



European conference

**Let's work together:
Territorial cooperation for
the provision of public goods
in the context of the reformed CAP**

**20 – 21 December 2013
La Bergerie, Villarceaux, France**

Report

Friday December 20

Welcome

Arie van den Brand, president of the Groupe de Bruges

Mr. Van den Brand welcomes all participants, representing 13 EU countries. He in particular welcomes the representatives of the French ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs and the Fondation pour le Progrès de l'Homme, who have made this conference financially possible.

Cooperation is one of the key words in the new CAP. But also in practice we can witness a growing number of initiatives in which farmers and other land owners engage in various forms of cooperation with the objective to improve performance concerning the delivery of public goods, notably eco-system services often in collaboration with other stakeholders (governments, NGO's, researchers). The Groupe de Bruges feels that these local initiatives and related stakeholders spread out over Europe can benefit from each other's experiences and knowledge by creating a platform for exchange. This platform or network can subsequently also act to formulate recommendations to improve policy measures.

Mr. Van den Brand stresses that this conference is the first of at least two meetings – the next one will be held in The Netherlands in the Spring of 2014 – which the Groupe de Bruges organises in collaboration with the French and Dutch ministries. The main objective is to discuss and set a common agenda and the creation of a European network that can work on this agenda.

Philippe Vinçon of the French Ministry for Agriculture: the vision of minister LeFoll concerning perspectives for territorial cooperation for the provision of public goods

Mr. Vinçon is Chef de Service des Relations Internationales at the French Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forests. He starts off with explaining that there is a strong relationship between France and the Netherlands concerning agricultural policy. In fact, minister LeFoll will accompany president Hollande on his visit to The Netherlands in January.

Minister LeFoll has identified four basic principles for his agricultural policy:

1. To protect the diversity of agricultural landscapes and 'terroirs' to counter the trend of the oversimplifications of agricultural production systems
2. To increase the competitiveness of French agriculture. While French agriculture is important for the economy and the creation of jobs - in particular in the light of the fact that currently there are no alternative jobs available – the economic crisis has led to a loss of production
3. To protect family farms. We currently have some 13 million farms in Europe, most of which are family farms. By contrast, the USA only have 2,5 million farms. The added value of European agriculture is twice as high as US agriculture. Redistribution of Direct Payments should therefore be in favor of small farms. Although we should not be dogmatic about this and keep an open eye on economic benefits.
4. To combine competitiveness with environmental objectives, such as protecting natural resources. The negative externalities of agricultural production is an important issue in global markets. We also

need the support of citizens to legitimize public spending. The French government therefore favors the agro-ecology approach, which is a systemic approach. Through use of scientific knowledge – agronomy- , coaching, advice and training farmers are encouraged to adopt agro-ecological practices. The notion of agro-ecology also extends into the agro-industry. If we, for example, want to encourage agro-ecological practices like crop rotation, involving new crops like alfalfa, the industry also has to find economic uses for these new crops to ensure that farmers will accept these practices.

At this moment the French government has started a process of dialogue in the context of the preparation of a new law that is based on the four principles. Besides experts also other stakeholders are involved in this dialogue such as Economic Interest Groups (GIE's). The aim is to come to a law that will facilitate protection of biodiversity and landscapes in combination with improved economic performance. This however can never be a turn-key solution. The implementation of the law should be flexible and adaptive. In other words: the French government has not yet set quantitative targets, but wants to encourage a process of transition.

Concerning the CAP Reform Mr. Vinçon stresses that the discussion is now focused on the Delegated Acts. Greening in the vision of LeFoll is key to gain legitimacy from the general public, but we need a smart implementation. The ministry has for this reason developed a weighing matrix for public goods that will encourage farmers to better adopt the greening measures.

Mr. Vinçon also warns that the free trade agreement with the US (TTIP negotiations), could lead to further intensification of production on already overused, fertile land and further abandonment of marginal land. This will damage both the economy and the ecology and should therefore be prevented. The French position is that the agreement should be a reasonable one in which our model is accepted.

Q&A

Q: at what level should competitiveness be evaluated, at the level of the farm or the food chain?

A: this is indeed a complex matter that will need more debate. In the context of protecting natural resources the problem is currently in the processing industry that will have to find marketable uses for new crops. This also means that we will have to open up the debate for new players, such as consumers.

