

14/06/2017

Report on the National Workshop in Italy

Rome, 05/06/2017

Organised by Francesco Mantino, Barbara Forcina, Francesco Vanni (CREA-PB)

This report presents the outcomes of the discussions at the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Italy.

The list of attendees is presented in the Annex.

Session 1 – Lessons emerging from the project so far

Questions for the discussion: *Is there any salient point that emerges as being particularly relevant/not relevant or not accurate to the situation in your country? Are there any other points specific in your country not included in the emerging findings so far?*

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

ESBOs provision

- Stakeholders well understood the aims of PEGASUS projects and its focus on processes, social and institutional mechanisms rather than on quantification of ESBOs provision. At the same time, especially academic specialists, emphasised the need to **strengthen the links between the drivers for ESBOs and the related level of provision** by emphasising how the mechanisms observed may enable an increased provision of ESBOs through farming and forestry;
- Stakeholders pointed out that a very relevant challenge is related to the availability of **data and indicators on ESBOs**, especially regarding direct relations between farming/forestry and the evaluation of associated social and environmental effects;
- A salient point that emerged during the workshop as being particularly significant is related to the specific **mechanisms that regulate food supply chains**, since these mechanisms exert a considerable influence on the provision of ESBOs. This aspect is often underestimated, but its key role seems quite evident not only in PEGASUS project but also in the emerging findings of PROVIDE project. Indeed, the provision of ESBOs is often strongly influenced by the relations amongst the supply chain actors as well as by the decision-making and technical support ensured to farmers. This support may vary according to the different types of supply chain (e.g. commodity or niche products), to the different role of retailers (e.g., presence of big retailers and specific corporate policies), typologies and contents of contracts between farmers and processors/retailers. Some examples were provided on the role of regulations for integrated and organic production in the tomato supply chain.



- Several stakeholders emphasised the **marginal role of social and environmental certifications (CSR)**, which are often used as marketing strategies but do not play a key role in influencing local practices and consequently in increasing the ESBOs provision.
- While the majority of projects/studies emphasise the trade-offs between public and private goods, the emerging findings of PEGASUS show that in many cases there are **unexpected synergies between public and private goods**, often as a result of common interests expressed by private and public actors. This is often the outcome of organisational and social innovations and represents one of the most interesting emerging finding of the project.

Case studies

- The participants appreciated the four **case studies** and emphasised the **complementarities** between them: two case studies are in intensive areas (IT-1 and IT-3) and two case studies are in extensive/marginal areas (IT-2 and IT-4). In both areas there is one case where policies play a key role (IT-3 in intensive area and IT-4 in extensive area) and a case where market mechanisms are the most important drivers for ESBOs provision (IT-1 in intensive area and IT-2 in extensive/marginal area);
- Stakeholders pointed out that the case studies were analysed through a rather **positive narrative**, and suggested to developed more clearly also the drawbacks/ mechanisms generating failures . In particular, the remarks were referred to the constraints and bottlenecks that in some circumstances could reduce the provision of ESBOs as well as all to the factors that are preventing (or could prevent) governance arrangements and market mechanisms needed to underpin such provision. According to the stakeholders, examples of negative aspects that should be better emphasised in IT case studies are:
 - IT-1: dependence on public support, especially CAP first pillar;
 - IT-2: general distrust of local institutions and impact of organised crime;
 - IT-3: difficulties to provide evidence of local appreciation and effects on public goods;
 - IT-4: risks related to the new institutional scenarios and difficulty to cope with the emerging needs of a quickly evolving rural area;
- Some other stakeholder, however, suggested avoiding too much emphasis on drawbacks, since this could encourage the preservation of the status quo. Focusing on what works well and looking at how to scale it could be a considered an effective research methodology and could to provide vital basis for change.

Session 2 – Messages for practice

Questions for the discussion:

- *Do the emerging findings of the project and discussions in previous sessions imply that policy change is needed? If yes, what change (e.g. policy design, implementation/delivery, scale of action, etc.)? What types of policy measures do you feel are currently missing (please use examples if possible)?*



- *Are there serious constraints preventing the achievement of the environmental and social goals? In what areas?*
- *How has policy (in combination with other factors) contributed to success?*
- *What opportunities are there for developing public-private interactions?*

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

The contribution of policy (and other factors) to success

- Participants emphasised the **key role of leadership**. All the national case studies show how behind the innovative governance and market mechanisms there is always a key person (or a small group of people) having strategic vision, reliability within local community and also technical knowledge to stimulate the innovation. Important factors related to the role of leadership for ESBOs provision are: continuity of human resources and trust/reciprocity with local communities.
- The key role of innovative leadership is summarised by the following aspects: a) capacity to recognise opportunities e design consistent initiatives; b) capacity to coordinate local actors; c) capacity to involve other innovators and to induce positive “breaking shocks” at the local level; d) capacity to develop trust and collaboration, having interest in public goals and not in defending social/political goals of some specific group. Stakeholders agreed on the **importance of policy mixes**, since the provision of ESBOs can be ensured only by activating several types of policies and regulations at different institutional levels. In this process usually local institutions must be also able to ensure the continuity of ESBOs provision through policy mixes changing over time so as to access and integrate different types of funding and make strategies coherent with the evolving regulations.
- Another key issue is related to **the time lapse between the implementation of policies and their effects on the ground**. Especially when dealing with ESBOs provision, it is difficult to understand which policy has played a major role, since the current provision of ESBOs could be the also the result of past policies. The complexity of policy mixes as well as the rapid evolution of policy scenario make it very difficult to identify straightforward relations between policies and ESBOs (for example, it is still not clear which have been the effects of CAP greening and yet this policy has already been changed). This implies that the role of policies and policy mix should be always seen under a historical perspective.
- Some participant emphasized the role of the regional government and the importance of a **multi-level governance analysis**
- According to some stakeholders in order to better assess the role of policies it would be necessary to **look better at the coordination mechanisms of such policies at the territorial level** and to assess the role of local initiatives. In many cases, it has been the bottom-up participatory and pooling process that operated as a positive trigger at local level and nonetheless there has been a generalised tendency to concentrate decision-making and programming at regional or national level (i.e. in the case of Tuscany Region in IT-4) that could undermine local governance in future. However, it emerged also that when local dynamics are blocked, the role of national institutions becomes fundamental to mobilise untapped potential and to unlock innovation;



