patterns, we provide a statistical overview. We also highlight examples of particular projects, supplementing the ENRD database with more qualitative information (publications, websites, videos) enabling us to gain deeper insights into their implementation. Consequently, we analyse the results with a view to provide possible answers to the following questions: Which RDP instruments are most favourable for fostering social food marketing? What are the main characteristics of the related RDP projects? What is the added value of social marketing in this context? This way, we intend to provide a meaningful operationalisation of the social marketing concept.

### **Outcomes**

Although the majority of CAP funding is still dedicated to the support of larger farms and industrial agriculture, systematic changes to assist smallholders are already visible in a number of national and regional rural development programmes. Alongside the 'classic' CAP certification schemes, specific additional incentives for setting up voluntary food standards are offered, creating the space needed for marketing experiments and innovation in this field. Several measures propose alternative solutions for smallholder farmers and food entrepreneurs to address the gaps that the above described 'official standards' leave in the system. Thus, during the 2007-2013 programming period various RDP instruments contributed to 'local standardisation' and the development or enhancement of food brands. The EU Member States could choose from a menu of measures offered under the four axes of the CAP RDP to create specific policies fitting their particular contexts. Hence, the CAP implementation varied by country and was strongly reliant on individual projects realised by farmers, food producers and processors, retailers, Local Action Groups etc.

Implemented measures could refer to many different areas, but food related issues normally represented an important target. By studying examples of the implemented projects, we detected certain social marketing strategies.

In total, the ENRD database contains 641 individual project descriptions (state as of July 2015). An advanced search, using 'food' as a filter, highlights 107 projects, representing some 17% of the total. This suggests that food-related projects were getting substantial attention in the RDPs 2007–2013. We cluster them according to the specific criteria and undertake a detailed analysis.

## Discussion

Overall, the support to food related projects was the most visible under the axis 1 (competitiveness of agricultural and forestry sector) measures and embraced nearly a half of them (53 out of 107 projects). This might be also less surprising, if keeping in mind that in many EU Member States, axis 1 was the most 'fuelled' in budgetary terms. On the contrary, axis 2 (agro-environment) food-related projects remained rather marginal, despite a similarly strong financial capacity. Nevertheless, through the design of individual measures, this axis did not focus directly on food projects. In addition, some 19 food projects were realised in both axes 3 (quality of life, economic diversification) and 4 (LEADER).

According to the database, the highest number of food projects (30) were realised under the M123, focusing on 'adding value to agricultural and forestry products'. With 16 documented cases 'farm modernisation and investments' took second place (M121). Also, 11 projects targeting 'cooperation for development of new products, processes and technologies in the agricultural and food sector' (M124) offer significant insights. It is quite surprising that only 1 project was recorded that is directly focused on 'supporting farmers who participate in the food quality schemes' (M132), which may mean that it was either less prioritised in the ENRD work or that the delivery of the measure was not well advanced at the time the database was being developed. Other relevant measures were found under axis 3. These are 14 projects under M312 'support to the creation and development of micro-enterprises'; and axis 4 LEADER (11 projects under M421, 'transnational and interregional cooperation', and 6 projects under M411, competitiveness). In some countries or regions LEADER was a mainstreamed approach towards other RDP axes. This means that the food-related projects could have been implemented through this approach (and through the LAGs) in other axes than the fourth. However, we are not able to state this unambiguously in connection with the database, because this criterion is not clearly embedded there.

The next step in our survey, following the grounded approach, was the clustering and a detailed content analysis of the projects. The database contains brief information about the project objectives, activities, results and benefits, lessons learnt, involved partners and financial data. Within these descriptions we looked for indications of social engagement that could be traced in particular projects, regardless of the axis or measure they belonged to. We looked for repeating patterns, exploring the relevance of each dimension in the implementation of every project, and finally considered only those appearing in at least five different cases.