Q: is the CAP reform an obstacle for the French approach?

A: Not really. It is all about the way the CAP reform is being implemented. The greening measures, for example, offer an anchoring point, but are not sufficient. The French government will therefore develop additional measures. The redistributive payments will favour family farms, which is also our objective. Rural development policy offers opportunities for a territory based approach and for collective approaches to implement agro-ecological practices. The experiences with these practices should form the basis for the next CAP (post 2020).

Arie van den Brand concludes this first session by reminding the participants of [Aldo Leopold](#) who already in the 1930's developed the idea of nature cooperatives of farmers and hunters in the US for wildlife management, which was embraced by the president Theodore Roosevelt.

Introduction to the theme: On the notion of cooperation for the provision of public goods

Presentation by Dr. Gerard Breeman (NL), Wageningen University, Department of Public administration and Policy.

The PowerPoint presentation can be downloaded [HERE](#)

Some clarifications on the presentation:

- The tragedy of the commons according to Hardin means that the benefits of managing commons are for the individual, while the cost are for the collective, meaning that state intervention is necessary to remedy this market failure
- Ostrom has countered this by stating that between state intervention and market there is a third way of collective arrangements
- Theory of social capital is based on three notions: bonding, linking and bridging. All three should be implemented simultaneously. Bonding is about building trust between participants in a collective. This starts simply by being nice to each other, to exchange experiences ('show and tell'), give feedback, obtaining first, small wins, thus creating a shared story. Trust should not be blind, arrangements should also be put in writing: what, how and monitoring. In this way trust becomes a resource and a self-reinforcing mechanism
- Collaboration in collectives based on shared values and pragmatism.
- Design principles of collectives (slide 9, based on Ostrom):
 - o Flexible rules: set minimum and maximum or use a menu. Also make an evaluation period obligatory
 - o Conflict resolution mechanisms: shows your independence towards governments
 - o Nested enterprises: created smaller, semi-independent groups through which leadership can become spread and shared. Leadership should not be executive but relational in character
- Connecting societal actors: it is important to speak the language of these actors and to not disqualify them on the basis of their lack of knowledge

Q&A

Q: are territorial collectives an alternative for failing or destroyed local governance?

A: for collectives to be successful as form of territorial self-governance the most difficult matter is for governments to keep a low profile and to accept that this form of governance has certain risks.

Q: public goods are destroyed continuously. How can collective approaches be successful in countering this trend?

A: a combination of celebrating quick, small wins and a more long term perspective, which requires above all patient leadership.

Q: the management of public goods (the commons) constitute a classic prisoner's dilemma. How can we overcome this if we do not want state regulations?

A: a characteristic of the prisoner's dilemma is the lack of communication. Communication is a key between all: the participants of the collective, with governments and the societal actors.

Q: is there a threshold for public goods above which cooperation is required?

A: first of all public or common goods have to be correctly identified, as some are hidden, and subsequently recognised as common goods. After identification the correct territorial scale of management should be assessed.

Q: is the discrepancy between the management of public goods and the necessity for farmers to become more competitive in the market not the biggest threat?

A: economic considerations should be part of the arrangements between collectives, individual farmers and governments. But we also have to consider that there are other sources of gains besides economic ones in the management of public goods such increased legitimacy (license to produce) and a greater sense of pride (psychological income).

Collective approaches and the CAP post 2013

Presentation by professor Janet Dwyer (UK), Countryside and Community Research Institute

The PowerPoint presentation can be downloaded [HERE](#).

Some clarifications of the presentation:

- Professor Dwyer prefers in this context the notion of ecosystem services over public goods
- New Member States still struggle with the notion of cooperation as stipulated in the CAP framework, they just don't see the potential
- Slide 1: higher oil prices are leading to growing demand for renewables (biofuels). Concerning food demand we have to ask ourselves if the EU should be the bread basket of the world. Given the self-sufficiency in basic food products, we could even decide to produce less and in this way create more space for nature
- Slide 5: increase multifunctionality of rural land: public goods must not be regarded as something extra but something that underpins the vitality of rural areas. Collaboration for public goods management is connected to family farms as the big farms have no need for it
- CAP Reform (slides 6 and 7): there is more room for tailored measures and actions, but this will need a sophisticated approach. The EIP concept could be very useful, but it as it is not compulsory we will have to see if it will be integrated in the RD programmes and how. Practical experiences should form the basis for research
- Collectives, UK experiences: most of them are informal and based on already existing local networks of information sharing. These are important entry points as farmers nowadays are primarily vertically organised in food supply chains, leading to less territorial communication and information sharing. These initiatives show that it is not always necessary to come to the contractual stage. The Pontbren (Wales) experience is a bottom-up initiative in an area which was not a target for environmental agencies. It has also led to economic spin off in the form of new businesses, such as tree nurseries. Drivers were: a long term objective, independency. The government response was to use this example and to disseminate it to other areas. This is a pitfall because then it is no longer bottom up. Ownership of the initiative by farmers and other landowners is crucial
- Free rider problem: the perceived risks of free riding are bigger than the actual risks
- Peer policing has proven to be a good mechanism for monitoring and sanctioning.

Q&A:

Q: you said you preferred the term ecosystem services over public goods. Why?

A: for a number of reasons. Public goods entails more topics than which are addressed in this context. On the other hand, ecosystem services can also have a private goods character. Ecosystem services also refer to the systemic character of the types of management and offer better opportunities to create spin off activities for the market economy in the form of new businesses or special, local products.

Q: how do you view the role of government in collective approaches

A: most important role is to maintain a stable policy connected with stable funding. The current practices of turning the money tap on and off is detrimental

Q: the European Court of Auditors maintains a sceptical position towards collective approaches as primary beneficiary of EU funds. How to deal with that?

A: first of all the ECA should not be the institute to determine policy, but to audit it. What helps is to engage them in these initiatives on a personal basis: invite them, show them and inform them.

Collective approaches working in practice

Presentations of practical examples from various European countries of new collective/territorial approaches for the provision of public goods.

All presentations can be downloaded [HERE](#).

Some additional remarks made by the presenters:

- Francois Leger (France) – Collective action on agro-ecological practices and public goods management in France: state of affairs
 - Agro-ecology as socio-ecological transition to sustainable food systems has been in practice in India and Latin America for 30 years aimed at increasing the resilience of food production
 - Ecosystem services do not only apply to a plot of land or farm but also to the level of landscapes. This level involves by definition multiple stakeholders, which necessitates some form of coordination
- Véronique Lucas (France) – Agro-ecology and collective approaches
 - Existing farm machine cooperatives, dating sometimes back to the 1980's offer a good territorial platform for diversification and innovation
 - Economic considerations (cost reduction of market diversification) can be drivers for more sustainable practices
- Quentin Delachapelle (France) – Biodiversity and arable farming in the Champagne region
 - The region is characterised by grain growers and poor soils, but which are suitable for intensive production. Agri-business is very strong. Pillar 1 payments are very important. Problems: soil is sensitive to chemical inputs; nitrate and pesticides effect ground water negatively, the level of table water is low.

