



HAL
open science

Local Food Systems: practices and strategies . European Workshop held on 22 February 2010, Brussels. FAAN Report

Les Levidow, Catherine Darrot

► To cite this version:

Les Levidow, Catherine Darrot. Local Food Systems: practices and strategies . European Workshop held on 22 February 2010, Brussels. FAAN Report. [Contract] 2010. hal-02821171

HAL Id: hal-02821171

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02821171>

Submitted on 6 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



FAAN
FACILITATING ALTERNATIVE
AGRO-FOOD NETWORKS



Local Food Systems: practices and strategies

European Workshop held on
22 February 2010, Brussels

FAAN Report

Authors:

Les Levidow

Open University
and

Catherine Darrot

Agrocampus Ovest

2010

FAAN project is funded by the European
Community's Seventh Framework
Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant
agreement no. 217280



Table of contents

1	Introduction to report.....	3
	1.1 Aims and structure of the workshop.....	3
	1.2 Report: structure and style	3
	1.3 Acknowledgements.....	4
2	Presentations and commentary	4
	2.1 Introduction to the workshop.....	4
	2.2 Local Food Systems: Resources for mobilisation.....	5
	2.3 Policy frameworks	7
	2.4 Ways to handle the framework requirements	10
3	Open Space: break-out groups	11
	3.1 Social Innovation (SI)	12
	3.2 Networking	13
	3.3 Peasants and Small-scale Farmers	14
	3.4 Urban-rural Connections	15
	3.5 Local authorities	16
3	Plenary discussion.....	16
4	Concluding talks	17
	Appendices	18
	I Invitation letter	18
	II Table: Policies relevant to Local Food Systems (LFS).....	20
	III Networking group: detailed notes.....	21
	IV Urban-rural Connections group: detailed notes	24
	V Local Authorities group: detailed notes	26
	VI Conflicting epistemologies (Wynne Wright)	29
	VII Workshop participants	30
	VIII Photographs from the workshop.....	39

1 Introduction to report

1.1 Aims and structure of the workshop

Workshop aims were announced as follows:

- to provide a trans-national networking opportunity for stakeholders for further co-operation to enhance local food systems;
- to identify needs for policy changes, civic action, and future research in order to support local food systems;
- to reflect on research findings in a broader context by drawing on participants' knowledge and experience;
- to engage researchers, policy and practitioner actors from different countries who may take up the findings and implications in their activities.

Structure

The structure was designed to fulfill the above aims in several ways:

- advance circulation of a briefing document, based on project results;
- presentations of key points from those results;
- discussion of those results and extra points from participants;
- external guest speakers as discussants;
- break-out groups on topics suggested by participants;
- report-back to a plenary session.

Programme & timetable

10.00 – 10.20 Welcome and Introduction

10.20 – 13.00 Presentations and discussions

‘Resources of the mobilisation of LFS’

‘Policy frameworks: facilitating or hindering?’

‘Different ways to handle the framework requirements’

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch break

14.00 – 16.00 Open Space – break out groups

16.30 – 17.30 Plenary discussion

17.30 – 18.00 Concluding remarks and feedback

Attendance: By the deadline ten days before the workshop, more than 60 people had registered. Additional requests were declined for lack of space and financial resources. The attendance was 56 people.

1.2 Report: structure and style

The report structure follows the timetable as above.

Related files

These files are available on the project website, www.faanweb.eu

Briefing document which was pre-circulated

PowerPoint files of the talks

Philippe Galiay, ‘A Science in Society Perspective’

Sandra Karner and Nicoleta Chioncel, ‘Co-operative research on Alternative Agro-Food Networks’

Bálint Balázs, ‘Resources for the mobilisation of LFS’

Les Levidow, ‘Policy frameworks: facilitating or hindering LFS?’

Cath Darrot, ‘Role of local authorities and local policies’

Sandra Karner and Sonja Petrovics, ‘Different strategies of LFS for dealing with framework conditions’

Thierry Gaudin, ‘What is the meaning of Knowledge Society?’

Attribution of statements: For simplicity of style, comments made at the workshop are generally presented here as statements, without repeatedly adding ‘s/he said’, or ‘it was said’. The report does not thereby endorse all the statements -- as fact or opinion. For formal presentations and guest talks (discussants), comments are attributed to the speakers under their names as sub-headings. Other comments are not always attributed to individuals. We have tried to represent those comments as accurately as possible and welcome clarification of meanings.

Numbered notes provide information beyond what was said at the workshop.

1.3 Acknowledgements

The FAAN project thanks the following:

- European Commission staff, especially Philippe Galiay and Jolanta Klimczak-Morabito, for helping with the workshop venue;
- other organisations for publicising the invitation letter, especially through the Convention for a Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe (CURE), <http://www.cureforsustainability.eu>, and the Peri-Urban Regions Platform Europe (PURPLE) network, www.purple-eu.org.
- FAAN partners IFZ and Via Campesina Austria for organising the workshop programme;
- FAAN partner Urszula Budzich-Szukala for chairing the workshop;
- workshop participants for contributing to the discussion, especially discussants (as noted below);
- FAAN partners for taking notes on the day and then commenting on an early draft of this report;
- participants likewise for commenting on a draft report.

Participants' comments have been helpful for the project to formulate its findings in ways more relevant to practitioners of Local Food Systems and to policy issues at several levels. These links will be made in the final report and other dissemination items.

2 Presentations and commentary

2.1 Introduction to the workshop

Philippe Galiay, 'A Science in Society Perspective'

Bio-note: Project officer for FAAN in DG RTD-L3 'Governance and Ethics' Unit. [For more detail on his talk, see also the PPT file]

Technological developments face a growing organised resistance. Is the 'progress machine' jamming? For Knowledge Societies, what kind of governance is needed? What is the place for values? What different kinds of knowledge? There are many lessons from governance case studies. Practices have been: partial in scientific advice, insufficient in risk assessment, insufficient in communication and dialogue, lacking inclusiveness in framing issues and lacking a sense of urgency. Overall: a failure to incorporate diverse values in a common and shared vision. How to move towards a renewed Governance Framework? Knowledge Societies will value their 'parents' values, e.g. by continuing previous patterns along divergent lines. Industry promotes competition, while civil society favours cooperation.

Challenges ahead for Science & Society include: restructuring relations between drivers of innovation; revisiting notion of progress, going beyond GDP as the measure of progress.¹ There are efforts at rewriting soft and hard rules, e.g. through Nanotech Rules of Conduct.

The European Commission has a new Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science; the title replaces the previous one (Research, Technology and Development) and may indicate a new emphasis on innovation.

Sandra Karner and Nicoleta Chioncel, 'Co-operative research on Alternative Agro-Food Networks'

Bio-note: FAAN project coordinators, Interuniversity Research Centre for Technology, Work and Culture (IFZ), Graz.

[For more detail on the talk, see the PPT file and pre-circulated briefing document.]

The FAAN project has aimed: to research specific questions related to Alternative Agro-Food Networks (AAFNs) within a co-operative research process; and to design, implement and evaluate a co-operative research activity.

Main research questions have been:

- How do current policies facilitate or impede the development of AAFNs?
- How could public policies and action better facilitate AAFNs?
- What are further research needs relevant for AAFNs?

Activities emphasise co-operative & participatory processes. Methods: literature studies; empirical case studies; interviews, focus groups, scenario analyses workshops, European level workshop.

¹ BEPA, Overview paper for the 'Beyond GDP' conference, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy_advisers/publications/docs/beyond_gdp_overview_paper_en.pdf

‘Alternative’ means various differences from a conventional agri-food system:

- reaction to challenges of conventional productivist agriculture: alternative products, production processes, marketing concepts
- certain qualities: product (fresh, tasty, specific origin), production (environmental friendly, traditional, socially sound, animal welfare, aesthetic attributes), marketing (direct selling, short chain supply, box schemes, specific labelling, local/regional embeddedness)
- active involvement of actors (farmers, processors, local distributors, CSOs, restaurants, consumers)

AAFNs may take different forms: ‘producers as consumers, producer-consumer partnerships, direct sales, specialist retailers, fair trade products. In the FAAN project, all case studies have been food re-localisation, towards establishing Local Food Systems (LFS).

What is ‘co-operative research’ (CR)?

CR could be defined as a form of scientific and practical inquiry, which involves both researchers and non-researchers in a close commitment requiring constant attention to trans-disciplinary engagement with stakeholders and public in order to explain the driving aims and purposes, the alternative orientations, and the wide social and environmental implications of research and innovation. CR treats different forms of knowledge and understanding in a symmetrical way, allowing for more effective integration of currently artificially separated processes of research design, implementation and dissemination. Difference in CR in terms of process and outcomes: ‘framing’ of research questions and research methods, bring complementary expertise to research on LFS, involvement of further actors to participate in integrated research, utilisation of research results.

2.2 Local Food Systems: Resources for mobilisation

Bálint Balázs, ‘Resources for the mobilisation of LFS’

Bio-note: FAAN partner, Szent István University (SZIU), Budapest.

[For more detail on the talk, see also the PPT file and pre-circulated briefing document.]

Local Food Systems (LFS)

- go beyond market motives
- enhance social, environmental and economic sustainability
- depend upon proximity between producers and consumers
- depend on state support

Strategies in performing alternatives

- Cooperation of diverse stakeholders
- (Re)invention of tradition
- Seeking to become mainstream
- Sustainable agricultural production system
- Territorial branding
- Creating alternative knowledge
- Developing via intermediaries

Success strategies

- Consolidating networks needs tailored funding
- Visionaries, dreamers and practitioners are required to foster cooperation
- Equal standing in communication is vital to transition
- Go beyond existing rules

Hannes Lorenzen: commentary

Bio-note: Advisor on agriculture and rural development for the Greens in the European Parliament. He is a founding member of the Convention for Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe (CURE). He has checked and corrected the text below.

It is good to see the Commission funding research on local food systems. Previously such topics were seen as suspect. In earlier times, the European Parliament has requested a research programme on the

sustainable use of genetic resources in agriculture, involving farmers. But the Commission replied: farmers have no knowledge of this topic, so we need scientists to do the research.

We should ask whether the food-chain market is functioning. It puts farmers under pressure: prices for farmers go down, while prices for consumers go up. So where is the added value? Who gains it? -- supermarkets, retailers, etc... Added value is leaving rural areas and is instead concentrated where the raw materials are processed. Farmers are losing, because they are not sufficiently organised.

The FAAN project gives us news about more organised resistance to gain back added value for rural areas. The project has asked how added value can get where it is most needed. The project is looking mainly at agri-food production; this makes sense, because alternatives need first to be developed before becoming a choice for consumers. Consumers need to become aware about the added value of alternatives – in terms of environment, social issues, cultural issues. Such benefits are difficult to measure. In the European Commission's Communication on the functioning of food chains in Europe, none of these issues have been addressed [see next paragraph]. Consumers might be able to shorten the food chain, thus giving back added value to both agricultural producers & consumers.

The Commission has published a report on 'A better functioning food supply chain in Europe', as a basis for future legislation.² Its report looks only at market function, price stability, etc. So the European Parliament's Agriculture Committee is preparing a response³ which emphasises the problems of unfair competition, unstable markets, farm-gate prices declining, farmers in difficulty, etc. Agricultural production should be turned into an alternative offering added quality for environment, culture, etc. According to the Commission report's proposal, farmers must get organised to find solutions. This main message does not help very much without tackling underlying policy issues, e.g. oversupply of milk. According to the Commission report, farmers must get organised to find solutions. But the EU faces a permanent surplus, especially in milk, so the problem lies beyond farmers' capacity.

In our Committee's view, Europe needs shorter food-supply chains to give farmers higher prices and to give consumers better quality. Big industries should be controlled so that profit does not go to fewer and fewer actors. Competition policies don't allow farmers to control prices but do allow buyer power to lower prices, contrary to competition principles. The FAAN project can become an important part of changing future policies, e.g. competition rules.

The EU should find ways to re-balance supply and demand. In this context, consumers have a role in shaping demand: what do they choose or want? How can farmers and consumers get into contact with each other? The health check of the CAP identified important aspects (e.g. climate change, water management, biodiversity). How can these be integrated in a new way of organising the consumer-producer relationship? How can food-chain policies be controlled so that the major profit does not go to fewer and fewer big suppliers? LFS could contribute to this.

Discussion:

Michael Dower (CURE): Reducing food miles through short food supply chains could contribute to sustainability, especially given problems of climate change. LFS can also contribute to urban-rural linkages. The CURE network has just finished seminars with DG Regio on urban-rural linkages.⁴ CURE is planning a seminar series and a research project on producer-consumer links to shorten the food chain (in France

² 'A better functioning food supply chain in Europe', http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/publication16061_en.pdf

³ 'Fair revenues for farmers: A better functioning food supply chain in Europe', Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, Parliamentary hearing will be held on 04.05.2010. According to this document, policy improvements should include the following:

- a differentiation and revision of hygiene rules and shelf life of products;
- decentralizing and simplifying certification and control systems;
- promotion of direct producer-consumer-relations and short food supply chains, whose sustainability benefits have been documented by EC research projects;
- involvement of producers and consumers in the elaboration of quality and fair trade criteria.

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/agri/dt/806/806345/806345en.pdf

⁴ <http://www.cureforsustainability.eu/index.php?id=7205>

and Romania), where they start from 'the other end' – from the consumers (e.g. school children, old people, office canteens).