As a result, the following typology of social marketing with six categories/dimensions was created:

1. Cooperation: the projects generated some forms of cooperation between food producers and/or processors, suppliers of raw material, retailers, information brokers (e.g. researchers, experts), local authorities or reflexive agencies (e.g. LAGs, cooperatives).
2. Joint marketing: the projects focused on common efforts towards identifying new marketing strategies and/or channels, including labelling, branding, joint sales efforts, developing printed and online marketing tools, participating in fairs or exhibitions together, etc.
3. Social events: these projects supported events, creating enhanced opportunities for interactions between producers, retailers, consumers, etc. (e.g. fairs, culinary routes, social dining etc.)
4. Social learning: the projects implied knowledge transfer and/or the creation and rediscovery of local knowledge aimed at individuals and/or communities in order to enhance production methods, product quality, marketing, etc.
5. Intercultural learning: the projects involved learning or knowledge transfer between different countries and cultures, e.g. through study visits.
6. Social space: the projects had an essential focus on investing into public space and built infrastructure where the products could be promoted, tasted and sold (e.g. farmers' market).

## Conclusions

Our paper focused on food marketing schemes that are crucial for coping with challenges of the globalising agro-food system. We reviewed the major trends and mechanisms driving food standards, certification and labelling in the EU context, including relevant interplays of markets and public policies. We also provided a survey of the ENRD database on best practice examples of projects supported under the RDPs. Based on contextual analysis of project description we argue that social marketing of food is a significant, tangible strategy for coping with challenges within the agro-food system.

The typology of social marketing was developed, characterised by certain observable activities and processes. It was grouped into six dimensions: (1) Cooperation; (2) Joint marketing; (3) Social events; (4) Social learning; (5) Intercultural learning; and (6) Social space. The number of characteristics applied in individual projects varied greatly, however, it was revealed that successful marketing of food is supported with a holistic and multidimensional approach. Most visibly, social marketing was practiced in the LEADER axis. It was also detectable under axes 1 and 3, whereas it did not concern axis 2 at all. Moreover, in a few selected cases we learnt that social marketing positively contributed to strengthening the market position of the food chain actors. It triggered collective approaches to problem solving in rural communities and increased their internal and/or external collaboration, in order to brand new food products or improve branding and joint marketing of the existing ones.

Consequently, this led to shortening value chains, expansion on the markets and higher returns. In addition, some projects contributed to improvements of actors' compliance with the

public standards set up at the EU level, namely the geographical indications.

Our study proved that social aspects in food production, marketing, supply and retail are significant. Even under axis 1, that was predominantly intended to support modernisation and investments of food production, social marketing elements supported the implementation of successful projects. Notably, cooperation between stakeholders seems to be crucial for the success of many projects and was clearly visible in the majority of cases we studied. Therefore, these particular mechanisms of social marketing could be more consciously integrated into the various RDP measures, in order to foster a greater impact. As the recent policy discussions revolve around the need to emphasise the 'food policy' in the EU undertakings, we argue that more effort could be invested into exploring the different factors beyond actual success or failure of the food projects that were supported with the EU funding. More account could be taken of the social marketing elements. Possibly, an approach could be developed promoting projects that could address the food system challenges in a holistic way, rather than being based on single measures. Judging by the examples of projects accessible for this study, we argue that social marketing, although not mentioned explicitly, has a prominent place in the EU-funded approaches to support food. Through specialised projects and dedicated activities, it is fostered across the EU. However, as the availability of data is still limited, our findings should be treated as the starting points for further investigations, rather than ultimate statements. The ENRD database proved to be a functional basis for the identification of relevant projects and general trends in their implementation and results. We could make observations on the character of each axis or measure and the supported projects. Nevertheless, the available evidence is not robust enough, nor sufficient to project their long term impacts.