- The region has various Natura 2000 areas, former military camps, as well as lakes and forests. In 2008 INRA, the national institute for agricultural research published a report, [Agriculture and Biodiversity](#), which concluded that also intensive farmers could be involved in biodiversity management to improve the resilience in the ecosystem. At the same time the government issued the Green and Blue Corridors Policy (top down). We tried to turn this policy into an incentive in collaboration with CIVAM. We started experiments which gave positive responses from the government and the green NGO's. The experiments were backed up by research by INRA. In fact, it was a co-design of farmers and researchers.
 - The main problem for us is the lack of coherence between the different policy domains and government levels that farmers have to deal with. In the daily practice of farming these domains are all connected and require consistency and adaptation to local conditions. For this reason we started a collective. We started by training farmers to identify the different species, in particular those that can act as indicators for potential biodiversity and to teach them which species can be beneficial for the crops instead of only looking for pests. This was then used to develop and spread a leaflet with practical guidelines. The whole process has led to a transition to systems thinking.
- Nicolas Ribes (France) – the experience of the Groupement d'Intérêt Économique DAD
 - Nicola works for SCARA, an organisation of facilitators
 - Context: 2009, dairy crisis in which milk prices were dropping and cost for inputs was rising. At the same time agriculture was criticized by the Environmental Forum and stigmatised in the media for its negative effects on the environment. The Water Board was putting measures in place to reduce the use of input
 - Project: 50 farmers formed an Economic Interest group (GIE) for collective buying of equipment aimed at reducing the use of chemical inputs and to improve phyto-sanitary conditions. The GIE also provided training for the farmers. It was a bottom up initiative that is already showing a socio-economic impact with a leverage effect concerning the creation of new jobs and new markets and better links between farmers and society through better communication. New economic activities concern the drying of the leguminous crops production through the use of methane from the manure of the cows of the farmers. Production of leguminous crops is to achieve feed autonomy.
 - Lessons learned: be prepared to arrive at additional goals emanating from the original project, such as renewable energy production and local products, support from Pillar 2 is necessary at the initial stages. The bottom up approach was a condition for acceptance by farmers, the success of the project and the increased support from society has increased the feelings of pride among the participating farmers.
- Sven Defrijn (Belgium) – Flemish Farmers Association supporting territorial cooperation: the ECO² experience
 - ECO² is a EU funded project aimed at establishing win-win opportunities for a broad group of farmers, organic and conventional
 - A wide variety of topics are addressed depending on the region: tailored approach
 - Successful experiences in one area are disseminated to other areas. This works as farmers can learn from their colleagues. It also changes farmers' attitudes towards sustainable production and biodiversity management (private benefit from public benefit)
 - The collective approach leads to lower transaction costs.

- Patrick McGurn (Ireland) – Burren Life project
 - Burren means ‘rocky place’. It is an extensive agricultural area and HVN area representing a diversity of landscapes with a long history of farming
 - The landscape was created by a ‘reverse transhumance’, meaning that the cattle were in the hills during winter and in the valleys during summer
 - Problems: farmers responded to CAP by rationalising production, turning them into part-time farmers. An effect was that there was no longer enough labour for the transhumance practise. Farmers turned to buying fodder from the market. Cattle didn’t move around anymore, leading to land pollution in de lowlands and marginalisation of the highlands, causing scrubs to invade the higher grounds
 - The project aims to reverse this trend and to reintroduce the transhumance as a mechanism for biodiversity management. It started off with a few ‘champions’ and a study followed by a stakeholder meeting. Although this meeting didn’t go well, it was a necessary step to know first from farmers what they want or what’s stopping them from engaging in the project
 - There was also a wider community interest as the degradation of the land and the subsequent invasion of scrubs made the area less attractive as a tourist destination
 - The project entails delivery payments to farmers. The money is coming from Article 68 of the 1st Pillar (!), because that’s where the room was to develop and implement specific measures. Of the 650 farmers, some 150 farmers are involved.
 - The basis for the payment is a scheme similar to identify and valorise beef quality. It has a 1 to 10 scale. Payments start off when a farmer has more than 3 points. Farmers determine by themselves the measures and actions to increase their number of points, starting by comparing scores.

- Henk Smith (Netherlands) – Territorial arable farmers biodiversity association “ANOG”
 - The Functional Agro-biodiversity project now has over 90 participants. Consisted of variety of plots and strips (breeding bird pots, winter stubble fields and bird friendly crops. Bird friendly crops are planted to support their population. A visualised plan is offered to the farmer, however, the farmers decide themselves, which scenario they want based on the land opportunities.
 - After 50 years farmers don’t see an insect anymore as a pest but as an indicator for healthy farming.

- Douwe Hoogland (Netherlands) – The experiences of territorial dairy farmers association “Friese Wouden”
 - The Noardlike Fryske Walden (NFW) essentially consist of 6 organisations and has over 1000 members. The area’s bid as a bottom-up process was not about the money, but about the biodiversity goals for the region combined in one bid.
 - To make sure that the working procedures are followed, field control commission is in place. Sanction system is accepted and sometimes needed.
 - This example highlights the need for professional administration unit.
 - Talking from an experience, area specific measurements lead to quality and more acceptance among farmers. “Own” field control is more accepted but must be independent.