Frederic Morand (Ecoinnovation): Interested in the institutional aspects of alternative ways to establish short food chains. Is there anything new that the EP is going to do, given its new competence in agriculture? For example, regarding a redistribution of added value in food chains and food localisation.

Hannes Lorenzen: One never knows what the European Parliament is going to do. It needs to find its new place and role. The Commission is looking to the Parliament in a new way now. The EP is on the same level as the Council, with increased power. The EP will discuss an opinion report on food-supply chains in May. If there is majority support, then the EP could emphasise that LFS are important. In the context of the new CAP, it might become more obvious how to change competencies and competition policies, as well as general agri-food policies. Competition needs to be considered on different levels, since competition on the world market is completely different than competition on the local/regional level/market. Do we want or need different laws? E.g. different hygienic rules, different trade laws, etc.

Michael Dower: We should ask the 'So what?' in the end, as regards what the results mean for future policies and research; the workshop will help. FAAN should answer that question in its final report. Workshop participants will help to say what the results mean for future policies and research, but FAAN should include such points in the final report. The FAAN project should have the courage to speak to policy issues.

Urszula Budzich-Szukala (FAAN): This policy link is an aim of this workshop, so we hope to come up with proposals.

Les Levidow (FAAN): The problem is not about courage. Rather, it's about needing to know better what are the policy discussions, as a basis for us to make our results more relevant and to intervene more effectively. The FAAN project needs participants help to clarify how results could create recommendations of greater relevance to policy discussions, especially those which will be coming up soon.

2.3 Policy frameworks

Les Levidow, 'Policy frameworks: facilitating or hindering LFS?'

Bio-note: FAAN partner, Open University.

[For more detail of the talk, see also Appendix II below, the briefing document and PPT file.]

A central question for our study is: 'How do policies hinder, facilitate or shape AAFNs?' – meaning local food systems (LFS) in our case studies. Practitioners find ways to challenge, accommodate and/or bypass unfavourable policies. Likewise they find ways to accommodate, use, strengthen and/or link favourable policies. These strategies result in specific forms of LFS.

Policies are rarely designed or implemented in order to facilitate LFS, especially the social cooperation involved. Government officials have no responsibility for their promotion. Nevertheless some key 'champions' attempt to change and link various policies along favourable lines, especially within regional authorities. Leader programmes have played a special role in facilitating cooperative networks among producers and with retailers.⁵

In any context, each policy framework may have various features which both hinder and facilitate LFS, so these features are shown in the two columns in the Table 'Policies relevant to Local Food Systems' (see Appendix II below). Such tensions can be seen in several policies: CAP, hygiene regulations, trading laws, public procurement, territorial and quality branding.

Mark Cropper: commentary

Bio-note: Deals with scientific support to policy and general policy issues within DG Agriculture.

[He has checked and corrected the text below.]

⁵ European Network for Rural Development (EN RD),
http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/enrd-structure/en/enrd-structure_home_en.cfm

In DG Agriculture my unit acts as an interface with the research world. Last September we held a workshop on policy-science interactions.⁶ Policymakers can approach these issues in two ways: as policy science, or as Knowledge Systems. The Standing Committee for Agricultural Research (SCAR) held a workshop on Agricultural Knowledge Systems (AKS) at Angers.⁷ Among the participants, the *status quo* regarding research and RD funding was assumed; so the aim became more to use better the resources available. Often a new idea undergoes research and then harvest in a product – but forgets the user or consumer.

My role is difficult to identify if regulations (or their removal) or financing is not requested. Maybe policing the AKS system from outside would be better.

As one way to look at it, my colleagues in DG-Agriculture would need a clearer incentive to attend a seminar such as this one. There is a cognitive gap: Local Food Systems are more real to you than to many of my colleagues, who look at how to shift large quantities of food around Europe.

Your policy report should clarify whether you spoke with the relevant people who deal with EC policies. Your report is missing the CAP Health Check and recent changes in pillar 1, which is now reducing payments to larger farmers. Also relevant is the food industry's Working Group on Food Chain Management.⁸ I am glad to see that your policy report cites the SCAR expert report,⁹ which has been read by few people. Other relevant research projects include EuroMarc, Insight, Cofami, etc.¹⁰

Your policy report mentions that food initiatives see EU rules as 'barriers', 'obstacles', 'burdens', etc. On that basis, you suggest that they need to bypass or bend unfavourable rules in order to carry out their occupations.¹¹ As a friendly policeman, I can't be expected to permit people to bend rules. So your message should be more factually based.

Your policy report talks about policies being 'designed' (e.g. hygiene regulations). But if you ask policy science specialists, they will say that generally EU policies get stuck together. It is a political process. Did you ask policy makers about their policies, as a basis for your comments on them? That makes a big difference. And did you include the Health Check of CAP? Is there a political scientist in your research group? Your project has to see the entire legislation and how it is drawn.

There are some relevant changes in the Commission. DG Agriculture has a new Commissioner who speaks about 'rééquilibrage des paiements', 'richesse rurale', 'diversité des agriculteurs' – e.g., local wealth, small-scale producers, etc., thus making openings to the Parliament. The Commission has referred to 'social innovation' in the *EU2020* document.¹² But the concept has no consensual meaning for the time being.

⁶ 'Science-Policy interactions: a workshop on EU-funded environmental research', 18 September 2009, <http://www.esa.wur.nl/UK/Research/SPworkshop/default.htm>
<http://www.esa.wur.nl/NR/rdonlyres/F1902BE6-1A7B-4036-B762-26DB0F628403/92386/Programme.pdf>

⁷ 'Strengthening the links between knowledge and agricultural innovation in Europe', Angers: 6-7th October 2008, Workshop organised by the French EU-Presidency for the Standing Committee for Agricultural Research (SCAR), http://ec.europa.eu/research/agriculture/scar/whatsnew_en.htm

⁸ Strategic Research Agenda for Food Chain Management, http://etp.ciaa.be/documents/group_docs/food_chain_management_b.pdf

⁹ *2nd SCAR Foresight Exercise: New challenges for agricultural research: climate change, food security, rural development, agricultural knowledge systems*, Foresight Expert Group, http://ec.europa.eu/research/agriculture/scar/pdf/scar_2nd_foresight_exercise_en.pdf

¹⁰ <http://www.insightproject.net>, www.cofami.org, <http://www.mountainproducts-europe.org/sites/euromontana/>

¹¹ As the workshop briefing document says, practitioners may find ways to bypass unfavourable policies. But the word 'bend' does not appear there. According to an Austrian case study (PPT file), an organic food cooperative has been 'subverting Hygiene Regulations', but workshop participants had not seen or heard this analysis before the above comment on 'bending the rules'.

¹² Consultation on the Future 'EU 2020' Strategy, Commission Working Document, <http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/>

To design and implement programmes to promote social innovation for the most vulnerable, in particular by providing innovative education, training, and employment opportunities for deprived communities, to fight

Jozef Konings is providing advice to the Commission to develop the idea. So you could relate your findings to that concept.¹³

The CAP has a co-decision procedure with a greater role for the Parliament. Questions are being asked there about the food chain.¹⁴

Some advice: Be deliberate about your language in communicating on policy.

Discussion: comments

Urszula Budzich-Szukala: Previously Michael Dower said that courage is needed for researchers to make strong proposals to policymakers. But we should remember that courage is also needed for policymakers to face researchers, and therefore I appreciate the contribution of Mark Cropper to our discussion.

Becky Price (FAAN): What has been said about Knowledge Systems refers to the idea that science leads to innovation. Innovation generally means a product to sell; this is a problematic approach. This is considered as one thing that is wrong with science in society, because it is mainly about how to sell a new product to people. It is about the consumers' dissatisfaction. Rather, we should ask: What is the problem to address? How best to feed people?

Mark Cropper: My previous comments referred to greater involvement of other actors in research programmes, or vice versa: that researchers shall not think that they have a monopoly on knowledge and shall listen to other people's ideas. There is a need for consumer involvement, not only producers. Twenty years ago my grandmother would have told you that GMOs are no-go as an innovation, but then we were in a different paradigm. We need different kinds of science-policy interaction: Scientists speak too much about problems – not enough about visions for the future.

Sandra Karner: In talking about the Knowledge Systems approach so far, we were mainly addressing science-policy interactions. A real integrated approach for a mutual understanding of each other, with various visions, should also include civil society actors. How could such a more integrated system be implemented? What is the potential role for civil society in Knowledge Systems?

Mark Cropper: As one problem, researchers often speak on behalf of civil society. The Knowledge Systems approach has difficulty to find consumers to participate (e.g. Round Table that I conducted in Spain). Also in policy making: Brussels events have representatives of EU-wide consumer (and other) organisations, who try very hard to speak on behalf of *the* EU consumers/producers/etc. If this is reproduced on the local level, then it is a different type of debate. But local events attract different representatives. The Environment research programme had an interesting project, SENSOR, which had a modelling component with a participatory impact assessment.¹⁵ This had ways to get people involved and to get a more balanced, broader political and scientific process. We should be more careful in how we engage people.

Hannes Lorenzen: I understood Mark's message to FAAN as: 'Find the right language, use your people to have knowledge about policy, get your act together, otherwise you will not have influence.' With projects like the FAAN, we need this kind of message from people who practice. It is not about representatives or lobbyists, but rather about people who do something on their local level and so who are experienced. Research should present a message based on practice and experience on the local level. We need this kind of messages to integrate into our reflections about struggles over policies. The FAAN project is on the right track, relevant to struggles over funds, influence etc. The process of 2013 CAP reform leaves very little time for people to come in with their own messages. The policy process needs to involve more people (like you) who think about relations between research and policy. Many people at this workshop have no clue about the communication process of the Commission on food supply chains: how is this possible? Hearings do not help very much, because the language is not very appropriate. Usually there is too much distance between practitioners and the people who do research on practice and then draw their conclusions. We need better ways to make use of research. But people should also be encouraged to talk about practice and

discrimination (e.g. disabled), and to develop a new agenda for migrants' integration to enable them to take full advantage of their potential (page 18).

¹³ Workshop on 'Europe and Social Innovation', 19-20 January 2009, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/policy_advisers/activities/conferences_workshops/socinnov_jan-2009_en.htm

¹⁴ See previous comments by Hannes Lorenzen and the Agriculture Committee's report.

¹⁵ SENSOR: Sustainability Impact Assessment: Tools for Environmental, Social and Economic Effects of Multifunctional Land Use in European Regions, www.sensor-ip.org

to find other ways of communication, rather than think that research is the only way to communicate about reality.

Irmi Salzer (FAAN): The FAAN project is designed as co-operative research, which means bringing reality into research. You [Mark Cropper] have advised us to use a proper language: that we should be careful not to offend the policy police, e.g. about bypassing or bending the rules. But this is reality because the policy is unworkable for small producers. They are struggling hard because they cannot deal with your policies. For CSOs [such as ours] it is very important to describe their reality; this was the reason why we decided to participate in this project.

Mark Cropper: The question is how we relate to each other. I am not a policeman of CAP. If you describe reality, then just describe it. Do you need words like 'bypass'? Your report could say what people do and how/why they do it, rather than say that they 'bend rules'. Keep in mind the Cash criteria for research: credibility, legitimacy (respect of content), salience to audience, etc.¹⁶ This is similar to the Commission's ethical code, which says: I must be objective in my work, impartial in my treatment, circumspect (i.e. reflective).

2.4 Ways to handle the framework requirements

Cath Darrot, 'Role of local authorities and local policies'

Bio-note: FAAN partner Agrocampus Ouest, Rennes.

[For more details of the talk, see also the PPT file.]

Action by local councils has specificities:

- Stakeholders know each other personally.
- They share some trends in a common local territory.
- Local personalities involved in public authorities, and local actors involved in LFS, are all involved personally in this territory.

This local dimension includes:

- Interactions between LFS and local authorities
- Forms and effects of local public action on LFSs
- Attempts by LFS to influence local authorities

LFS depend upon building new socio-political norms. They use opportunities of favourable factors, and avoid hindering factors. These are illustrated by case studies from the FAAN project.

Question from Mark Cropper:

By socio-political norms, do you mean pathways? Who initiates these norms, e.g. a local authority?

Sandra Karner and Sonja Petrovics, 'Different strategies of LFS for dealing with framework conditions'

Bio-note: Sandra Karner is FAAN project Coordinator, IFZ; Sonja Petrovics is FAAN partner, OeBV (Via Campesina Austria).

[For more detail, see also the PPT file and pre-circulated briefing document.]

LFS have different strategies for dealing with favourable and unfavourable factors, e.g. policies or wider contexts. These different strategies are illustrated by three initiatives in Austria.

¹⁶ Three criteria for effective mobilisation of science for policy: credibility – the perceived scientific adequacy of the evidence; legitimacy – perception that the information has been respectful of context; salience – the relevance of the information to the needs of decision makers. Based on D. W. Cash et al. 'Knowledge systems for sustainable development', *PNAS* 100 (14): 8086-91, 8 July 2003, <http://www.pnas.org/content/100/14/8086.full>

Table: Alternative strategies of three initiatives in Austria

ALMO	BERSTA	Organic food coop
<i>assimilated alternatives</i>	<i>professional alternatives</i>	<i>subversive alternatives</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adapting to the market • using existing funding and lobbying for additional funding • growth is success • cooperative handling of hygiene requirements • additional certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adapting to the market but keeping core ideas • initial funding, today based on economic viability • slow growth according to core principles (e.g. fairness) • adapting to hygiene regulations (individual basis) • specific products, active communication with consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • subverting the market, • do not request funding and aim at structures that need no funding • multiplication instead of growth • subverting hygiene regulations • buying certified organic but also from trust-based un-certified organic farms

Karl Reiner, commentary

Bio-note: Since 1988 with the ÖAR-Regional Consulting Ltd. He specialises in integrated regional development programmes, feasibility studies and tourism development.