The database does not deliver a clear message on what kind of combination of these six dimensions could result in best practice, or what minimum requirements for supporting food projects need to be fulfilled in order to strengthen the local economy and society. Neither can the connections between social marketing elements and long-term impacts of projects and how these are affected by the social and economic background of the project area be precisely explained. Further in-depth investigations of complex projects with a strong focus on social aspects in marketing strategies is needed. The potential of complementing 'investive' and 'infrastructural' measures with more collective approaches could also be explored further. All this is important to justify public spending on agricultural policies, giving a high priority to food. It can also be crucial to ensure viable support for the participation of rural communities and smallholder food producers in the globalising value chains.

#### References:

Augustyn, A., & Nemes, G. (2016). *Social components of food marketing in RDP-supported projects. SOCIO. HU, (SpecIs), 203-218.*

#### Authors



#### Anna Maria Augustyn

[annamaria.augustyn@yahoo.com](mailto:annamaria.augustyn@yahoo.com)

Anna Maria is a member of the board at Groupe de Bruges, an international think tank advocating sustainable agriculture and territorial development. She is also an experienced international consultant. Over the last thirteen years she has been working as an expert with

the European Commission, European Network for Rural Development, LEADER Local Action Groups, academic institutions and private sector companies. Her more recent assignments include the FAO (climate-smart agriculture, disaster risk reduction), European Commission DG RTD (impact evaluation of the EU research funding), and European Evaluation Helpdesk for Rural Development (evaluation of innovation). In 2015 she was also selected as one of the Future Earth / ICSU fellows.



#### Gusztáv Nemes

[ruralbt@gmail.com](mailto:ruralbt@gmail.com)

Gusztáv is a rural sociologist, economist. He is a senior research fellow at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Economics and a lecturer at the Budapest Corvinus University. He has contributed to a number of international research projects, scientific networks, conferences, publications in the field of rural development and environmental sustainability. He is also an expert consultant with 16 years of experience in the field. Worked both on the level of policy and practice, contributed to evaluation of policies, training materials, methodologies, helped a number of Hungarian LEADER LAGs, rural entrepreneurs, in building and implementing strategies, social innovation and networking. He makes films about rural development and is also member of a Hungarian LAG as an entrepreneur.

He is also an expert consultant with 16 years of experience in the field. Worked both on the level of policy and practice, contributed to evaluation of policies, training materials, methodologies, helped a number of Hungarian LEADER LAGs, rural entrepreneurs, in building and implementing strategies, social innovation and networking. He makes films about rural development and is also member of a Hungarian LAG as an entrepreneur.

### SHORT FOOD SUPPLY CHAINS AS A WAY FOR DIVERSIFYING FARMERS' ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

**Barbara Wieliczko, Marek Wigier, Paweł Chmieliński**  
*Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics – National Research Institute*

#### Introduction

In view of the increasing interest in sustainability issues, a particular role is attached to the analysis of new forms of economic and social activity related to the organization of the short food chains, and as a result of social innovation they take the form of networks based on shared values, community and cooperation. Such forms of organization often create new, local governance models where openness and exchange of information is a guarantee of quality of service and products.

The aim of this paper is to identify a comprehensive set of good practices leading to growth of SFSCs and thus enable different groups of stakeholders to plan their actions towards supporting or creating new SFSCs.

#### Approach to the problem

We analyse the potential of small farms in Poland in the context of their participation in short food chains. In addition to the characteristics of this segment of agricultural sector, we analyse existing entities gathering farmers and small food producers. Two case studies of purchasing networks created in Poland

were analysed. One of them consists of small farmers and develops locally, while the other, based on new technologies and advanced logistics, successfully expands on the Polish market. Proposed approach includes socio-economic analyses to identify, describe and benchmark different business models in terms of starting conditions, obstacles faced, enabling factors, financing mechanisms, generation and distribution of added value and other potential environmental and social benefits.