- Francesco Vanni (Italy) – the Valdaso territorial agri-environmental agreement project
 - ASAM is a public advisory centre
 - Although various other stakeholders are involved it is a bottom up initiative, that started small (3 farms). Today 150 fruit (peach) farms are involved

- There is a scale mismatch between ecological and social-institutional dimensions
- In this case transaction cost are higher, additional costs are not covered by public money. This problem should be addressed by policy.
- Liselotte Unseld (Germany) - German Association for Landcare, DVL
 - Landcare Associations are not classical nature conservation organisations, but multi stakeholder associations that are aimed at reaching agreements through compromises.
- Véronique Rioufol – Terre de Liens: experiences from around Germany, France and Spain with alternative (collective) access to land models to ensure sustainable production and bio diversity management
 - Main objective of Terre de Liens is to buy farms in collective ownership and leasing them on 30 years contract to starting farmers. The leases have compulsory obligations regarding sustainable land use and biodiversity management
 - Civil society involvement is addressed next. Mobilisation of citizens is the basis to determine the type of food production and land management
 - Cooperation for us means: involvement of all stakeholders. In this context we also collaborate with institution that are not our natural allies
 - We have also developed a tool for the assessment of the environmental impact of our approach.

Main remarks from the discussion:

- One of the messages from the presentations is that civil servants should be more humble and give greater weight to the bottom up initiatives. However, this begs the question how successful bottom up experiences can be disseminated to other areas and groups of farmers and avoiding at the same time the pitfall of a top down approach?
- A mutual recognition and respect of the stakeholders involved is a pre-condition
- We also have to look how EU funds can be allocated to support the investments necessary for greening and agri-environmental measures
- Collective management of public goods should be more than just agri-environmental measures. Area payments are little incentive when the area in question is very small (ref. example of hollow ways management in Belgium)
- How can money for collective projects be better earmarked
- There is a lack of research on these and other examples that could offer information to facilitate better existing and new collectives. In conjunction with research we should also capitalize more on practical knowledge by creating a dissemination infrastructure ('knowledge cooperative')
- The same is also true for the agricultural education system: currently pupils and students at these schools are not being taught about these issues
- Added value of cooperation is in the monitoring of delivery through which civil society can be convinced of the role of farmers in biodiversity management
- Main key elements are: process of learning and dissemination of experiences combined with a bottom up approach
- The examples show many innovations aimed at greening of agriculture, which are currently not included in the CAP, such as new access to land models in combination with sustainable land management

- An important aspect is the scale of the area. A bottom up approach based on farmers working together in a certain area will coincide more with social factors (common identity) than with ecological criteria. For certain ecological measures which requires management measures on a larger scale adjoining collectives should engage in cooperation of collectives to achieve the critical mass required
- Predation: improved habitat and species management will by definition attract also more predators. This has to be accepted as part of habitat and biodiversity management.
- Parallel to improved public goods management, either through collective approaches or on an individual basis should run parallel with improved access for the general public to the countryside. Getting more people into the countryside will help the local economy and the understanding of the role of farmers in biodiversity management
- Public goods management should not exclusively be governed and incentivized by economic 'carrots'. We should emphasize also additional rewards such as increased autonomy and independence and the transition to a sustainable agriculture that is accepted by the public.

Saturday December 21

Workshops

1. Building capacities:

The example of Dutch cooperatives – Paul Terwan

The Dutch government has decided to deal exclusively with cooperatives from 2016, in order to reduce operation costs, as well as the number of cooperatives, thus increasing their scale. Even though there is no one-size-fits-all model of cooperation, some do's and don'ts are commonly applicable by cooperatives:

- Choose your common self interest and the kind of cooperation that is the best adapted to it
- Choose a logical scale for the cooperation (preferably based on existing ones that can be scaled up), its scope and its composition.
- Need for a good leadership, a professional staff and good representatives in the region
- Maintain close relations with actors from the science and research.
- Invest in communication and make your organization known.

Example of a French farmer in Brittany – Samuel Dugas

As a dairy farmer, Samuel Dugas has been a member of the association ADAGE (sustainable agriculture through autonomy, management and environment) since 8 years. This association belongs to the CIVAM, the French initiative centres for the promotion of agriculture and rural areas.