I have been involved in BERSTA, a local food initiative.¹⁷ I also know ALMO as one of the most successful regional agro-food networks, which concentrates only on one product. There is a similar successful project in Austria, the *Käsestrasse* production and marketing of cheese in the Western part of Austria (Vorarlberg). We could learn a lot from these initiatives. Local food networks promote diversity. It is very important to maintain such varieties, and alternative networks support this. Local food networks also develop close relations between producers and consumers. This offers regional value-added for people, e.g. in mountain areas, making it more attractive for people to stay in rural areas. Such an alternative in the longer term must remain small, because most initiatives become conventional when they grow. The main problems of these networks were hygiene regulations in the 1980s. Now it is a growing market, so the main problem becomes logistics. In Austria local food is still a growing market with much hype, especially in combination with tourism activities. There we can see many success stories. What is the real product: is it a good or something different? A better landscape is as much the product as the food itself. Thus the relevant policies relate not only to food production but also to the landscape, to sustainable living.

3 Open Space: break-out groups

As chair of the workshop, Urszula Budzich-Szukala explained the overall plan for break-out groups. Workshop participants would now propose topics for these groups, to clarify which topics attract most interest. Participants could freely circulate among the groups in the open space. For each topic, the convenor would take charge of a flip-chart for recording ideas. From those groups, outcomes could be a better understanding of each issue and practical proposals.

Each group recorded key points on sheets of a flip-chart, as an extra basis for the record below. For the report-back to the plenary session, each group had a rapporteur, as indicated below.

Discussion about possible topics

- The discussion about possible topics raised the following questions:
- What language & evidence can best communicate FAAN project results to policymakers?
- What is the meaning and relevance of social innovation?
- How can we set up a European Wiki to exchange ideas among our networks?

¹⁷ Founded in 1980, BERSTA is a cooperative of 17 organic farmers in the Waldviertel region in Lower Austria and a consumer group in Vienna. This became a case study of the FAAN project, <http://www.faanweb.eu/page/case-study-1>

- What are the difficulties in selling processed products, e.g. around the hygiene rules?
- What are the problems of policy capture, e.g. by powerful interests or by administrators trying to spend budgets?
- What are the rural-urban relations in/for local food?
- How can local & regional authorities promote LFS?
- What are the needs of small scale farmers (who comprise 2/3 of European farmers)?
- What type of CAP & market rules do we need? What role for food sovereignty?
- What are the broader social aims, e.g. social inclusion?

The discussion concluded with a list of six topics for break-out groups. Too few people attended one group, so there remained five topics for discussion, as listed below. Although participants were invited to circulate among the groups, most stayed within the same group. All the groups aimed to discuss aspects of LFS, so this term is not repeated in the subheadings below.

3.1 Social Innovation (SI)

Working group hosted by Mark Cropper (DG Agriculture) and Becky Price (FAAN partner, Genewatch). Reported by Bálint Balázs (FAAN partner, Szent István University).

Introduction by Mark Cropper

The term Social Innovation is broad. But it does not mean social inclusion, social capital, social goods, CSR, etc. It refers to new strategies that meet all kinds of social needs across all sectors of the market, the civil society and the state. In Eurospeak, the Renewed Social Agenda uses the term to mean new models of social services.¹⁸ Drawing on how to socialize the Lisbon Strategy, social innovation can mean anything in connection to bottom-up, networked, participatory approaches. It acts as a pre-policy concept, a plug-in for policy reform that is currently cross-cutting several DGs work. As a hook, it captures policy areas and invites policymakers to an open debate. FAAN could serve up the project results and feed into this ongoing debate on SI. Choose the appropriate terms carefully to give your message.

Discussion points

AAFNs/LFS can be interpreted as either a source or a medium of Social Innovation (SI). In a similar sense, SI has overlapping meanings:

- as a source of innovation, creativity, design;
- as a means of innovation (e.g. collaborative experiments, participatory techniques, open source platforms);
- as an aim of innovation (e.g. microcredit, participatory budgeting).

When thinking of SI in agricultural research, the Leader programme is considered to be a good example of process innovation and stakeholder involvement. When Leader remained small and local, it managed to gain success. But when it becomes mainstreamed and centralized, the magic is lost.

People feel too distant from food sources. They want to know where their food is coming from. That comes first, not the social innovation.

What is social in SI? How it is different from entrepreneurship? How it is different from neoliberal regime? How does it relate to the Social Good?

Agricultural Knowledge Systems (AKS) were promoted in the SCAR Foresight report. It diagnosed a problem: a growing gap between farmers' knowledge and scientific knowledge, though without clear agreement on why it exists. As a solution, AKS means linking several knowledges – of farmers,

¹⁸ Renewed social agenda: Opportunities, access and solidarity in 21st century Europe, <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=547>, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:DKEY=473792:EN:NOT>

agronomists, lab scientists, extension services – so that farmers become more than recipients of knowledge.¹⁹

Agricultural knowledge used to be about growing crops, but now it's how to cultivate subsidy. The medium of knowledge has changed too: it used to be extension workers, but now it's the internet etc.

SI is not an opening for technological innovation. Rather it is innovation integrated into society by several organisations. For example, traffic accident deaths led to innovation which didn't reduce deaths, so attention shifted to drivers' attitudes for finding solutions.

LFS create a decentralised system, less dependent upon food imports, though agricultural inputs may be imported. Such a system can promote food sovereignty – an issue which has been marginalised by a focus on food security.²⁰

3.2 Networking

Hosted by Lasca ten Kate (Friendly Kitchens Alliance). Reported by Nicoleta Chioncel. Below are some key points. For the full notes, see Appendix III.

There is a need for a networking forum around the experiences of LFS. This could be seen as a knowledge marketplace, as a platform of services, and/or as a social learning tool. Diverse LFS initiatives exist but have no communication space to share already invented and tested practices. The initial idea started from creation of a possible Wiki interactive space for developing and sharing knowledge about LFS. Such an interactive space could be a 'social learning tool' for different types of users. A 'platform of services' could offer multi-language sections, modules, search possibilities, and restricted areas. The platform should address the needs of entrepreneurs, farmers, consumers, other stakeholders, etc. EU project partners could also bring their experiences, but in an accessible way.

Such a network would depend on financial support. The Commission is interested to know how many potential users are expected to use such a platform and how it could be made effective. It could represent a good dissemination tool for various European projects; end users are expected to be attracted from various fields and with various interests. In order to discuss a feasible plan for a further project, three main questions should be answered:

- i. Who is organising the bid (grant application)?
- ii. How could such a project be developed?
- iii. A platform for what?

i. Who is organising the bid?

Eco-Innovation is interested to work for such a proposal, also in connection to Platform Technology Organics (<http://www.tporganics.eu>) The FAAN project will also support this initiative. Friendly Kitchens Alliance is interested to contribute mainly as moderator for different discussion groups and networking. The Commission is potentially interested by such a proposal, e.g. for demonstrating the effectiveness of the knowledge production in the co-operative research process and the utility of such an eTool. Mainly CSOs are interested and motivated to run such an ePlatform. They also have the capacity of mobilisation of different actors in the field.

ii. How to develop such a project?

First step is a review of existing eTools and projects dealing with LFS, by integrating experiences and feedback from different projects. Next step is choosing the most suitable tool and adapting the best open source software (already developed by Eco-Innovation). Initial financial support for starting the project is essential; further work on this initiative could be self-financed, based on a regular membership.

¹⁹ Foresight Expert Group, *2nd SCAR Foresight Exercise: New challenges for agricultural research: climate change, food security, rural development, agricultural knowledge systems*, http://ec.europa.eu/research/agriculture/scar/pdf/scar_2nd_foresight_exercise_en.pdf

²⁰ European Platform for Food Sovereignty, 'European food declaration: Towards a healthy, sustainable, fair and mutually supportive Common Agriculture and Food Policy', 2009, <http://www.epfs.eu/uploads/campaign/09%2012%2005%20European%20food%20declaration.pdf>; Patel article for free download from *Journal of Peasant Studies*, <http://rajpatel.org/2009/11/27/food-sovereignty-but-with-details/>

iii. A platform for what?

- A prototype for social learning, as a simple tool to facilitate and improve social learning in LFS.
- Exchange of information and interdependence of info. For example, online archives of different types of magazines are really effective tools for many practitioners; and they become available for many users.
- Through these information systems, farmers could become free to choose different methods, while bringing additional value for self-producers or customers.

The benefits could be formulated in terms of: empowering different types of end-users, re-evaluating the norms and ethical aspects, as well as freeing the production of knowledge and thus their exploitation.

Conclusions:

- Such a project could be successful if enthusiastic promoters are launching this initiative.
- There is a need for intensified moderation activities
- There should be initial resources for launching it.
- A core group will further elaborate the present skeletal idea and find possible sponsors/funding sources.

3.3 Peasants and Small-scale Farmers

Hosted by Michael Dower (CURE) and Michela Potito (Associazione CampiAperti)

Reported by Irmi Salzer (FAAN partner, OeBV – Via Campesina Austria).

This group dealt with two main topics:

- the situation and role of small farmers/peasants in Europe; and
- the process towards a new CAP, especially how to influence decision-makers to accommodate the needs of peasants/small farmers.

i. Situation and role of small-scale farmers

Information was exchanged about the important role that small farmers play in Europe, considering their numbers (two thirds producing on less than 5 hectares) and the number of people whom they provide with food. Small-scale agriculture has a great importance – not only in terms of food provision but also concerning local culture, tradition, biodiversity, landscapes, and especially employment (multifunctionality). Small farmers face problems regarding access to markets, hygiene regulations and access to technologies for food processing. Furthermore farming becomes increasingly less attractive for young people. EU funding schemes for subsistence and semi-subsistence farmers require them to become ‘competitive’ in an EU sense within three years. This pressure leads to the closure of many small farms as well as the rise of unemployment. To improve small farmers’ life, a possible solution is to develop local food systems – processing products and selling them directly to consumers, hence adding value to products. Other parallel solutions are to engage in farm tourism or other diversifying practises. Farmers’ networks could provide processing facilities, organize the packaging and the distribution, and do the quality control. Networking is essential for cooperation and farmer cooperatives.

ii. Process towards a new CAP

Participants agreed that the current CAP’s design does not support peasants’ agriculture. The group took into account the ongoing discussions about the CAP after 2013, and the design of the EU 2020 strategy. Participants tried to figure out possibilities to influence the CAP’s design, towards policies favouring small-scale and peasant farmers. According to the representative of DG Agri, possible entry points will be to lobby:

- at the European Parliament: the most promising to gain a hearing for cross-sectoral issues, but this is probably the most difficult strategy.
- at the national level, since the Council is one of the most important players
- at the administrative level.

Discussion about the design of the new CAP centred around the following issues: distribution of payments, legitimacy of payments, and the architecture of the new CAP regardless of money. Most participants agreed that market regulation plays an equally important role as the distribution of direct payments.

The working group wanted to accept the offer of the FAAN project officer Philippe Galiay to organize a meeting with representatives of various DGs (such as DG Sanco, DG Environment, DG Agri) in order to discuss FAAN project results as well as policy recommendations.

3.4 Urban-rural Connections

Hosted by Ryszard Kamiński (Agricultural Advisory Center in Minikowo; and Polish Rural Forum).

Reported by Leokadia Juroszek (FAAN partner, Polish Rural Forum).

Below are some key points. For the full notes, see Appendix IV.

Working group participants were representing such bodies as DG Agri policy unit, Norwegian Farmer and Small Holder Union, Association for Habitat Survival and Protection (YAPAD), Bugday Association for Supporting Ecological Living, OeBV – Via Campesina Austria, European Parliament (Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats), and a researcher from the Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Most participants represented civil society organisations acting in interests of farmers or consumers or both these groups – from Norway and Turkey as well as from EU countries. Some of them are farmers owning small farms.

The topic was announced as one of the last, during the plenary session before breaking out for the group discussions, by one of the invited participants. The topic was especially of interest for people dealing with consumers' and producers' initiatives in different countries, to discuss developments of networks for effective ways of selling local products.

During the discussion, participants raised issues that represented two main viewpoints – one from the consumer side and the other from the producer side. These two groups have different expectations and so should be approached in different ways. They need each other, but the mode of exchange has to be profitable and satisfactory for both groups.

There were also some general statements which should be considered when looking at issues of connecting producers and consumers – or more generally, urban and rural areas. Before presentation in plenary session, conclusions were ordered in way which represented statements connected to farmers' and consumers' viewpoints separately. The general issues can be put under the categories below.

Global dilemma

It was a starting remark that the search for and delivery of high quality food is a global problem. According to participants in the group, the countries which they represent have a rising consumers' demand for 'alternative' food and problems of small scale farmers who are searching for ways to survive in rural areas where industrialized agriculture predominates. Most consumers live in cities, so developing effective connections with producers from rural areas is crucial for LFS.

Different attitudes

Understandings of what is traditional, conventional or alternative is different in certain societies. In former Communist countries, not so long ago 'conventional food' meant in fact 'traditional food' because still large parts of society remember when food was produced by using organic methods – better than agri-industrial methods. What is traditional in one country can be still conventional in the other if in the latter the agricultural system is not so much industrialized.

Rural products are more than food

Participants agreed that the countryside provides much more benefits than food. It delivers also landscape, biodiversity, etc. This role should be highlighted in urban societies to make them aware of the added value from the countryside.

Consumers' viewpoints:

Differences between supermarket products and weekend products

In cities people are usually busy with their occupational duties during the week. They need something easy to get and to prepare, so they generally choose supermarket products. Special food – such as traditional, organic or local products – is more often reserved for the weekends or special occasions, when people have more time and want to prepare something special for their families or friends. They are more likely to spend more time searching for such products and sometimes spend more money for them.

Weekend fair trades and special events connected with food selling

Connected with the statement above: Weekends are a good opportunity to attract people to local food by organizing events where they can meet farmers directly or learn about local specialties. Food sales can be organized with other events such as concerts, activities for children, cooking lessons with chefs. Weekend

fair trades – markets open during weekends where people can buy food directly from producers – help them to know where the food comes from and how it is produced. It is also an opportunity for producers to sell their products without middlemen and so to earn more.

It is also important to make consumers aware of their responsibility for local food producers and possibilities of supporting them. Education on the importance of local products should be started from childhood if possible. Such education should include ‘story telling’, whereby consumers meet producers and learn about their work. Reliable producers must know not only how they produce but also where from their seeds (materials) come from.

Producers’ viewpoint:

Farmers can be encouraged to participate in LFS, e.g. by showing benefits for them and for consumers.

Activities:

- Creating common/collective markets.
- Help with finding fair retailers who ensure a proper share of income for farmers.
- Organize logistics of sale: delivering and paying is more important than ordering.
- Creating opportunities for farmers’ cooperation with others e.g. municipalities.

3.5 Local authorities

Hosted and reported by Helen Wallace (FAAN partner, Genewatch).

Notes taken by Catherine Darrot (FAAN partner, Agrocampus Ouest).

Below are some key points. For the full notes, see Appendix V.

Local authorities have facilitated Local Food Systems by:

- Facilitating/supporting networks: listening to stakeholders, coming together for action, responding to/identifying champions, building alliances.
- Building brands/labels, educational role, helping to create customer base/trust.
- Creating (local) cross-departmental partnerships to recognise/realise benefits: health, agriculture, environment etc. (= food as public good)
- Facilitating access to shared facilities (e.g. kitchens) and land (= sharing risk)
- Sustainable procurement and institutional behaviour (= shared values)

At EC level:

- Flexible implementation of rules is needed at local/national level.
- Local allocation of funds (e.g. Leader) works best.
- EC needs to find ways to see/hear/listen to Local Food Networks at EU level, e.g. set up a Food Group. Perhaps then procurement/CAP/competition rules could actually support small farmers and Local Food Systems.

3 Plenary discussion

Each break-out group presented a short report, followed by general discussion. The following points were expressed as viewpoints of individuals, sometimes presenting views from break-out groups.

Michael Dower: Philippe Galiay offered to set up a cross-DG meeting on the FAAN project results, so we should take up this offer and prepare a draft report. We should demonstrate benefits of LFS, based on the data gathered. LFS offer social innovation as well as a wide range of societal benefits.

Our report should add clear recommendations for policy, to answer the ‘So what?’ question. The FAAN results should be integrated in a wider policy context. The CURE network could help FAAN contribute to policy debate on CAP reform, perhaps with CSOs. The network will take up the results in its project on Food Chains for Rural-Urban Sustainability, e.g. at its next conference on sustainability in Krakow (organised by the PRF). The Good Practice Compendium of LEADER can also include the case studies and should be made available.²¹ Will FAAN continue? What could a follow-up project look like? The working group on networking has proposals for how to build wider networks.

²¹ European Database of Leader+ Good Practices, http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/leaderplus/gpdb_en.htm

Philippe Galiay: A further workshop could discuss results from FAAN with various DGs from the Commission. Details will be discussed with Mark Cropper and some members from the FAAN project. It has been difficult to define research agendas for 2012 and beyond, so FAAN could make proposals. It is a positive thing that research produces questions for further research and results useful for policy makers to develop better policies in the futures. During the break, a CSO representative wanted more results relevant for practices of CSOs. Cooperative Research should produce results relevant to everyone.

Sandra Karner: But it could be difficult to fulfil the aim of results relevant to everyone. The project should also draw on results related to the cooperative process, e.g. between academics and CSOs.

4 Concluding talks

Thierry Gaudin: 'What is the meaning of the Knowledge Society?'

Bio-note: Association pour la promotion de la prospective et de l'innovation. He chaired the group of experts who wrote the 2007 SCAR foresight report on European agro-food futures.

[For more detail on his talk, see also the PPT file.]

What is the meaning of the Knowledge Society? We face cognitive questions, e.g. the overload of bureaucrats. What do we know about local food systems? For the moment, we have only some samples.

The communication system has been decentralised by the internet. Alvin Toffler introduced the concept of 'prosumer', linking the roles of producer and consumer. This concept can be applied to research: the producer becomes researcher. And the consumer too!

The *Economist* magazine cover depicted human evolution as leading us to mass obesity. This societal problem has been treated as an opportunity to sell new products.

Innovation faces a tension between efficiency versus resilience. Crops can have greater resilience via diversity. We need a diversity of social-food systems as well as of crops. In the planetary garden, we need to take care of nature. Humans have to live close to nature. We need know-how in self-sustainability.

Wynne Wright: comments on the day

Bio-note: Associate Professor of Community, Food and Agriculture at Michigan State University. Her research interests are in the area of agrifood restructuring in global and local contexts.

[For more detail on conflicting epistemologies, see Appendix VI.]

Local food systems are not always good; they can be dysfunctional or defensive. They are sometimes perceived as separating people – on one side, the members of the LFS; on the other side, people who are outside this group. In the USA, where religious beliefs remain strong, many people look for guidance by asking, 'What would Jesus do?' For agri-food issues, 'What would Jesus eat?' These questions have been co-opted by fundamentalist groups. And there is a backlash against US 'local' food, which is widely seen as elitist, alienating for non-judeo-christian people. LFS can also be co-opted for racial or social reasons.

So we should be clearer about why LFS are superior. You have organised a participatory method including producers who are exercising leadership for the public good. LFS benefit the public good. Through food citizenship, people go beyond market actors as merely producers or consumers. Knowledge of food systems is a responsibility of citizens, this is social innovation.

In this workshop, we have seen a clash of epistemologies (see Appendix III).

Sandra Karner (FAAN):

In the workshop we wanted to get a better idea about the relevance of the project findings for practice. Several points which we had identified as being important became validated during the discussions. The group discussions were more useful than I might have hoped. As we have understood better from this workshop, food can be more than provision of goods by producers to consumers. This highlights the importance of taking a stronger integrated approach when dealing with food on different levels by linking different policy areas and different actors. It is worthwhile to elaborate on how to implement such approaches. Thank you to everyone who helped to make this workshop successful.

Appendices

I Invitation letter

Workshop, Monday 22nd February 2010, Brussels
Local Food Systems (LFS): practices and strategies

This workshop will provide an opportunity for interested stakeholders to discuss practices and strategies of developing local food systems. The discussions will be structured around the findings of the research project, 'Facilitating Alternative Agro-Food Networks (FAAN): Stakeholders' Perspective on Research Needs', funded under FP7. This project has investigated local food systems (LFS) in five European countries in order to identify policies and other factors influencing their development. Findings from these case studies will be presented for discussion in plenary sessions and small-group activities.

Workshop aims are:

- to reflect on our findings in a broader context by drawing on participants' knowledge and experience;
- to identify needs for policy changes, civic action, and future research;
- to engage stakeholders who may take up the findings and implications in their activities;
- to provide a networking opportunity for stakeholders for further co-operation to enhance local food systems.

Participants

The workshop will bring together a broad range of expertise and experience relevant to local food systems. We intend to attract diverse actors, e.g. from research, policy, agriculture, consumers, and other civil society organisations engaged in relevant activities.

Background

In recent years 'Alternative Agro-Food Networks' (AAFNs) have emerged as an alternative to conventional agri-food chains, based on agri-industrial mass production and supermarket chains. Their negative environmental, social and economic impacts have become more evident. As a response, AAFNs take many different forms:

- Producers as consumers, e.g. community gardens, community food coops, allotment groups.
- Producer-consumer partnerships, often known as Community-Supported Agriculture (CSA), where consumers share the risks and rewards of production.
- Direct sales: farmers' markets, internet sales, box schemes etc.
- Specialist retailers selling more directly to consumers than via supermarkets.

Unlike conventional agri-food chains, alternative food systems emphasise 'quality' involving various attributes — e.g., aesthetic characteristics, ecological production methods, shorter (spatial and social) distances between producers and consumers, economic relations going beyond purely financial motives, higher standards for animal welfare, etc.

Central to many alternative food systems is a commitment to social cooperation and local economic development. According to Alimenterra, a campaign network promoting local food, 'We live in a global economy. But instead of one that is moving towards a food monoculture, it can be based on a network of co-operating local economies and cultures that interact to form a complex and flexible system whose strength is in diversity'.

In Europe local food systems have emerged in the context of a devolved rural governance, often drawing on the Leader model (of the CAP).²² Although LFS have recently expanded, they remain marginal within the wider agro-food system. The workshop will discuss opportunities, challenges and strategies for current local food systems, as well as for enhancing such developments throughout Europe.

²² European Network for Rural Development (EN RD),
http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/enrd-structure/en/enrd-structure_home_en.cfm

The FAAN project studied diverse local food systems (LFS) through case studies in Austria, France, Hungary, Poland and United Kingdom. In most cases, practitioners have developed strategies to (re)localise food production and consumption. Findings include the following aspects:

Practices and societal benefits: Our studies confirmed that AAFNs provide many societal benefits – such as environmentally better cultivation methods, higher-quality and fresh food, community engagement, re-linkages between rural and urban areas, local economic development. Consumers gain awareness of those societal benefits through greater proximity to producers, thus developing knowledge and trust as a basis for their economic relationship. Often these benefits are integral to the practices of a LFS.

Policies: The case studies identified policies which facilitate or impede the transition towards a more localised food system. Such policies include the RDP, structural funds, hygienic regulations, public procurement and trading laws. Some relevant policies are based on EU regulations, which are interpreted and implemented in different ways across regions, sometimes even in the same country. Moreover, each policy area has internal tensions between different aspects which can support or restrict the development of LFS.

Strategies: In responding to those policy frameworks, there are various strategies – e.g., improving the policy, making adaptive efforts to accommodate it, or finding ways to bypass its obstacles. In many cases, success depends upon joint action by stakeholders and public agencies.

II Table: Policies relevant to Local Food Systems (LFS)

Adapted from the workshop briefing document.

	Hindering (or not helping)	Facilitating
CAP pillar 1: payment basis	Historic basis reinforces earlier drive for productivity (AT, FR).	Area basis opens up broader options, especially for new entrants to farming (HU, PL, England).
CAP pillar 2 (RDP, including Leader)	<p>‘Modernisation’ & efficiency measures for standard agri-products to compete better in distant markets (all five countries).</p> <p>General rural development, regardless of agriculture (all).</p> <p>Environmental protection mainly beyond agriculture, e.g. by withdrawing less productive farmland (all).</p> <p>Each grant or investment has a high minimum level (and/or a co-funding requirement), thus benefiting large processors.</p>	<p>Leader funds to facilitate cooperative networks.</p> <p>Infrastructure for local processing and marketing (AT, England), e.g. for specialty branded products (FR, PL Lower Vistula).</p> <p>Agri-food-tourism links (AT, FR, England)</p> <p>Agri-ecological cultivation methods, e.g. low-input, organic conversion (FR, PL, England)</p> <p>Environmental protection via extensification of agricultural methods.</p> <p>Small grants are available (England).</p>
Hygiene regulations	Strict rules presume industrial contexts and methods. For example, govt inspectors must be present whenever animals are killed (UK).	Flexibility in rules according to production method and sales context.
Hygiene regulations: exemptions for small quantities of primary products in direct sales	<p>Exemptions are narrowly defined or ambiguous, remaining in a legal ‘grey’ zone (AT).</p> <p>‘Direct sales’ exclude collective marketing (FR) and exclude animal products sold to shops or institutions (HU).</p>	<p>Exemptions or lighter rules are broadly, clearly defined (rare).</p> <p>Lighter rules for direct marketing of some primary products (AT).</p> <p>Lighter rules for individual merchants – but not for collective sales (FR).</p>
Hygiene regulations: lighter rules for traditional products	<p>No lighter rules – or even no permission – for some traditional methods (PL).</p> <p>No lighter rules for many animal products (AT).</p>	<p>Exemption for specialty products (PL).</p> <p>Lighter rules for on-farm processing.</p> <p>Flexibility for small, marginal, local products derived from crops (UK).</p>
Trading laws	<p>Inconsistent criteria across various laws (all)</p> <p>Invoices are required for every sale (HU).</p> <p>Collective-marketing income counts as profit and so imposes greater fiscal burdens on producers (FR).</p> <p>No exemptions for small business (UK).</p> <p>Tax benefits go to supermarkets (HU).</p>	<p>Direct sales have lighter rules and lower tax (PL).</p> <p>Farm activity and employment have some exemptions from tax (FR).</p> <p>Box schemes are exempt from rules on labelling specific products (UK).</p> <p>Tax benefits for ‘primary’ producers below a certain annual income receive tax benefits (HU).</p>
Public procurement (<i>restauration collective</i>)	<p>‘Economically advantageous’ criteria favouring the lowest price.</p> <p>‘Best value’ through aggregated purchasing to minimise the price, without clear criteria to justify a higher price (UK).</p> <p>Diet improvement emphasises nutritional and safety criteria (FR, UK).</p>	<p>‘Economically advantageous’ criteria justifying a higher price – e.g., for quality, freshness, life-cycle analysis, economic development, etc.</p> <p>Contracts are split up by locality and product to favour local suppliers (Cumbria).</p> <p>Diet improvement emphasises agri-food quality, e.g. organic (AT).</p>
Territorial branding	<p>PDO or PGIs to be marketed anywhere, bypassing local economies.</p> <p>Label includes large-scale industrial processors (PL, Warmia Region).</p>	<p>Brands promoting a general territorial identity of food and economic development.</p> <p>Label promotes small-scale, quality production with Leader funds (PL, Lower Vistula).</p> <p>Flexible labels – both in terms of low financial costs and administrative burden – enhance value added for producers (HU, Living Tisza label).</p>

III Networking group: detailed notes

Note: The original record had biographical notes for all participants, corresponding to the abbreviations below; that list is omitted here.

Introduction

The proposed topic has been one of the first announced by one of the invited participants and seemed to be a very attractive one at least for some people interested in further developing an internet tool – a sort of forum which could better promote the best practices and offer practical strategies and advices in regard to Local Food Systems.

During the allocated time for the break-out working group, there have been four people constantly attending the discussion, and another four have been joining in different parts of the discussion. Around five other people have been interested in the results of this group, having a look at the flipcharts. Moreover, there have been discussions with other participants regarding the topic during the coffee break. The contributions, as far they could be identified in the scope of reporting, are mentioning the initials of the contributors' names. The draft has been sent for comments and additional contributions to the convenor of the working group.

Since it has been agreed in the group that a possible proposal for a follow-up project could be drafted, Frederic Morand from Eco-Innovation Belgium took the lead to summarise and further elaborate the skeleton of the discussion. In addition, a main contribution will also come from the convenor, Lasca Ten Kate from the Friendly Kitchens Alliance. The FAAN project team members, through its coordinator will also be actively involved and distribute the information to other partners, especially to the Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) engaged in the FAAN project. Moreover a list of projects/contacts possible interested in this topic will be provided.

LFS Wiki/ Platform of services/LFS knowledge marketplace

(LTK) In the beginning of the session, it has been argued the need for a forum as a 'knowledge marketplace'. In different cities like Amsterdam, Brussels, Anderlecht and surroundings – diverse initiatives exist but it seems there is no communication space or an opportunity to share already invented and tested practices. Through a forum people could benefit from sharing experiences, projects, and interests. The initial idea started from the creation of a possible Wiki interactive space for supporting the development and sharing information, knowledge about LFS

(FM) Such an interactive space might be seen as a 'social learning tool' for different types of users, the potential and importance of mutual learning has been revealed for different categories of users – community garden planning, sharing experiences of the municipalities involved in community garden projects, info for agricultures on different types of seeds and practical info for beginners etc.

(FM, LTK, TG, NC) There are specific details to be discussed in regard to various requirements, technicalities: establishing common e-mail list, providing opportunities for interactions via Skype, posting announcements. It should be better called differently and have a role of a 'platform of services' offering multi language sections, modules, search possibilities, and restricted areas. It has been considered that the existing platforms, websites, discussion groups are mainly oriented toward the researchers processes/ outputs.

(NC) The FAAN project experience has been both a positive and negative experience with online tools. The FAAN mailing list as well as a Wiki communication platform has been created for the team members in order to store all the information, perform the daily project activities and interact with other teams. The chosen Wiki media has been proved as being too difficult for some members to edit/ contribute using the open source programming language. It has been in principle a shared space for posting the relevant materials to be accessible to all partners in the project. For the FAAN public website, initially we designed an interactive platform, password protected, for the team members and other stakeholders engaged in different stages of the research or any other participants who would like to share the information, communicate with the team or with others, or have access to some of the data which were not available on the open public website. There has been little interest from external participants from different countries, mainly because almost all the info available has been accessible on the public section of the FAAN website. The advertisements and the English language tools were not attractive for many other participants from the

different national contexts. Moreover an important aspect for such interactive platforms is the moderation; proposing discussion topics and facilitating interactions have been shared by the project co-ordinator and the WP leader responsible for communication and dissemination.

(LTK) Experiences from other projects – COFAMI, SOFT-AGRI, Alimenterra – should be considered in this respect as well, and moreover contacts with different networks & projects should be established/enforced.

(FM, LTK, TG) It has been emphasised that an intensified moderation activity should be planned, dedicated people who might be interested and actively engaged in moderating different sections of the platform. The public (target group) should be receptive and positive towards the platform as well.

(LTK, FM) One important aspect has been mentioned that the platform should be oriented towards co-ordinating different types of activities/ practices, and the research aspects could be also included but in a very specific and creative way.

(FM, NC) There is no possibility that such a network will evolve simply with no financial support. Thus an important aspect is to search for potential opportunities for the next calls at different sponsors: DG Communication, DG Agriculture and Rural development, DG Research, Grundtvig (Adult education programme).

(FM, LTK, NC) Clarifying the target group seems to be essential: it has been agreed that the platform should be not addressed in the first instance to the researchers / research projects but to the entrepreneurs, farmers, consumers, other stakeholders, community in general. Of course, EU project partners in different countries could join and contribute, also researchers could bring their experiences and data but in an accessible format/ design – creativity is needed to find the best strategies to approach the target group.

(TG) The Foresight exercise revealed that there is a huge amount of info accessible on the net, unfortunately not always well structured, and a negative effect might have the limiting diffusion of knowledge which is unavoidable. The important aspect is the increase of speed and diffusion of knowledge thus the facilitation of the development of an interactive medium for the topic of LFS.

(TG, FM) Integrating different media images, text, films using an open source programming (Belgian output from a different project) which could be adopted and designed especially for our topic.)

(FM) Quality criteria for the information system (Eco-Innovation developed the model and the tool which could be adopted for different projects).

1. mixed verbal and non-verbal information
2. traceability of information
3. navigability of the information flows , in both senses and different levels
4. interactivity – with the content and with other users

The competition between different platforms for attracting users and offered facilities are key elements.

(MP) The experience gained from one participant in regard with such a platform has been expressed. ‘Localised food systems’, which is an international ERG-financed initiative, is a network for research projects – more like a dissemination tool, also linked to educational aspects. It aims at increasing the visibility of different projects/ initiatives and attracting more funds.

(FM) The aim of such a platform: it should respond to the existing problems, namely the strong demands for LFS, linking rural and urban and promoting urban agriculture. Basic know-how could be better offered to those interested in developing LFS, cultivating specific plants, breeding animals, developing marketing schemes, short supply chains etc. Moreover, sharing the information brings benefits, especially to avoid channelling efforts towards re-inventing things already known and practiced (e.g. the compost used in different conditions – different approaches and possible simple solutions based on existing experiences). Another example has been provided in regard to scheduling the activities of the community gardens (Belgium) and distributing information for their members.

(TG, NC) The most important aspect relies on exchanging the experiences, not necessarily on producing knowledge. Sharing experiences and practices could bring more effective benefits for practitioners. In this context indeed the integration of knowledge or how to treat different types of knowledge is relevant. This

aspect is considered important for the CSOs in order to facilitate exchange and to promote the diffusion of knowledge.

(PG) As practice, for the Commission it is interesting to extend co-operative research practices, integrating knowledge being one important aspect. In addition to the opportunity created in 2001 by the 6th Framework Programme (FP) for enlarging science and society expectations, the 7th FP offers the possibility to engage CSOs in co-operative research partnerships. In order to continue the present programme, a feedback in regard to the effectiveness of such practice is desired and expected.

(PG, NC) There is a need for positive examples of co-operation and exchange of practices. The support for such type of research/ activities could be expected only if clear evidence can be provided that an added value is acquired. The Commission as well as the European Parliament both need such kinds of evidence. The evaluation report in the FAAN project will offer some conclusions regarding the effectiveness of co-operative research; it will discuss the issue of knowledge integration as well as the effectiveness of eTools for the limited purpose of the research – which is different than that the eTool proposed in the current working group.

(PG, LTK, FM) Moreover, in order to be feasible, the Commission is interested to know how many potential users are expected to use such a platform and how it could be made effective for investing the effort in it. There have been clear answers that such a platform is seen as an important dissemination tool, and there are very many people interested in launching such an initiative (especially the CSOs). Also it could represent a good dissemination tool for various European projects; end users are expected to be attracted from various fields and with various interests.

Three issues:

In order to discuss a feasible plan for a further project, three main questions should be answered:

- i. Who is organising the bid?
- ii. How could such a project be developed?
- iii. A platform for what?

i. Who is organising the bid?

Eco-Innovation is interested to work for such a proposal, also in connection with Platform Technology Organics (<http://www.tporganics.eu>). The FAAN project will support this initiative. Friendly Kitchens Alliance is interested to contribute mainly as moderator for different discussion groups and networking. The Commission is potentially interested by such a proposal, e.g. for demonstrating the effectiveness of the knowledge production in the co-operative research process and the utility of such an eTool. Mainly CSOs are interested and motivated to run such an ePlatform. They also have the capacity of mobilisation of different actors in the field.

ii. How to develop such a project?

First step is a review of existing eTools and projects dealing with LFS, by integrating experiences and feedback from different projects. Next step is choosing the most suitable tool and adapting the best open source software (already developed by Eco-Innovation). Initial financial support for starting the project is essential; further on this initiative could be self-financed, based on a regular membership.

iii. A platform for what?

- Eco-Innovation sees this project as a real need in the context of agriculture developments, as a prototype for social learning, as a simple tool to facilitate and improve social learning in LFS.
- Exchange of information and interdependence of info. For example, online archives of different types of magazines are really effective tools for many practitioners; and they become available for many users.
- Through these information systems, farmers could become free to choose different methods, while bringing additional value for self-producers or customers.

Moreover, the benefits could be formulated in terms of: empowering different types of end-users, re-evaluating the norms and ethical aspects, as well as freeing the production of knowledge and thus their exploitation.

(KR) Another possible aim could be oriented towards production and consumption types and ideas. For example there is an important similar initiative launched four years ago (which took a lot of time and

effort). It is related to providing information about sustainable tourism and eco-agro tourism. Other initiatives are EuroMarc and EuroMontana see <http://www.mountainproducts-europe.org/sites/euromontana>

Conclusions

At the end of the session, the conclusions of the working group were presented:

- Such a project could be successful if enthusiastic promoters are launching this initiative.
- There is a need for intensified moderation activities.
- There should be initial resources for launching it.
- A core group will further elaborate the present skeletal idea and find possible sponsors.

IV Urban-rural Connections group: detailed notes

The proposed topic has been announced as one of the last, during the plenary session before break-out for the groups, by one of the invited participants. It seemed to be interesting for people dealing with consumers and producers initiatives in different countries, who wanted to discuss possibilities for the development of networks for effective ways of selling local products. During the allocated time for the break-out working group, all participants constantly were attending the discussion. Only one person joined the group almost in the end of discussion.

Most participants represented civil society organisations acting in the interest of farmers or consumers or both of these groups, not only from EU countries but also from Norway and Turkey. Some of them are farmers owning small farms. In the group participated also representatives of EU institutions, who were interested in the development of initiatives for LFS.

Urban-rural connections in LFS context

During the discussion participants noted that raised issues represent two points of view, one from consumer side and the other from producer side. It seemed to be worth to highlight that these two groups have different expectations and have to be approached in different ways. They need each other but their interaction has to be profitable and satisfactory for both of them.

There were also some general statements highlighted which should be considered when looking at the issue of connecting producer and consumer or more generally urban and rural areas.

Before the presentation in the plenary session participants ordered all conclusions in a way which presented statements connected to farmers separately to the consumers' point of view.

The general issues were:

- Global dilemmas

It was a starting remark that the issue of searching for and delivering high quality food is an international or even a global problem, not only within certain countries in Europe, but also in other parts of the world. All participants in the working group admitted that in countries which they represent there is rising consumers' awareness for 'alternative' food and problems of small scale farmers who are searching for possibilities to survive on rural areas with industrialized agriculture. Most consumers live in cities and developing effective connections with producers from rural areas is crucial for Local Food Systems.

- Different attitudes regarding what is traditional or conventional in different countries or different parts of the world.

Understanding of what is traditional or alternative is different in certain societies. The example of former communist countries was given, where not so long ago 'conventional food' meant in fact 'traditional food' because still large parts of society remember when the conventional food production - what in fact meant organic - was better than industrial production.

What is traditional in one country can be still conventional in the other if in the latter agriculture is not so much industrialized.

- Rural products are not only food

It was raised by one of the participants and the others seemed to agree that the countryside provides much more benefits than food. It delivers also such 'products' as landscape, biodiversity, etc. It should be highlighted in urban societies to make them aware of added values of the countryside.

Consumers' point of view: the following issues have been raised

- Difference between supermarket products and weekend products

In the cities people are usually busy with their occupational duties during the week, and they need something easy to get and to prepare, thus they choose supermarket products. Special food such as traditional, organic or local products is more often reserved for the weekends or special occasions, when people have more time and want to prepare something special for their families or friends. They are more likely to spend more time searching for such products and sometimes spend more money for them.

- Weekend fair trades and special events connected with food selling

This point is connected with the statement above. Weekends are a good opportunity to attract people to local food by organizing events where they can meet farmers directly or learn about local specialties. Together with food selling can be organized events such as concerts, activities for children, cooking lessons with chefs. Weekend fair trades - markets open in weekends where people can buy food directly from producers - give them a possibility to learn where the food comes from and how it is produced. It is also an opportunity for producers to sell their products without middlemen and earn more.

- Different groups of consumers with different demands

Demand on local food are diverse, some consumers search for organic products for everyday life, the others just for some specialties, rare and original, for other ones high quality or lower price is crucial. There is also an increasing group of consumers with health problems who need special diet. It is important for producers and also for retailers to identify market niches in which they can fit.

- Developing LFS must be started from individuals

Before some common initiatives will be started (e.g. establishing group of consumers) it is necessary to convince individual members of society that local food is valuable, in order to change their attitudes and food habits. Only if large groups of individuals change, it is possible to expand initiatives effectively supporting LFS.

- Individual consumers' share in supporting farmers

This point stressed the importance of making consumers aware of a common responsibility for supporting small scale food producers. It is necessary to clarify that not always producers gain a fair share in the income from selling his or her products. Consumers should know that they have a possibility to support farmers who ensure good quality food for them and take personal responsibility for that.

- Children education

This is an important factor because food habits shaped in early years will be developed in future. If in schools or even kindergartens children are used to deal with what they eat and where their food comes from, probably they will be more witting consumers in the future. They are also able to influence parents' attitudes.

- Story telling

This phrase was used in order to explain that many consumers want to learn about farmers' work and the origin of raw materials used. It is one of the opportunities to attract people in local food. If the producer can tell in an interesting way about the process of production, consumers can be more likely to buy his/her products. It could be especially attractive for children who e.g. know the names of cows in farm, chickens, etc.

Not all participants were convinced if this term is proper because for some of them 'story telling' sounded like 'trumping up' and mislead consumers. But after short explanation that information given to consumers can be 'colored' but must be always true, proposed phrase was accepted.

- Food should be delivered by 'real' producers who know where their seeds come from

This point was raised because in many cases organic producers are not able to say anything about raw materials that they use in production. They sell their products as organic, for instance not being aware that the seeds were genetically modified. 'Real' producer must ensure that his or her products are traceable from seeds to the final product.

Producers' point of view: important issues were:

- Farmers' animation to create common markets

There was the question raised about what farmers really want. If they are interested in direct sale for consumers in the farm or rather in selling all production at once with a reasonable price without spending much time on common initiatives and building social networks? The latter point of view was admitted by some participants as very common because many farmers are not willing to develop a close relation with consumers.

But sometimes it is impossible or very difficult to find ways in which farmers can sell their production and achieve proper income. Thus it is important to show them possibilities and benefits of cooperation with each other and with consumers. Creation of common markets allows reaching more consumers in the same place and time as well as reducing logistic efforts.

- Help with finding fair retailers who ensure proper share of income for farmers

Common problem of small scale farmers is ensuring proper income when selling via retailers. Costs of production of quality food are often so high that proper income is not possible to be achieved with prices offered by retailers. Sometimes there is large gap between producer's price and final price in retail point. There are also some requirements which hinder entering local or regional markets by the individual farmer even if his/her products are very good. Thus it is necessary to support producers in finding fair retailers or in negotiating with them.

- Organize logistic of sale

Farmers are mainly producers and some of them are not able (because of time limits or lack of knowledge) to produce and in the same take care of marketing and sale of products, thus it is important to support them in logistic issues. In direct sale gathering orders from consumers is relatively easy comparing to delivering and collecting payments. There should be developed systems with operative logistic tools.

- Creating opportunities for farmers' cooperation with others e.g. municipalities.

It is important not only to make producers aware that cooperation with others is necessary but also to create opportunities for such cooperation. Key role in this process can play municipalities (public authorities) which have resources and power to foster LFS development.

In the final part of discussion one person joined the group and raised the problem of policies which hinder the development of LFS by too strict or not adjusted rules and laws which can destroy many initiatives aiming at supporting LFS. Participants agreed that the regulations are a serious barrier and need to be changed. But in the meantime LFS must be developed in current policy frames and people already manage to fit into them. Unfriendly laws cannot be an excuse for abandoning LFS initiatives.

V Local Authorities group: detailed notes

Local authorities have facilitated Local Food Systems by:

- Facilitating/supporting networks: listening to stakeholders, coming together for action, responding to/identifying champions, building alliances.

Specificity of local authorities: officials live in the area, know the area, and are sometimes involved in local initiatives as local citizens.

In local authorities, there is often a contradiction in the way different departments see food. One of the success factors: people are really interested in food, Champions are needed across different services to promote the importance of food

- Building brands/labels, educational role, helping to create customer base/trust.

Korcin, Podlasia, East Poland: In Poland, promoting the small region through the product has been a success, example of cheese, promoted by national mass media. Today it is recognised by Polish consumers. 8 companies produce it, at a small scale but with much better conditions and hygienic requirements.

Small scale is not possible for the European market. But the product is well perceived on the internal Polish market; it is commercially efficient. Maybe in the future small dairies will trust European standards, but at the moment they do not need it. Small dairies are expected to produce the cheese according to the EU

regulation, but a few years ago the production was illegal. But without the efforts of local authorities to promote those products, they would never have known this recent success.

Manchester, UK: We recently ran a campaign to promote local shopping and seasonal products. In order to develop LFS, Manchester is developing a definition of what we mean by sustainable food: incorporating food democracy, fair price, seasonality. This definition may be difficult for supermarkets to achieve.

- Creating (local) cross-departmental partnerships to recognise/realise benefits: health, agriculture, environment etc. (= food as a public good)

Manchester: Many communities in Manchester are disadvantaged; they have limited access to fresh food products. We developed a food strategy to look at how food for residents could be improved by encompassing the whole food system. This strategy originally came from a public health concern about nutrition and also from a desire to improve Council food policies, particularly around catering and markets. This strategy involves different departments and partners. The partnership has a Board of senior officers and departmental heads who are tasked with influencing policy and activity within their service areas.

France: Food is a big concern for farmers, consumers. Local authorities manage to bring together all those stakeholders into common initiatives.

- Facilitating access to shared facilities (e.g. kitchens)

The aim is to make the innovative activities less risky for the stakeholders (involved for example in sustainable public procurement): sharing risks for farmers, and making innovative changes less risky.

France: Canteens no longer have the right to prepare the vegetables. Shared kitchens (for vegetables) in public procurement can be established or are envisaged in order to limit investment requirements per institution.

- Facilitating access to land (= sharing risk)

Rennes Métropole, Brittany, France: Access to land is a big issue in France. Local authorities can have a special measure to facilitate access to land for young farmers. In Brittany, Rennes Métropole implements a local plan for agriculture with the extension services to find solutions for access to land. They organised a contract to block the land when a farmer stops its activity, and reserve it to promote short supply chains. In order to maintain farming land; it will thus not benefit real estate interests.

Manchester, UK: There is also a local debate about identifying urban land that could be used to grow food.. The approach should be first to support groups to develop the skills and capacity to sustain food cultivation projects; the land can follow later.

- Sustainable procurement and institutional behaviour

(Sandra Karner): In the FAAN national workshop in Austria, the main expectations people had toward public authorities related to educational aspects, schools, public procurement... People were aware about such projects and were satisfied by the result.

Sustainable procurements: EU rules on public procurement have established barriers to local sources, but some authorities have carried out successful initiatives to favour local sources; we can learn from them.

At EC level:

- Flexible implementation of rules is needed at local/national level, local allocation of funds (e.g. Leader) works best

Hygiene regulations could potentially be avoided for short supply chains, because at the local level: consumers can speak to producers. In case of bad quality, it is easy to find the producer. Can build trust.

European Social Fund (ESF) helps to start initiatives, but only for the first year. It appears to be very useful for short supply chains: the first year is enough to help relationships between producers, consumers... Then it is not necessary anymore to have support. Regional level manages the ESF, without referring to EU control. It is like Leader. EU funds should be managed at local level.

(PL Dariusz Gosziński): The European frame is flexible and each country can adapt it to its requirements and local conditions. It is a positive aspect. The local level is good but the funding agencies must make sure that the EU funds are used in a good way: consequently the national level of control can not be avoided.

(Sandra Karner) It is not clear that a broad frame is going to help the local initiatives.

- EC needs to find ways to see/hear/listen to local food networks at EU level

Set up a Food Group. Perhaps then procurement/CAP/competition rules could actually support small farmers and Local Food Systems.

Local Action Groups (LAGs) are composed of half country representatives, and half business and voluntary sector representatives. So it is easy to create an ambition which is specific to the local area. It is the reason why Leader is so present in local food systems. We can't impose a system in one area; we must listen to what people want. It is the public authority responsibility to listen to actors.

It is also the responsibility of local stakeholders to communicate on good national experiences. On the other hand, policies are vulnerable to lobbying.

(*Manchester*) We try to break down problems into manageable chunks and identify solutions. Our general approach is to look at incremental policy change – doing things in small steps, so that success can be demonstrated – rather than try to bring in large-scale policy changes with limited evidence that they will succeed. This is a good way to convince people who are sceptical of the value of policy change.

Messages to EU: If one single thing was to be changed, which one?

– Supporting negotiations between stakeholders. Facilitate cooperation among consumers, farmers etc, local authorities Fund initiatives of 1-2 years for this. Local support must evolve during the life of the initiative. Creating collaborative action groups also at Commission level

- Change moral and political values: considering food as a public good and issue rather than as a central source of profit.

- Change the rules for competition/context (i.e. supermarket power): Concerning the retail distribution side, they can do much more to change the competition context.

- Public procurement: Actively encourage local food through procurement rules.

- Environmental, social and economical aspects in EU public policies: Rebuild CAP in a way that doesn't cause problems. Concerning PDO/PGI rules, support quality schemes at the EU level.

- Simplifying, clarifying, informing: In Brittany we have too many labels today. Consumers don't know anymore what they buy: labels do not always guarantee quality. We have no global standards for the labels or brands, even for 'ecological farming' brands in EU.

Poland has no strong tradition of labels. The recognition of those quality brands still has to be built in Poland (but also in other countries), also for the consumer.

(*Switzerland*) 'PDO – PGI regulations could be targeted for export' versus local market: Need not put it in opposition: a leader project can steer all the products and develop successfully. Even if you export products, the different steps of production are useful to the region.

(DG, PL): But only big producers can apply for PDO-PGI. So is it part of our interest in LFS?

VI Conflicting epistemologies (Wynne Wright)

[Note: This email message was sent afterwards for inclusion in the workshop report.]

My comment was intended to reference (what I perceived as) a distinction between the comments by the DG Agriculture representative Mark Cropper and the team's approach to understanding and presenting this material – not a difference within the team. I suspect that the team also may have encountered epistemological differences during the life of the project – especially between the CSOs and researchers.

The team presented empirical findings with the aim to illuminate the difficulties in implementing AAFNs due to policy impediments based on a co-creation epistemology – i.e., knowledge revealed through equally valued joint partnerships between researchers and citizens. Yet Cropper's response was, 'Don't tell me they are bypassing the law.' In other words, 'Don't tell me what you learned; tell me what I want to hear in the frame I want to hear it.' This example and others, such as his attempt to sell 'social innovation' as an organizing frame throughout the day, suggests to me unique ways of knowing/understanding the proper role for collaboration. Along with other discourse, this illustrates a tension or struggle among actors in this intellectual exercise. Also the exercise of visually drawing himself outside the circle of knowledge or praxis on the flip chart speaks to this separateness that must be bridged if change in EU policy making is to occur.

This sort of 'divide', between the team and the policy makers, suggests differential values, beliefs and preferences at work. Citizens aspire to have a greater voice – and more influence – in both public policy directions and in the civic directions taken by public, private, and non-profit institutions. Will knowledge be disseminated in a way that can fit into the mould prescribed by policy makers who hold seats of influence?

These tensions/differences signal challenges related to epistemology. In this context, I use epistemology as it applies in professional terms; this pertains to the way in which professionals position themselves with, for, and to the public. The conventional professional epistemology – the epistemology that is the foundation of 'policy-making' – is that of professional as expert: the professional 'knows' and the objective is to transfer or impart knowledge into policy to 'serve' the public, which in essence makes them passive actors. The concept that the public 'also knows', or can exercise agency and resist obstacles that stifle human endeavors, is threatening to professionals. At issue in the co-creation epistemology is the extent to which professionals are willing and able to share power with non-peers – not call all the shots. The politics of knowledge favors conventional knowledge for serving the public– drawing on existing knowledge expertise to accomplish that objective – over collaborative governance with the public.

The presentations I heard – and my reading of the materials beforehand – suggest that you have learned a great deal about the role of collaborative governance. This includes: what good collaborative governance looks like, what the researcher and practitioners' role is in this scenario, and how EU policy can respond to being more receptive to collaborative governance – how they can enhance their knowledge and application of community/science collaborative strategies. It seems to me that your approach pushes the boundaries of 'conventional institutional and professional epistemologies', beyond policy making with collaborative citizen partnerships tacked on. The real work to be done forces us to explore the question of how these lessons can be shared and catalyzed, so that they might become embedded in the culture of inquiry in future EU efforts.

VII Workshop participants

To avoid spam and unwanted emails we have added a spam protection indicating it as follows: "space(@NOSPAM)space" in the email addresses of participants. If you wish to contact them by email, please remove the two spaces plus the two brackets, and also the word NOSPAM, to ensure that the email will be properly sent. Thank you!

Fergal Anderson

Organisation: European Coordination Via Campesina

email: fergal (@NOSPAM) eurovia.org

Fergal works in the European office of La Via Campesina, an international movement of peasant farmers. The European Coordination Via Campesina is comprised of 24 farmers organisations from all over Europe whose focus is on changing the food and agricultural systems of the EU to a framework based on food sovereignty, sustainability, social justice and a thriving rural world.

Bálint Balázs (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Szent István University, Budapest, Hungary

email: balazs.balint (@NOSPAM) essrg.hu

Bálint is a research fellow at the Institute of Environment and Landscape Management and a Ph.D. candidate at the Environmental Science Doctoral School, St. István University. He works on the socio-economic evaluation of alternative / local food systems and development.

Blaise Berger (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: FNCIVAM - Fédération Nationale des Centres d'Initiatives pour Valoriser l'Agriculture et le Milieu rural, Bretagne, France

email: Blaise.berger (@NOSPAM) civam-bretagne.org

Blaise is employed by CIVAM and is in charge of the local food network project. He works to train groups of farmers and consumers and to bring the subject of local food into the mainstream. His background includes work in project management, agro-food systems, territorial economy and energy.

Stein Brubæk

Organisation: Norwegian Farmer and Small Holder Union

email: sbrubaek (@NOSPAM) c2i.net

Stein is leader of the International Committee in the Norwegian Farmer and Small Holder Union. He is a farmer from the North West coast of Norway with his own cheese production from cow and goat milk. He is working full time as an advisor for small scale producers in his region and also interested in how products can reach the marketplace.

Urszula Budzich-Szukala (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Polish Rural Forum

email: ubs@farnet.eu preparenetwork.org

Urszula is one of the founders of the Polish Rural Forum, a national platform of cooperation of rural NGOs, and has, since its inception been its Secretary of the Board, supervising all activities of the Forum's secretariat, managing and coordinating a variety of projects. Since October 2009 she is one of the Thematic and Territorial Coordinators in the FARNET Support Unit in Brussels, supporting the sustainable development of areas dependent on fisheries.

Annemiek Canjels

Organisation: Peri Urban Regions Platform Europe

email: ampa.canjels (@NOSPAM) prvl limburg.nl

Anemiek is a senior EU Public Affairs officer, working in offices in Brussels and Maastricht working for the Dutch province Limburg. As an expert on the Common Agricultural Policy, she did the writing for the rapporteur of the Committee of the Regions on the CAP Health Check legislative proposals and at the moment she is writing the CAP position for the Dutch provinces on the EU Budgetary Review. She is an officer representing the cross border region MHHAL in the Peri Urban Regions Platform Europe. She is also representing the network of the Greenport(s) Holland on EU/International affairs in its management group. Most of her work concerns sustainable food production and world trade in food, feed and fresh products.

Geertrui Cazaux

Organisation: Division for Agricultural Policy Analysis, Administration, Flemish Government

email: geertrui.cazaux (@NOSPAM) lv.vlaanderen.be

Geertrui is a policy advisor, writing and editing policy reports on Flemish agriculture. Her domains of interest are sustainable food, diversification in agriculture, rural sociology and animal welfare. See: <http://be.linkedin.com/in/geertruicaazaux>

Nicoleta Chioncel (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Inter-University Research Centre for Technology Work and Culture, Austria

email: chioncel (@NOSPAM) ifz.tugraz.at

Nicoleta is a researcher at the IFZ, working in the coordinating team of the FP7 Project 'FAAN - Facilitating Alternative Agro-Food Networks: Stakeholders' Perspectives on Research Needs', funded by European Commission. Her main research interests are focusing on: participatory methods and public engagement, social learning, sustainability, active citizenship and governance.

Mark Cropper

Organisation: European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development

email: Mark.Cropper (@NOSPAM) ec.europa.eu

Mark deals with scientific support to policy and general policy issues within DG Agriculture.

Catherine Darrot (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Agrocampus Ouest, Rennes, France

email: cathdarrot (@NOSPAM) yahoo.fr

Catherine is a researcher at Agrocampus Ouest. She is in charge of the FAAN project and several other research projects connected to sustainable farming and rural development. She also teaches on the same topics at Master level. Her background is in agronomy, rural sociology, global analysis of farming systems, evaluation of sustainability of agriculture, agro-food systems and the CAP.

Jan de Wit

Organisation: Louis Bolk Institute, Driebergen, Netherlands

email: j.dewit (@NOSPAM) louisbol.nl

Besides being a participatory researcher in organic and sustainable animal production, Jan assists a CSA initiative, assisting a group of dairy farmers who are interested to market 'raw milk', assisting a producer-processor cooperative which is trying to develop a kind of "adjusted-scale processing" to close the link between producer and consumer, trying to initiate a research project on the sustainability-aspects of different forms of producer-consumer linkages, etc.

Hakkı Kurtuluş Demir

Organisation: Association for Habitat Survival and Protection (YAPAD), Turkey

email: hdemir586 (@NOSPAM) hotmail.com

YAPAD provides services to increase the chances of survival for endangered wild animal and plant species. They support rural development by contributing to the development and numerical increase in traditional farm animal species. A current project involves working with local hunting clubs to establish sustainable hunting practices and "model hunting grounds". The Association's most recent project proposal seeks to bring to greater public notice the values of traditional agriculture and its farm products by seeking alternative channels for selected goods from mountain villages of the Bigadiç (Balýkesir) region. These efforts will include, for the first time in Turkey, trial work with participatory certification (NGOs and local governments).

Michael Dower

Organisation: CURE – Convention for a Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe

email: mdower (@NOSPAM) waitrose.com

Michael is a visiting Professor of European Rural Development, University of Gloucestershire, England. He is a member of the core group for the Convention for a Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe (CURE). In that capacity he supports the Food Chains for Urban-Rural Sustainability (FOCUS) project. Non-permanent staff member, Contact Point, European Network for Rural Development.

Abby Falla

Organisation: Manchester City Council Food Futures Programme Officer, UK

email: a.falla (@NOSPAM) manchester.gov.uk

Together with Christine Raiswell, Abby coordinates the development and implementation of the Food Strategy for Manchester - Food Futures. Food Futures is a partnership that embraces a wide range of individuals and organisations with an interest in improving food in the city. Its ambitious goal is to create a culture of good food in the city, based on the belief that everyone in Manchester has a right to good food. They are currently working on the coordination of sustainable food activity in Manchester's Climate Change Action Plan. One of the projects we are leading on is 'Growing Manchester' - a package of training, advice and support for community food growing projects to ensure they are well placed to sustain themselves over a long period.

Philippe Galiay

Organisation: European Commission DG Research

email: Philippe.Galiay (@NOSPAM) ec.europa.eu

Trained as an engineer, Philippe got a PhD in physics from the University of Strasbourg in the field of holography. He joined the Commission (DG Research) in 1996 and participated to the creation of the Science and Society Directorate in 2001. He is now in charge of Governance issues in the Unit RTD-L3 "Governance and Ethics", notably about civil society participation to research."

Thierry Gaudin

Organisation: Association pour la promotion de la prospective et de l'innovation, France

email: gaudin (@NOSPAM) vaour.net or gaudin (@NOSPAM) 2100.org

Thierry is originally an engineer, who then specialized in innovation policies and foresight. For instance, he was chairman of the group of experts who issued for the SCAR the first European agrofood foresight and then a report on "the world in 2025" presented to the press in September 2009.

Wojciech Goszczński (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, Poland

email: wojciech.goszczyński (@NOSPAM) gmail.com

Wojciech is currently focused on the popularization of food network concepts amongst Polish rural sociologists. He is also finalising his PhD thesis. In addition, he is involved in a project of preparing the Rural Animator Distance Course - a distance learning platform which provides knowledge about sustainable rural development amongst leaders, and activists at Polish rural areas.

Dariusz Goszczynski

Organisation: Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Markets, Poland

email: dariusz.goszczynski (@NOSPAM) minrol.gov.pl

Femke Hoekstra

Organisation: ETC Urban Agriculture

email: f.hoekstra (@NOSPAM) etcnl.nl

Femke is involved in setting up a learning trajectory with municipalities to work towards local/regional food systems in the Netherlands. Furthermore she works with the RUA Foundation on urban agriculture projects in about 20 cities worldwide.

Lisa Hofer Falkinger

Organisation: OeBV - Via Campesina Austria (VCA)

email: lisa_hannes_hofer (@NOSPAM) yahoo.de

Lisa is an organic farmer in the Mühlviertelregion in Upper Austria. Since 1990 she has been producing and marketing noodles from her farm directly to consumers. She is a board member of OeBV-Via Campesina Austria and engaged in VCA's women's group. Her political engagement aims at supporting peasant agriculture and improving the legal framework especially for direct selling on farm.

Leokadia Juroszek (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Polish Rural Forum

email: l.juroszek (@NOSPAM) faow.org.pl

Leokadia works in the secretariat of PRF, assisting in projects on rural development. She is also a PhD student in sociology, focusing on local cross-sectoral partnerships in rural areas and social capital.

Ryszard Kamiński

Organisation: Agricultural Advisory Center in Minikowo, Poland

email: r.kaminski (@NOSPAM) pro.onet.pl

Ryszard works for the Agricultural Advisory Centre in Minikowo and is its vice director. He is also with the Institute of Agriculture and Rural Development Polish Academy of Sciences and last, but not least, he is the Chairman of the Polish Rural Forum (FAAN partner). Whilst he works generally for rural development in Poland his special interest is in the Leader Programme

Sandra Karner (FAAN partner)

Organisation: Interuniversity Research Centre for Technology, Work and Culture (IFZ)

email: karner (@NOSPAM) ifz.tugraz.at

Sandra is a researcher at the Interuniversity Research Centre for Technology, Work and Culture (IFZ) and coordinator of the EC-funded research project 'FAAN - Facilitating Alternative Agro-Food Networks: Stakeholders' Perspectives on Research Needs'. Her main research interest lies in issues related to the involvement of the public in research, and on integrative approaches linking science, policy and civil society actors. The thematic fields she is working in relate to sustainable food production and consumption, but also to agri-biotech and biomedical issues.

Csilla Kiss (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Vedegylet - Protect the Future, Hungary

email: csilla (@NOSPAM) vedegylet.hu

Csilla is working as an agricultural campaigner at Protect the Future. She is mainly focusing on creative and participatory awareness-raising activities around local food systems, in particular local farmers' markets. Her other work area centres on lobbying, public education and awareness-raising linked to the conservation and renewal of agrobiodiversity, including issues like farmers' rights and agrobiodiversity's role in local food systems, local economies and in mitigating climate change.

Antje Koelling

Organisation: IFOAM EU Group, International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements

email: antje.koelling (@NOSPAM) ifoam-eu.org

Antje is Policy Coordinator at the IFOAM EU Group which is an independent European working level group within IFOAM, the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements. It brings together more than 300 organisations, associations and enterprises from all EU-27, EFTA and candidate countries. IFOAM's goal is the worldwide adoption of ecologically, socially and economically sound systems that are based on the principles of Organic Agriculture.

Katharina Kraiß

Organisation: University Kassel/ Witzenhausen, Department of Ecological Agriculture, Germany

email: K.Kraiss (@NOSPAM) web.de

Katharina is master student of Ecological Agriculture at the University Kassel/ Witzenhausen. She wrote her bachelor thesis about Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) in Germany. In her study she focuses on CSA and sustainable systems. She will also write her Master's Thesis on CSA.

Krzysztof Kwatara (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Polish Rural Forum

email: kwatara (@NOSPAM) onet.pl

Krzysztof is an independent expert on sustainable local development and partnership building. He is a trainer supporting the Local Action Groups (LAGs) in the Leader Programme. He is also president of the Board of Local Action Group Dolina Raby, a representative of LAGs in the Polish National Rural Network. He is interested in kitchen incubators for small business in food sector.

Rachele Laponi

Organisation: CampiAperti, associazione per la sovranità alimentare, Italy

email: rachele.laponi (@NOSPAM) libero.it

Rachele is a student of Sociology at University of Bologna, She does the training for Campi Aperti. Her interests are in rural a contemporary traditional practice that has developed around urban life. Her focus in the association are re-thinking information interactions with consumers and also are related with an info point in the market, trying to make public aware about the natural, local and traditional food.

Les Levidow (FAAN partner)

Organisation: Open University (UK)

email: L.Levidow (@NOSPAM) open.ac.uk, <http://dpp.open.ac.uk/people/levidow.htm>

Les is Senior Research Fellow at the Open University, UK, he has carried out studies on various agri-environmental issues. From an early focus on agbiotech, his research now encompasses a broader range of issues, e.g. alternative agri-food networks, agri-innovation priorities and biofuels, within an EC-funded research project (www.crepeweb.net). His new book is *GM Food on Trial: Testing European Democracy* (Routledge, 2010).

Hannes Lorenzen

Organisation: European Parliament, CURE Network Advisor

email: hansmartin.lorenzen (@NOSPAM) europarl.europa.eu

Hannes is a Member of the European Parliament and is an advisor to the European Greens on agriculture and rural development. He holds a degree in Sociology and runs a farm. For more than 20 years he has been interested in issues related to ecological economies, renewable energies, eco-tourism and organic farming. He is a founding member of the Convention for Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe (CURE).

Frédéric Morand

Organisation: Eco Innovation, Belgium

email: frederic.morand (@NOSPAM) eco-innovation.net

Eco Innovation is an entrepreneurial and international not-for-profit association, creating urban vegetable gardens, focuses on how to better understand and alleviate barriers to eco-innovations, takes part in eco-innovation research and policy and provides a range of communication and educational services. See: <http://eco-innovation.net/>

Gusztáv Nemes

Organisation: Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

email: nemes (@NOSPAM) econ.core.hu

Gusztáv's main interest is to find ways for helping rural society and communities to maintain and develop rural values. He does research, analysis and evaluation of EU and national policies, helps advocacy groups to find arguments for their objectives and rural communities to develop and succeed in the jungle of policies, rules and institutions.

Marguerite Paus

Organisation: AGRIDEA - Swiss Association for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas

email: Marguerite.Paus (@NOSPAM) agridea.ch

Marguerite's research focuses on collective agro-food supply chains and their potential to foster rural development (case studies of Geographical Indications from Switzerland and Serbia). She was involved in the European projects SUS-CHAIN and SINER-GI. Currently, she is leading research on the role of facilitators in building collective agro-food supply chains.

Sonja Petrovics (FAAN partner)

Organisation: OeBV - Via Campesina Austria (VCA)

email: Sonja.petrovics (@NOSPAM) viacampesina.at

Sonja studied landscape planning with a focus on municipal planning, regional management and peasant farming. Since 2008 she has been a project officer at OeBV - Via Campesina Austria (VCA). Additionally she is lecturer at the University of Applied Life Sciences in Vienna for Landscape Planning.

Michela Potito

Organisation: Association of organic farmers and consumers, Italy

email: michela.potito (@NOSPAM) gmail.com and info (@NOSPAM) campiaperti.org

Michela is the Administrative Secretary of the association CampiAperti which organises three markets every week in Bologna in Italy. This association aims to develop the traditional way of making agriculture by using man work, saving resources such as land and water, preserving the environment, producing seasonal products, stimulating the rural settlements and the quality of food. The association also organises activities to promote the concept of alimentary sovereignty.

Becky Price

Organisation: GeneWatch, UK

email: becky.price (@NOSPAM) genewatch.org

Becky is based at GeneWatch UK and has been working of Food and Agriculture issue, especially Biotech and the funding of science for the last 10 years.

Sonia Priwieziencew

Organisation: Social Ecological Institute and AgriNatura Foundation for Agricultural Biodiversity, Poland

email: sonia.priwieziencew (@NOSPAM) sie.org.pl

Sonia works on projects focused on spreading organic farming, supporting small local food processing and reintroducing to the field and to the farms agricultural biodiversity (old breeds of animals and plant varieties). She is very interested in food distribution issues in relation to small farms and local producers.

Katerina Psarikidou (FAAN partner)

Organisation: Lancaster University, UK

email: a.pсарikidou (@NOSPAM) lancaster.ac.uk

Within the FAAN Project, Katerina has been working as a researcher for GeneWatch UK. She is a PhD candidate in Sociology and the ESRC Centre for the Economic and Social Aspects of Genomics (Cesagen), both in Lancaster University (UK). Drawing upon her research on Alternative Agro-food Networks in UK, she is looking at their potentiality of shaping a competent counter-hegemonic knowledge-based socio-economic agro-food paradigm, which may contribute to the reconfiguration of sustainable agro-food futures and practices. She has also worked in issues related to bioethics, public participation and conflicts over the implementation of EC regulatory framework on biodiversity conservation (EC PAGANINI Project).

Christine Raiswell

Organisation: Manchester City Council Food Futures Programme Manager, UK

email: c.raiswell (@NOSPAM) manchester.gov.uk

Together with Abby Falla, Christine coordinates the development and implementation of the Food Strategy for Manchester - Food Futures. Food Futures is a partnership that embraces a wide range of individuals and organisations with an interest in improving food in the city. Its ambitious goal is to create a culture of good food in the city, based on the belief that everyone in Manchester has a right to good food. They are currently working on the coordination of sustainable food activity in Manchester's Climate Change Action Plan. One of the projects is Growing Manchester - a package of training, advice and support for community food growing projects to ensure they are well placed to sustain themselves over a long period.

Karl Reiner

Organisation: ÖAR Regionalberatung GmbH

email: reiner (@NOSPAM) oear.at

Since 1988 Karl has worked for ÖAR-Regional Consulting Ltd.. He specialises in integrated regional development programmes, feasibility studies and tourism development. Further work was on soft mobility in tourism, development of tourism in protected areas, EU programme planning, evaluation and project coaching. He is author several articles and manuals e.g. "marketing practice for agro-tourism" and "traffic calming/soft mobility in tourism destinations". Karl is a member of the executive board of ECOTRANS, an European expert network for sustainable tourism development (www.ecotrans.org, www.destinet.eu) and club-tourism (www.club-tourismus.org).

Gildas Roger

Organisation: Pays de ploermel – Coeur de Bretagne, France

email: g.roger (@NOSPAM) paysdeploermel-coeurdebretagne.fr

Irmi Salzer (FAAN partner)

Organisation: OeBV - Via Campesina Austria

email: Irmi.salzer (@NOSPAM) bergbauern.org

Irmi studied landscape planning at the University of Agriculture in Vienna. She has been working and researching about cultural landscape, regional management, alternative economy and biological agriculture. Since 2005 she has been working as a press, public relations and lobbying officer of OeBV - Via Campesina Austria (VCA). Her experiences in organic farming and AAFNs also include the fact of owning a small organic farm together with her husband and being a member of a small AAFN in the Austrian region of South Burgenland.

Heide Salzer

Organisation: Via Campesina Austria

email: heidrun.salzer (@NOSPAM) care.at

After finishing degrees in International Relations and International Development in the UK Heide is now working with CARE Österreich in order to gain experience in various aspects of development cooperation. She is mostly interested in political and economic relationships and their impact on development in general and people in poorer communities in particular. Her aim is to contribute to the alleviation of some of the effects that our contemporary way of life and our political and economic systems have had and are still having on the poorer segments of the world's population.

Borbala Sarbu-Simonyi (FAAN Partner)

Organisation: Vedegylet - Protect the Future, Hungary

email: simonyib (@NOSPAM) vedegylet.hu

Borbala is working as an agricultural campaigner at Protect the Future. Her current work is focused on advocacy and lobbying aimed at easing hygiene regulations for food processing and direct marketing by smallholders. She is the coordinator of the Hungarian Platform for Food Sovereignty.

Orhan Defranceschi Seda

Organisation: Bugday Association for Supporting Ecological Living, Turkey

email: seda (@NOSPAM) bugday.org

Seda is the Brussels' representative of the Turkish NGO- Bugday (Wheat) Association for Supporting Ecological Living, which aims to establish and support the ecologically sustainable production – consumption systems by carrying out activities that intend to solve the ecological (and related economical, cultural and social) problems in rural and urban areas mainly in Turkey. Bugday is a pioneer of ecological markets in Turkey and has also developed the first eco-agro tourism program of Turkey.

Tracy Lord Sen

Organisation: Emanetciler (Stewards) Association

email: emanetciler (@NOSPAM) gmail.com

Tracy Lord is co-founder and currently president of the Emanetciler (Stewards) Association since 2007. They are currently in their second project supported by the Small Grants Program (SGP/GEF) of the UNDP, this time as secretariat for a national "Seed Network" information. With approximately 90 individual and institutional participants they cover a variety of professions; our main work involves finding practical methods that volunteers may use in locating traditional farm varieties and keeping them alive and in circulation. They are also interested in following legal developments regarding plant genetic material inside Turkey and internationally.

Bron Szerszynski

Organisation: Lancaster University, UK

email: bron (@NOSPAM) lancaster.ac.uk

Bron is a sociologist and philosopher who specialises in issues concerning environment, technology and politics. At Lancaster he also works at the Centre for the Study of Environmental Change (CSEC) and the ESRC Centre for the Economic and Social Aspects of Genomics (Cesagen). For a number of years much of his research has focused on the conflict over GM food and crops in Europe. He has also just co-edited a special issue of the journal Theory, Culture and Society on climate change and society."

Lasca ten Kate

Organisation: Stichting Vriendelijke Keukens (SVK) / Friendly Kitchens Alliances

email: lasca (@NOSPAM) vriendelijkekeukens.nl

Lasca is founder and director of the Friendly Kitchens Alliances, the organic food campaign of the Province of North-Holland (The Netherlands) and the project leader of 'The Good Meal', focussing on the increased use of organic products from the region in institutional kitchens (especially hospitals and care homes). The theme that connects different projects and jobs is 'e-connecting people with the roots of their food' in order to make them aware of the direct relationship between their choices of consumption and issues concerning animal and environment friendliness, biodiversity and fair trading (also within a country).

Daniela Terrile

Organisation: European Commission DG AGRI unit K3

email: daniela.terrile (@NOSPAM) ec.europa.eu

Daniela works in K3 dealing with advisory groups and rural development. She follows activities in INTA and AGRI REGIO and ITRE committee. She is a member of think tank EuReforme. She is studying architecture with a special care of urban planning activities and hydrographic districts in Europe.

Danièle Tissot

Organisation: European Commission DG RTD unit E4

email: Daniele.Tissot (@NOSPAM) ec.europa.eu

Danièle Tissot is a project officer at RTD unit E4 Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries, Aquaculture, focusing on Food Chain, Organic farming, Sustainable Production Systems topics.

András Tóth-Czifra

Organisation: European Parliament, where he is a trainee.

Adriana Tuca

Organisation: European Commission, CURE network

email: info (@NOSPAM) cureforsustainability.eu

Adriana is presently working at the DG Regio, in a geographical unit managing the implementation of Structural Funds in Romania, mainly in the field of environment and transport. Previously she was in charge of the coordination of the CURE (Convention for a Sustainable Urban and Rural Europe) network, taking care among other activities a local food chains project.

Helen Wallace (FAAN partner)

Organisation: GeneWatch UK

email: Helen.wallace (@NOSPAM) genewatch.org

Helen is the Director of GeneWatch UK, a not-for-profit group which aims to ensure genetics is used in the public interest. Our current activities include researching and lobbying to change research funding systems so that alternatives to GM crops and foods are given a higher priority.

Iris van de Graaf

Organisation: Stichting Biologisch Goed Van Eigen Erf, the Netherlands

email: iris (@NOSPAM) vaneigenerf.nl

Iris is the director of the Dutch (nationwide) foundation of organic farmers who sell their products locally. Van Eigen Erf develops and promotes local organic farm food for reasons of health, taste, sustainability and a better income for farmers. They are running a training programme to professionalize farm shops, and organise workshops and knowledge exchange programmes. Moreover, they are helping setting up co-operations and new distribution channels like web shops. For consumers they are organizing several events at the farm to promote the use of regional organic ingredients. Van Eigen Erf organises yearly a national network event with workshops. In 2010 this will be organised at the BIOVAK, a trade fair for organic farmers. Various subjects of local sales will be on the programme like selling to restaurants, care houses for the elderly, catering, farmers markets and local sale in supermarkets. Van Eigen Erf is also co-writer of the handbook for local sale of farm food. The consumer programme consist of yearly events at the farm, like the annual Open House at the organic farm (organised with Biologica) and the Burgundy dinners where consumers have a special dinner in a special setting at the farm like the stable between the cow or in the field.

Wynne Wright

Organisation: Michigan State University

email: wrightwy (@NOSPAM) anr.msu.edu

Wynne is an Associate Professor of Community, Food and Agriculture at Michigan State University. Her research interests are in the area of agrifood restructuring in global and local contexts. Current projects include French value-added agriculture and agritourism, the socio-economic impact of food safety regulation, and the advancement of citizen engagement in the agrifood system for social sustainability. Wynne is co-editor of *The Fight Over Food: Producers, Consumers, and Activists Challenge the Global Food System*.

Bernd Wulf

Organisation: Zentralverband deutscher Konsumgenossenschaften e.V, Germany

email: bernd-wulf (@NOSPAM) t-online.de

Since 2009 Bernd has been a member of the supervisory board of a producer-consumer-cooperative called EVG LANDWEGE eG in Lübeck/Germany. He is a consultant in a project initialised by the German Ministry of Education and Research; project-title: "Climate and Energy in a Complex Transition Process towards Sustainable Hyderabad. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies by Changing Institutions, Governance Structures, Life Styles and Consumption Patterns" working on the improvement of food provision for the poor.

VIII Photographs from the workshop

More photographs are available on the FAAN project website: <http://www.faanweb.eu>