### Outcomes and discussion

With the economic development and the increase in society's wealth, rapid structural changes in the food sector are observed. In agriculture, they rely on the concentration of resources and on the scale of production. The growing relationships of farms with the market favour the commercialization of production and, consequently, the evolution towards industrial agricultural enterprises. For resilience of rural areas, it is extremely important to maintain their multi-functionality and sustainability. Family farms have a role to play in this process. In Poland, the process of structural change in agriculture occurs at an accelerated pace. This is influenced by changes in the socio-economic system and in the macroeconomic environment. Between 2002 and 2015, the number of farms in Poland decreased by nearly 30% (the largest number of holdings, i.e. over 50 hectares, increased by 66% and the area of up to 10 hectares decreased by about 60%). At the same time, between 2002 and 2015, the number of ecological farms in Poland increased by more than tenfold (currently they account for about 1.6% of all farms and occupy about 4% of the area of agricultural land).

New forms of organization within short food chains are being initiated from the bottom up, by farmers or consumers. It is a social innovation that transforms the traditional direct sales system (usually at marketplaces) into new forms of interaction with the consumer, within a trust-based network. While our research indicates that just over a third of the surveyed vendors around the sales platforms have organic food certificates, other farmers and processors declare the use of traditional production techniques. As traditional foods enjoy a high reputation among consumers, the confirmation by the sales platform of the authenticity of the production process and the quality of the products offered is a sufficient guarantee for potential buyers. Thus, the analysed sales forms are of a trust-based nature, where the role of the certification body for the production technology and the quality of the products offered is taken over by the network organizer. The organizer conducts individual supplier audits by setting up network access criteria, while being in agreement with consumers who support it in evaluating (e.g. exchanging comments and evaluating products on the online forum), reporting new ideas and demand for goods and act as controllers. The maintenance and development of a platform for organic and traditional food sales depends on good economic relationships, but above all on social relationships between suppliers and consumers. The added value of the product is its identity, which the producers give through the story telling, which not only covers the description of the production process but also the personal histories of the people involved. This creates the opportunity for higher sales results, with a relatively small production scale. Farmers participating in a network receive 70-80% of the final price of the product. Commission to group

coordinator is 10-20% per order. Therefore more than 60% of the farmers observed an increase in incomes (up to 40%). Farmers in the group may offer a wide range of products and they will protect one another. If one farm faces crops failure, the other farmers deliver goods for that farm. Trust and cooperation allow to maintain production capacity reserve and minimize risk against, among others, climate change and seasonal crop failures.

### Conclusions

Participating in short food supply chains (SFSCs) is one of the effective ways to make use of small farm potential and to combine farming with other economic activity.

As our research shows that creation of SFSC also facilitates the diffusion of the most sustainable production models as the proximity to consumers and their demands leads to the need for more environmentally responsible farming practices. It also allows for the creation of new forms of cross-linking between producers and consumers, which are observed in theoretical governance models. Due to the growing supply of local, ecologically-friendly and traditional products, well-organized shopping networks can be considered to have a chance for economic success, but they also become opportunities for the development of small farms. Collaborative networks and social innovations are crucial factors forming successful SFSCs.

### Authors



#### Barbara Wieliczko

*wieliczko@ierigz.waw.pl*

Barbara is an assistant professor at Department of Agricultural Finance, Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics – National Research Institute (IAFE-NRI), Warsaw, Poland and an analyst for the Committee of Foreign and EU Affairs in the Polish Senate specializing in agricultural issues. She has also been involved in preparation of a number of expert opinions for the Polish Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development related to agricultural finance, rural development and CAP. Research expertise includes: agricultural policy, rural development, evaluation methods.



#### Marek Wigier

*wigier@ierigz.waw.pl*

Marek is Director Plenipotentiary for Multi-Annual Research Programme and senior researcher at IAFE-NRI. He was granted with scholarships from the U.S. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, French government, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs and visiting professorships at the Bucharest University of Economic Studies and Academy of Public Administration in Kazakhstan. Since 2014 he is member of the Monitoring Committees of the Rural Development Programme for Poland in 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 under the Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development. He managed or was employed in many scientific and evaluation projects at national and international level. Marek is author or co-author of over 200 publications and expertise referring to the following problems: evolution of the CAP and cohesion policy; economic situation in agricultural sectors and in food processing industry; innovation in the food industry, market information systems.