- Some stakeholders suggested exploring more the role of sectoral national policies, since they could have a positive impact on framework conditions, even if there was general agreement on the fact that, all things being equal, it is the **local social capital** and the escape route chosen that is crucial since not always innovation in ESBO provision comes from actors institutionally benefiting of policies.

Opportunities for public-private interactions

- Stakeholders pointed out the importance of a prominent role of public institutions in piecing actors and policies together by recognising and exploiting the opportunities, aligning and focusing decisions and involving many different players. However, they also emphasized that compromise and harmonization of interventions could well prove to be dysfunctional as far as innovation is concerned;
- Participants expressed general agreement on the fact that ESBO provision is most often the result of interrelations between public and private schemes and that the role of private actors is fundamental to ensure long-term sustainability (i.e. in IT-1 case study, where, despite much more and better could always be done, improvement of the commitment to environmental protection is grounded in a long-term vision that combines competitiveness and sustainability).

Session 3 – Messages for policy

Questions for the discussion:

- *How can local or thematic initiatives such as those examined in the case studies, expand their reach/impact, be replicated/transferred, and/or become more effective?*
- *What key qualities or actions/stepwise processes do participants need to adopt, to develop and achieve success? Please assess how participants' needs might differ between different groups of stakeholders, and different environmental or social goals targeted, in different contexts, etc.*
- *Who are the key people to involve, to enable long-lasting change? Why?*
- *What are participants' needs in terms of the types of maps or other basic information which would be useful in this context?*
- *What format should PEGASUS' tools and guidance take, to spread success across rural areas?*

The main points of the discussion with stakeholders covered:

How to expand/replicate/transfer the initiatives

- A big challenge for the most innovative practices described in the case studies will be the **consolidating the innovation and at the same time continuing the experimentation of new practices**. Key elements in this regard are the generational turnover and the human capital available;





- Another key element is ensuring a **direct involvement of key actors** during the design and the development of the initiatives and above all ensuring an active participation of the most important economic actors;
- Local initiatives aimed at increasing the provision of ESBOs should not focus on all of the challenges posed but on the major limiting factor, on the **most critical environmental and social problems of a specific area** to be identified with the most relevant stakeholders and not on the basis of a list of ESBOs provided by public institutions;
- **Online platforms and social networks** can play a key role in spreading the knowledge about the most successful initiatives and may be useful to expand/replicate/transfer the best practices;
- While H2020 projects analyse in depth case studies and mechanisms, **other funding opportunities (such as LIFE programme) are strategic to transfer knowledge and to favour the replicability** of successful initiatives.



Attendees to the PEGASUS WP5 national workshop in Italy

Name	Organisation	Type of stakeholder
Alessi Eva	WWF	International NGO
Bartolini Fabio	Università di Pisa	University
Benvenuti Federico	Ministero dell’Ambiente	Ministry
Bonati Guido	CREA-PB	Research Centre
Canali Gabriele	Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore	University
Coderoni Silvia	Univ. Politecnica delle Marche	University
Cristiano Simona	CREA-PB	National Rural Network
D’Antoni Susanna	ISPRA	National Institute for Environmental protection
Di Iacovo Francesco	Università di Pisa	University
Di Napoli Raffaella	CREA-PB	National Rural Network
Forcina Barbara	CREA-PB	PEGASUS Team
Henke Roberto	CREA-PB	PEGASUS Team
Macrì Maria Carmela	CREA-PB	Research Centre
Mantino Francesco	CREA-PB	PEGASUS Team
Marconi Valentina	Università di Bologna	University
Monteleone Alessandro	CREA-PB	National Rural Network
Natali Anna	ECO&ECO	Private Company
Nazzini Luisa	ISPRA	National System for Environmental protection
Orlando Salvatore	Università della Calabria	University
Petriccione Gaetana	CREA-PB	Research Centre
Pieroni Sandro	Regione Toscana	Regional government
Raimondi Stefano	Legambiente	National League for the Environment
Stranieri Stefano	Gal Montagnappennino	LAG
Tagle Laura	Nuvap-DPC	Presidency of the Council of Ministers, Department for Development and Cohesion Policies
Valentino Grazia	CREA-PB Puglia	National Rural Network
Vanni Francesco	CREA-PB	PEGASUS Team
Varia Francesca	CREA-PB Sicilia	National Rural Network
Viganò Laura	CREA-PB	National Rural Network

