

**Follow up conference**

**“Territorial cooperation for the provision of public goods in the context of the reformed CAP”**

**Workshop 1 - Information sharing and capacity building**

**Territorial cooperation and the provision of public goods:  
some considerations from the Italian experience**

Emilio Chiodo

Faculty of Bioscience and technologies for food, agriculture and environment  
University of Teramo – Italy  
Groupe de Bruges

Francesco Vanni

INEA – National Institute of Agriculture Economics



Territorial cooperation and the provision of public goods: some considerations from the Italian experience

1. The pilots projects in the Italian experience
2. Specificities, main characteristics and problems
3. A proposal of a research and innovation agenda starting from the Italian experience

Some pilots / good practices with international relevance, even if not inserted in the mainstreaming of the rural development policies:

- Custody of the territory in Tuscany: local agency funding and RDP; Payments for Environmental Services (OECD, 2013)
- Valdaso territorial agro-environmental agreement - Marche Region: Multi-measure action in RDP (European Network for Rural Development, 2012)
- Provision of Public Goods through Mountain Meadows and Pastures in Aosta Valley: RDP agro-environmental measures + regional funds (OECD, 2013)
- Community gardens in Pontecagnano – Campania Region: ONG and no public funds (OECD, 2013)

INEA research project “Agriculture and Public Goods. Territorial Governance and Policies” => May 2014 (final publication)

Critical aspects in the socio-economic and institutional point of view for the provision of public goods by collective approaches:

1. Identification of the transaction costs
2. Recognition and direct involvement of the intermediate bodies of local governance
3. Territorial diffusion, representativeness and managing capacity of the associations / cooperatives
4. Quality criteria identified by the public authority for the selection of the associations
5. Territorial animation / Creation of local leaderships
6. Government style of the public authority: oriented towards the flexibility of the instruments, cooperation with beneficiaries, results and impact evaluation (more than to the expenditure monitoring)
7. Technical and social / institutional innovation as a key driver for cooperation

To integrate environmental initiatives into broader processes of territorial governance and development:

1. Social recognition of collective approaches through the involvement of civil society (NGO, environmental associations, consumer groups, etc.): participation, monitoring, financial support to the initiatives
2. Promotion of the agro-food products obtained through environmental schemes (i.e. local selling networks)
3. Environmental certification and labelling systems
4. Quality labelling at territorial level (collective trademarks, Nature 2000 products, Natural parks products)
5. The role of intermediate governance bodies

## Intermediate governance bodies:

1. Local authorities and their associations
2. Development agencies
3. Public-private partnerships
4. Environmental associations
5. Producers associations
6. Products protection consortia
7. Cooperatives
8. Research and service centers
9. Local “leaders” (companies, etc.)

Governance of rural policies at local level and public goods production: base for competitiveness and innovation

Collective actions



Governance



Public goods



External economies



Competitiveness and sustainability of the local system



Trust and acceptance



Collective actions

# An hypothesis for a research agenda

An hypothesis for a research agenda (Horizon 2020):

Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy

Work Program 2014-2015

Innovative, Sustainable and inclusive Bioeconomy

- “Provision of public goods by EU agriculture and forestry: Putting the concept into practice”  
ISIB-01-2014 (expired in 2014-03-12)
- “Unlocking the growth potential of rural areas through enhanced governance and social innovation”  
Call ISIB-03-2015 – Deadline 2015-02-24



# An hypothesis for a research agenda

“Unlocking the growth potential of rural areas through enhanced governance and social innovation”

## **Specific challenge:**

- Capitalize the distinctive territorial capital of rural areas and thus 'turn diversity into strength'.
- Social innovation: new forms of organisations and interactions
- Collective learning processes: new skills and practices, new attitudes, values, behaviours and governance mechanisms.
- Social innovation as an enabler for a transition towards sustainable agriculture and rural development

## **Focus:**

- Outcomes of social innovations / supporting conditions
- Marginalised rural areas where the social structure is most fragile.
- Institutional capacity building
- Diversity of rural areas: EU / Associated Countries and non-European Mediterranean countries

**Thank you for your attention!**

**Emilio Chiodo**

**Faculty of Bioscience and technologies for food, agriculture and environment**

**University of Teramo**

Via Carlo R. Lerici, 1

64023 MOSCIANO S.ANGELO (TE)

ITALIA

Tel. +39 0861.266898

Fax +39 0861.266915

E.mail: [echiodo@unite.it](mailto:echiodo@unite.it)



# An hypothesis for a research agenda

- “Unlocking the growth potential of rural areas through enhanced governance and social innovation”
- **Specific challenge:**
- To foster a balanced development of rural areas by enabling them to capitalize on their distinctive territorial capital and thus 'turn diversity into strength'.
- Social innovation relates to the development of new forms of organisations and interactions to respond to societal challenges.
- Collective learning process in which different social groups and actors participate and which results in new skills and practices as well as in new attitudes, values, behaviours and governance mechanisms.
- Social innovation as an enabler for a transition towards sustainable agriculture and rural development
  
- Limited empirical evidence of the extent and outcomes of social innovations and on the supporting conditions.
- Little is known as to how to support social innovation, in particular in marginalised rural areas where the social structure is most fragile.
- Promoting institutional capacity building in these areas, at different levels, to develop the social capital and skills required to support the creation of successful social innovation.

# An hypothesis for a research agenda

- “Unlocking the growth potential of rural areas through enhanced governance and social innovation”
- **Scope:**
- Establish appropriate methods for the evaluation of social innovation.
- Different learning arrangements (e.g. multi-actor networks, producer-consumer association, hybrid innovative networks, territorial alliances)
- Innovative governance mechanisms at various levels, and their potential implications for social innovation.
- Role of different policy instruments, other relevant incentives and diverse entities (public/private, local/non local, active citizens, etc.)
- Diverse types of rural areas across the EU and Associated Countries and non-European Mediterranean countries.

# An hypothesis for a research agenda

- **Expected impact:**
- clarify the different dimensions of social innovation and its dynamics in agriculture, forestry and rural development
- Identify pathways to unfold the territorial capital of rural regions and thus shape sustainable development trajectories in different types of rural areas
- support more sustainable agri-food and forestry systems and rural development, thus contributing in the medium term to smart, inclusive and sustainable growth in rural areas
- improve territorial governance and pave the way for an integrated approach to rural development (i.e. ensuring effective mechanisms to coordinate different policies and establish appropriate linkages with other areas).
- deliver analyses of different innovative governance mechanisms with respect to social innovation in different contexts
- allow policy makers and the local communities to improve the formulation and delivery of relevant policies as well as to shape such programmes that explicitly foster the creation of sustainable social innovations.