### Paweł Chmieliński

*chmielinski@ierigz.waw.pl*  
*chmielinski@erdn.eu*

Paweł is an assistant professor at the Department of Social and Regional Policy of the Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics – National Research Institute, Warsaw, Poland.

He has over ten years' experience of carrying out researches and implementation of research projects in the field of rural non-farm economy development, including social structures, labour market & entrepreneurship of rural population, local governance & community-led development, national and EU agricultural and rural policy. Since 2012 he co-organises the European Rural Development Network ([www.erdn.eu](http://www.erdn.eu)) and he is an editor-in-chief of the ERDN yearbook: Rural Areas and Development. In 2010-2011 he was a visiting fellow at the Sogn og Fjordane University College in Norway, as a beneficiary of the grant by EEA and Norway Funds. Since 2016 he has been a team leader in the EU H2020 project PERCEIVE ([www.perceiveproject.eu](http://www.perceiveproject.eu)). Paweł is also a member of the board of the LEADER Local Action Group "Zielone Sąsiedztwo" (Green Neighbourhood), voluntarily working for the development of local community.

Author or co-author of a number of scientific articles, research monographs and expert's reports and studies for Polish and international public and professional bodies. MeRSA.

## DISCUSSANT



### Jerzy Wilkin

*jwilkin@irwirpan.waw.pl*

Jerzy Wilkin was born in 1947 in Poland. He is full professor and Head of the Department of European Integration at the Institute of Rural and Agricultural Development of Polish Academy of Sciences (IRWiR PAN) in Warsaw, Poland.

He graduated from University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic Sciences in 1970 and received PhD in Economics in 1976.

Head of Chair of Political Economy at University of Warsaw (1986-2014).

Visiting Professor at Kent State University - USA (1985/1986) and Notre Dame University - USA (1992/1993). Fellow of the European Association of Agricultural Economists. Member of the Polish Academy of Sciences since 2004.

Author of over 300 publications in the field of political economy, institutional economics, agricultural economics, rural development and European integration.

### Session Organisers:

-  Paweł Chmieliński, ERDN and Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics – National Research Institute, Poland
-  Anna Augustyn, Groupe de Bruges, the Netherlands
-  Piermichele La Sala, University of Foggia, Italy

## Call for contributions

to the book under the (working) title:

## Networks, Social Innovations and Short Food Supply Chains

Short Food Supply Chains (SFSCs) are more and more complex operations, consisting of collaborative networks of producers, consumers and institutions, often seeking to sustain 'traditional' farming practices through new models and social innovation. This call for papers is intended to bring together scholarly contributions from a variety of disciplines presenting most recent theoretical and practical studies on SFSCs, Alternative/Local Food Networks.

Examples of possible topics include:

- the role of (social) innovations in SFSCs development,
- new forms of collaborative networks,
- resilience of food systems,
- institutional and policy support,
- infrastructure and logistics in SFSCs,
- potential synergies with other rural businesses/activities,
- economic and social impacts of SFSCs,
- best practises (and failures) of SFSCs and AFNs,
- consumer and producer/farmer perspective.

Timeline:

Deadline for submission of abstract (200-300 words):

15 November, 2017

Deadline for submission of full paper (between 5000 and 8000 words):

31 January, 2018

Final inclusion of the paper is dependent upon peer review.



A selection of papers will be published in the spring 2018. Abstracts and papers in English should be submitted to Paweł Chmieliński at: [chmielinski@erdn.eu](mailto:chmielinski@erdn.eu). The call and guidelines for authors will be provided at: [www.erdn.eu/SFSC](http://www.erdn.eu/SFSC)