The main advantages of being part of ADAGE are:

- To benefit from the experience and the best practices of other farmers
- To be supported by other farmers during harsh phases or to rebel against public authorities
- To become aware of the weaknesses of one's own farm thanks to the opinion of others
- To mix conventional and organic farmers in one single group
- To remain constantly informed, to benefit from trainings

Discussion

- Ireland: For commonages (land that is owned by several persons), building capacities poses the problem of collaborating with people that are not keen (risk of free-riding).
- Netherlands: Twenty years ago, cooperation was a bottom-up approach but today, there is a fear that it will become a top-down one, controlled by the State.
- France: For public authorities, when there is a cooperative for products, it is enough, although another kind of collaboration may be needed for environmental preservation.
- New Member-States: cooperatives are not developed, especially because of the pejorative connotation of the word due to history.
- Should environmental incentives to cooperate come only after economic ones? Both are linked since farmers have to pay externalities because of damages on the environment.
- There is an urgent need to educate facilitators to build capacities among professionals.

2. Contracts, delivery and accountability:

The Dutch CAP pilots

Jan Gerrit Deelen (Ministry of Economic Affairs) and Teunis Jacob Slob (farmers' organization representative) presented the Dutch approach to the management of environmental measures in the RDP.

Agro-environmental measures that relate to biodiversity management are an important part of the RDP. In the last programming period 4 CAP-pilots were developed applying a collective approach for the management of the measures. The main characteristic of this approach is the direct involvement of agrarian nature associations (farmers associations) in the policy management: the associations participate in the target and activities definition and are financed directly by the program. This approach seems to be more effective in reaching the environmental goals, more efficient in managing public funds (agro-environmental measures have high administrative costs) and more flexible (because more targeted on environmental results than on the payments).

In the programming period 2014-2020 this collective approach will become the mainstream of the management of agro-environmental measures; some points are still under discussion: i.e. the selection of territorial spots with high potential (regional/province level); the qualification criteria of the associations (number of members, territorial coverage...); the payments ceiling (related to the single farmers or to the total amount of resources).

Main considerations

The main considerations expressed by the participants starting from the Dutch experience presentation are the following:

- The collective approach can be a real revolution both for the European Union policy (to pay a collective for services and not the single farmer) and for the farmers (to do something together);
- Two main ways to pursue a collective approach are put in evidence: a "collective" approach (Dutch) and a "coordinated" approach. This second one (presented by the Belgium and Italian experience of Pilots projects on agro-environmental measures) consists in the definition of more contracts (with the single farmers) but inside a unique project scheme, after a negotiation between regional authorities and organizations representing farmers. Both are valid, it depends on the level of organization of the representations.
- The transition - for the collective approaches - from Pilots projects to the mainstream depends mainly by the diffusion, representativeness and quality of the associations; it is very important

to work on territorial animation, on the involvement of intermediate levels of governance, on the creation of local leadership, and also on the style of government of the civil servants (flexibility: from negotiation to collaboration; from an approach based on money expenditure to an approach based on the quality of the results).

- Social recognition can be a key element to enhance the success of collective approaches: links with civil society, environmental organizations, for monitoring, helping and also financing farmers organizations; it implies a new recognition of the role of farmers in the society.
- Market recognition: communication and quality labels (i.e. the Val D'Aso fruit producers in Marche region, in Italy) can increase also the value of the agricultural products produced by the farmers participating in the agro-environmental scheme; the collective approach can also be applied to other public goods (water, soil, biodiversity, landscape) with a potential market value (i.e. for tourism or energy production).
- The costs are a key issue: transaction costs; monitoring costs; effectiveness and efficiency of the payment schemes; evaluation; are all aspects have to be taken into careful consideration and to be clearly defined.

This kind of approach can be extended from agro-environmental schemes to the other measures of the 2° Pillar.

Furthermore, today the whole approach of the 1° Pillar of the CAP is an individual one, also for the payments for agricultural practices beneficial for the climate and the environment (greening), causing incoherent situations like those concerning the Ecological Focus Areas management. A more effective management of the resources in reaching environmental objectives could be obtained using collective approaches. The resources of Pillar 1 could be the key to extend the agro-environmental measures application from an application based on Pilot projects and territorial spots the whole European agriculture.

3. Innovation and knowledge transfer:

Presentations

- Gilles Allaire, INRA (France): theoretical notions and examples on the relationship between CAP, collective approaches and innovation
- Frank Stubbe, Vlaamse Land Maatschappij (Belgium) on the European Innovation Partnership, Horizon2020 and EIP Service Point to foster to close the gap between researchers and practitioners.

Both presentations can be downloaded [HERE](#).

Main considerations

- Collective approaches can be a source of innovation, especially social and institutional (governance) innovation.
- Implementation of the EIP concept through operational groups depends on the MS. DG AGRI and Service point try to convince MS to do so
- Horizon2020 offers possibilities for multi-actor cross border thematic networks. These could be networks of Operational Groups or also collectives. In the H2020 programme exchange visits are also possible

- In new call for Focus Groups by EIP more attention for societal demands. Could offer opportunity to have a focus group on public goods management and the role of collective approaches
- Research and exchange of experiences needed to come to workable models for self-regulating monitoring and sanctioning systems. Results of these models that have been working in practice should be disseminated to other areas in Europe
- Researchers should be aware of the tensions and potential paradoxes between competitiveness and ecological objectives and develop a framework to integrate public goods in agricultural production. Among both researchers and other actors there are two main narratives: the productionist narrative and the sufficiency narrative.
- There is an ongoing trend of the privatization of knowledge (e.g. patenting) by big corporations for their private, commercial interests (private valorisation of public goods).
- Another trend is in the academic and research world where there is now an enormous publication stress that is an obstacle to demand (farmers) driven research.
- We should distinguish between knowledge transfer (from research to farmers) and knowledge exchange.
- Innovation not only builds on successes, but even more so on failures to come to success. If we intend to create a database of experiences, we should also include failed practices.
- Innovation often starts with 'idiots' that experiment. Policy should allow the possibility of 'seed money' to support these 'idiots'.
- When information on good, bad and failed practices is shared, it is important to also know the context and conditions.
- A facilitator is needed to bring the considerations expressed some steps further and to play an innovation brokerage role. For now the Groupe de Bruges could play that role. Eventually a European network or platform should do this.

Questions

- Public goods are not absolute items, they can change over time, depending on changes in ecological conditions and public perception. How can these changes be anticipated by farmers and farmers' collectives?
- What incentives are effective to get farmers to be engaged in public goods management collectively?
- How can delivery on the various public goods be measured, by what indicators (e.g. carbon credits)?
- What is the appropriate level of public goods design and management: local, national, European, global? In the latter case there should also be a connection made with WTO.
- What time horizon should be maintained to monitor and evaluate the economic and ecological effects of public goods management?
- How can spin off effects of the (collective) management of public goods be measured (ref. TEEB: [The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity](#))?
- How can consumers be involved to gain a top up on the public funding (e.g. through marketing of local products, recreation, etc.)?
- How can we come to a continuous exchange of knowledge and experiences among farmers and farmers groups and between farmers and green NGO's? The information is there, but fragmented. How can this be brought together in an easy accessible way? What incentives are needed to bring actors involved to share information and with whom?

- The presentations of yesterday showed a wide diversity of local experiences based on largely local knowledge systems. How can these experiences be used to feed other areas with at the same time avoiding 'copy and paste'?
- What role could advisors and mediators play in bridging the gap between researchers and practitioners (ref. innovation and knowledge brokers)?
- How can processes of co-design of research and innovation by researchers and farmers be organised effectively?
- How can the validity of the information shared be determined: by peer review method or through a Wikipedia approach?
- There is of course always the language barrier. How can this be overcome?

Wrap up

Evaluation:

- Presentations were good
- There should be clear goals of workshop discussions
- More time needed for workshops to come to in depth discussion

Final words

Arie van den Brand, president of the Groupe de Bruges

Mr Van den Brand thanks everyone for participating. He also highlighted that the results from this conference will become building blocks for the next meeting in April, that is now officially announced for the 23rd - 25th April. One of the main findings are that a bottom up approach to collectives is crucial and that farmers and governments should climb 'the ladder' together towards better delivery, trust and self-governance.

Mr Van den Brand once again, thanked the representatives of the French ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs and the Fondation pour le Progrès de l'Homme, who have made this conference possible.

In collaboration with and financial support from:



Additional financial support from:

