

ORGANIC ACTION PLAN

Workpackage 2.2 National Stakeholder Workshops Synthesis Report

From national workshops held in April 2006


18 August 2006

Pip Nicholas, Nic Lampkin,
University of Wales Aberystwyth

and

Johannes Michelsen and Thyra Bonde
University of Southern Denmark

Specific Support Action project:
European Action Plan
for organic food and farming
FP 6 - 006501

Subject:	ORGAP WP2.2 NATIONAL WORKSHOPS	
Author(s):	Pip Nicholas and Nic Lampkin University of Wales, Aberystwyth (UWA), UK with support of from national partners as indicated Johannes Michelsen and Thyra Bonde University of Southern Denmark (USD)	SPECIFIC SUPPORT ACTION PROJECT: EUROPEAN ACTION PLAN FOR ORGANIC FOOD AND FARMING
Date:	18 AUGUST 2006	FP 6 - 006501

1	Introduction	4
2	Part I – Conflicts and Synergies	5
2.1	Summary	5
2.2	Introduction, methodology and outline	8
2.2.1	Data Collection Method	10
2.2.2	Policy makers’ assessment	11
2.2.3	Outline	13
2.3	Cross-country analysis of synergies	15
2.3.1	EU’s Action Plan on common standards versus national organic standards	15
2.3.2	EU’s Action Plan on a common label versus private or national organic labels	18
2.3.3	EU’s Action Plan on the common market versus national organic market policy	22
2.3.4	EU’s Action Plan on international trade versus the national policy on organic markets	25
2.3.5	EU’s Action Plan on rural development policy versus the national policies and programs on rural development	29
2.3.6	EU’s Action Plan on information and promotion versus the national policies on information and promotion	32
2.3.7	EU’s Action Plan on joint research programs versus national research programs on organic food and farming	36
2.3.8	EU’s Action Plan on environmental and other policy concerns versus national policy priorities	40
2.4	Supplementary analysis – Stakeholder perspective	44
2.5	Important discussions in the eight member states	47

2.6	Conclusion	53
3	Part II – Objectives and Indicators	54
3.1	Introduction and methods	54
3.2	Participants	54
3.3	Objectives	55
3.3.1	Discussion of list of objectives	56
3.3.2	New objectives introduced	58
3.3.3	Objective voting and prioritisation	59
3.3.4	Objective 1 – Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses	61
3.3.5	Objective 2 – Increasing the scale of the organic sector	65
3.3.6	Objective 4 – Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic farming regulation and reducing bureaucracy	67
3.3.7	Objective 5 – Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food	69
3.3.8	Objective 6 – Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society	72
3.3.9	Objective 7 – Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources	73
3.3.10	Objective 8 – Maintaining and enhancing the environment (includes biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)	77
3.3.11	Objective 9 – Maintaining and enhancing animal health and welfare	81
3.3.12	Objective 10 – Maintaining and enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of rural communities	83
3.3.13	New Objective A – Protecting and assessing handmade and traditional production systems and the local culture associated (in extinction danger) - AND	85
3.3.14	New objective B – Maintaining and enhancing consumer awareness and trust in organic food - NL	86
3.4	Workshop Evaluation	86
3.4.1	AND	86
3.4.2	CZ	87
3.4.3	DE	87
3.4.4	ENG	87
3.4.5	IT	87
3.4.6	NL	88
3.5	Participant evaluation	88
3.6	Workshop organizer review	90
3.7	Conclusions	90

1 Introduction

This document reports the findings of the ORGAP Project WP2.2 National Workshops held in 8 partner countries/regions (AND, CZ, DE, DK, ENG, IT, NL and SI) in April 2006.

The aims of the workshop were to:

- a) inform participants about the project, the EU Action Plan and interactions with national plans, with particular reference to the national context and
- b) consider approaches to evaluating the process and outcomes of EU and national action plans, identifying issues of particular importance to the group concerned.

These two aims were reflected in the structure of the workshop. The first aim was dealt with in the morning session (prepared and reported by the Danish team (Part I of this document)), which was designed to identify potential positive and negative synergies of the EU Organic Action Plan with related national policies in support of organic food and farming. The second aim was addressed in the second part of the workshop in which participants were asked to identify the key objectives of the EU and National Action Plans and define suitable indicators for evaluating the objectives (prepared and reported by the British team (Part II of this document)).

The structure of this document follows the reporting structure used for the national workshops.

2 Part I – Conflicts and Synergies

Prepared and reported by Johannes Michelsen and Thyra Bonde, USD

2.1 Summary

This paper presents an analysis of workshops held in eight member states of the European Union. Participants in the workshops discussed the synergies between EU's Action Plan on Organic Food and Farming and national action plans and policies - in preparation of in depth studies of similar issues.

Participants were sampled to match eleven different stakeholder types relating to information, training/extension, research, producers, processors, market actors, consumers, certification, administration, policy-makers, environmental/animal NGOs. Stakeholder types were unevenly represented in the eight workshops.

We were interested in studying response patterns and synergy ratings given by the participants on both the country level and at stakeholder level.

The participants were encouraged to rate the synergies for eight different topics from EU's Action Plan in relation to their own national action plan or policy. The eight topics summarized the 21 actions included in the EU Plan.

We found that between member states there were relevant and clear patterns in the synergies and in the comments made by the participants. Very often there was agreement between most of the participants in a member state on how to rate the synergies although facilitators encouraged diversity of statements.

We found that agreement between stakeholders across the member states on the synergy ratings could only be found in a few cases, but this was quite unsystematic and we therefore chose to focus the analyses on the study of the member states.

Below we have listed the eight topics and a summary of the synergy ratings within each country.

- EU's Action Plan on common standards versus national organic standards

The answers to the question of the synergies between national standards and common EU standards varied very much between member states. Participants in Germany and

Slovenia made the most negative and the most positive ratings of synergies respectively.

- EU's Action Plan on a common label versus private or national organic labels

Participants in Slovenia and England rated the synergies as positive. The Danish participants were mainly positive whereas ratings in Andalusia and Germany were mixed. The Netherlands' participants were rather neutral and finally the Czech and Italian participants rated the synergies as primarily negative.

- EU's Action Plan on the common market versus national organic market policy

In all the member states except Slovenia there was a rather mixed view on the common market versus the national and local organic market policy.

- EU's Action Plan on international trade versus the national policy on organic markets

Participants in Slovenia and the Netherlands saw the most positive synergies between these policies whereas the most negative synergies were found by Italian participants. The Andalusian, Czech, Danish, German and English participants were all disagreeing among each other on whether they found the synergy to be negative or positive.

- EU's Action Plan on rural development policy versus the national policies and programs on rural development

The topic was perceived quite differently in the various member states. The most positive assessments were found in the Czech Republic, England and Slovenia. Andalusia, Italy and Germany had participants with differing opinions on the synergy. Denmark and the Netherlands were each dominated by neutral assessments of the synergy rating.

- EU's Action Plan on information and promotion versus the national policies on information and promotion

The Dutch and the Slovenian ratings of synergies between the measures in EU's Action Plan and national policy were positive whereas the German rating was negative. The Danish rating was neutral and the rest of the assessments were mixed with positive, negative and neutral ratings within each member state.

- EU's Action Plan on joint research programs versus national research programs on organic food and farming

The Slovenian and English participants rated the synergies as positive. The participants from the Netherlands found the synergies to be neutral. No member states

rated the synergies as entirely negative but the Andalusian, the Czech, the German, the Danish and the Italian groups rated the synergies as mixed positive, neutral and negative.

- EU's Action Plan on environmental and other policy concerns versus national policy priorities

In Germany, Andalusia and the Netherlands participants rated the synergies as negative. The Slovenian group rated the synergies as neutral. The Danish and the Czech participants made a mixed rating.

Following this analysis we studied which topics sparked the most disagreement between the participants in each member state or region.

We found that the participants in the English, the Dutch, the Slovenian and the Italian workshops agreed the most with each other. As opposed to this the participants in the Czech, the Andalusian, the German and the Danish workshops had the most disagreements with each other.

- The discussions on EU's Action Plan on information and promotion (topic f) and EU's Action Plan on joint research program (topic g) did not spark very much disagreement in any of the countries.
- Participants did disagree in most of the workshops when EU's Action Plan on a common label (topic b) and EU's Action Plan on the common market (topic c) were discussed.
- The discussions on EU's Action Plan on common standards (topic a), EU's Action Plan on international trade (topic d) and EU's Action Plan on rural development policy (topic e) each revealed a lot of disagreement in three workshops.
- Finally the debate concerning EU's Action Plan on environmental and other policy concerns (topic h) only revealed disagreement between participants in the Danish workshop.

2.2 Introduction, methodology and outline

This paper is part of the ORGAP project aiming at developing a toolbox for evaluating the EU Action Plan on organic food and farming and similar national action plans. It is a preliminary analysis preparing for in-depth studies of potential positive and negative synergies regarding the interplay between the EU organic action plan and national policies on organic food and farming among stakeholders in eight selected EU member states: Spain represented by the region of Andalusia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, England, Italy, the Netherlands and Slovenia. The main part of the data was collected during April 2006 in national workshops composed of persons representing various interests involved in the development of organic food and farming. Facilitators of the workshop were instructed to ask for *diverse* views and *not* to seek any form of unanimity among participants.

This information is to feed into an in-depth analysis of how the implementation of the EU Action Plan can be expected to be influenced by processes involving interplay between public agencies and private stakeholders involved in the development of organic food and farming.

Each workshop followed a common guideline that emphasized two issues. One was the composition of participants to assess the potential positive and negative synergies between the EU Action Plan and national organic policies on food and farming. 11 different categories of stakeholders were defined ranging from policy makers and public administrators to farmers and market actors. It was not necessary that all types of stakeholders were included, only that a broad range of stakeholders participated. The findings are thus not to be taken as representative for the views held by stakeholders in the eight EU member states as participants do not give neither a representative picture of all stakeholders and interests nor the views of similar groups of stakeholders. The findings are only to be considered indicative for the discussions within member states and between types of interest.

The second issue of the guidelines for the workshops was the definition of issues to be discussed. The EU action plan includes 21 recommendations (EU 2004¹). All EU member states have policies on organic food and farming, but they do not cover all issues mentioned by the EU action plan and they do not all have the form of action plans. In order to facilitate the discussion, the 21 recommendations were summarized into eight relatively broad topics, expected to be relevant to or included in most national policies. The topics are

- Common vs. national standards, mentioned in several actions mentioned in the EU Action Plan and covering a topic where a proposal from the EU Commission had been published a few months before the workshops were held.
- Common label vs. private or national labels, also mentioned in several EU action points and included in the recent EU proposal.
- The common European market vs. national markets, also touched upon in several action points and influenced by the recent proposal from the EU Commission.
- The policy of international trade with organic produce involving third countries, equally touched upon in several action points and touched upon in the recent proposal from the EU Commission.
- Rural development, mentioned in one action point in the EU Action Plan as source for financing national actions in support of organic food and farming.
- EU vs. nationally controlled information and PR campaigns mentioned in the first action point of the EU Action Plan.
- Joint vs. national research programs mentioned in a separate action point of the EU Action Plan.
- Organic food and farming policy as part of political concern for environment and other concern public goods mentioned in two action points.

These eight topics helped structuring the search for diversity in national stakeholder views regarding the interplay between the EU Action Plan and national policies.

¹ COM (2004) 425, {SEC (2004) 739}: “Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament: European Action Plan for Organic Food and Farming”

2.2.1 Data Collection Method

All eight partners who held the workshop followed the same guidelines for which topics to cover, which initial questions to ask and how to report the data². This was done in order to ensure the same procedure in all member states. In general the member states followed the same procedure during the day with only minor variations such as small time delays.

The following categories of stakeholders were represented in the various member states:

	AND	CZ	DK	DE	ENG	IT	NL	SL
Information	X	X		X	X	X		X
Training/extension	X	X	X	X	X	XX	X	X
Research	X	X X	X	X X	X	X	XX	X
Producers	X	X	X			XX		X
Processors	X	X	X			X		X
Market Actors	X	X		X		X	X	X
Consumers	X	X X	X					
Certification	X	X	X	X	X	XX		X
Administration	X	X	X	X	X	X		(X)
Policy-makers	X	X X	X				X	X
Environmental/Animal NGO	X	X		X	XX			
Total:	11	14	8	9	7	11	5	8 (/9)

Germany additionally had one representative from an umbrella organization.

Last minute apologies to the Slovenian team led a member from the team to act as research representative and the Policy-maker representative responding on behalf of the administration too.

Several member states had last minute delays or were unable to get participants from all categories.

² Nic Lampkin, Pip Nicholas and Johannes Michelsen (2006): ORGAP WP2.2 national workshops – detailed guidelines for partners

The design was not aiming at consensus but it should be noted that the English participants did agree on how to rate the synergies on all the topics.

The participants were asked to rate and comment on the topics but only if they had something to add to the discussion. In other words it was not intended that all participants should speak on all topics.

In some member states there was more than one representative from some of the stakeholder groups. We have however chosen not to distinguish between these unless where this is of particular interest.

The participants were asked about their views on how the EU Action Plan matched their national plan or policy. The ratings thus do not reflect the sympathy of the participant regarding the EU Action Plan but is rather an assessment of how well the topic under discussion is fitted in with the national policy.

In some cases the participant did not make a rating but a comment which was put down in the data report. In these cases we have added a 'C' for 'comment' in the tables in the appendix.

2.2.2 Policy makers' assessment

Prior to the national workshops, a session was held in Bohnij, Slovenia on March 30th 2006 with 20 representatives of the IFOAM EU group. It gave the opportunity for policy makers of the organic agriculture movement to state their views as a sort of baseline for the analysis of national workshops and it gave the opportunity to include viewpoints from member states where workshops were not held to the analysis. In summary, their views were as follows.

Regarding the topic of **common vs. national standards** the IFOAM members argued in favour of common standards as they agreed that they would be a guarantee for consumers and did not expect the ideas of the EU Action Plan to generate consumer confusion. In addition, common standards give a level play field for operators. The Swedish representative emphasized, however, negative synergies in terms of diminishing capacity to satisfy needs for diversity in the development.

On the **topic on one common vs. several private labels** several participants argued for positive synergy as a common label facilitates trade. The representative from the United Kingdom argued for negative synergies caused by the risk that an over emphasis on the EU logo might reduce resources for other purposes and the focus needed for local and national logos.

The topic on **one European vs. several national markets** was rated as having mainly negative synergies by organic movement policy makers. The UK representative argued that national policies are very different from the EU Action Plan regarding the option of favoring local markets and identities. The Lithuanian representative, on the other hand, found it problematic with low competition in the European market.

Regarding the topic on **international vs. local trade**, policy makers of the organic movement rated synergies as both positive and negative. The Swedish participant stated that the synergy was positive since there is now a possibility to compete between the governments on what is the “best of organic”. A negative synergy was argued to be that regulations concerning international trade are either lacking or too strong.

The topic on the match between **the rural development policy and the national programs** received mainly positive ratings. The rural development policy was seen as supporting real development of organic food and farming and not to be in any conflict with national policies. A representative from the Netherlands argued, however, that the current situation is characterized by market distortions caused by different national levels of organic area payments, and that this might increase if each member state was to define how to use rural development policies in support of organic food and farming.

The topic on **national vs. EU guided information and promotion** obtained several positive assessments regarding synergies between the EU Action Plan and the national policies. Most important was its contribution to creating increased market demand and a higher consciousness regarding organic food and farming in society at large. Against this view, the Dutch representative argued that the common campaigns are being

produced too far away from consumers and therefore will not influence the relevant groups.

Concerning synergies between **joint vs. national research programs**, there was an overall agreement in finding positive synergies. The joint research programs are beneficial and sometimes they can even co-fund national research and development programs. The last topic was dealing with synergies between the EU Action Plan and national policies regarding **environmental and other policy concerns**. Here, none of the IFOAM-representatives made positive ratings as they found it problematic if a common policy restricts national policy priorities.

The statements from organic movement policy makers suggest relative consensus among them across member states. Regarding the few deviant statements they came as often from policy makers from one of the eight member states in which separate workshops were held as they came from one of the other member states. This indicates that variation in the views held within and between the eight member states selected is as large as variation among in the views of the remaining member states.

2.2.3 Outline

The analysis falls in three main parts. After The first one is a cross country analysis of the synergies between the EU Organic Action Plan and the policies relating to organic food and farming in the eight member states selected. The second part of the analysis shifts the view from the member states to the stakeholders. As this analysis appeared to give only few significant results it is very short. The third analysis combines the two analyses in order to identify which topics that seems to provoke most debate among national stakeholders. The conclusion draws up the major findings from the analysis and the summary gives a quick overview of the whole study and our results. The appendix includes eight schemes that include all the data on the ratings of synergies. They are relevant to all analyses. When using the schemes for the country analyses the scheme should be read vertically. As for the stakeholder analysis the scheme should be read horizontally. Regarding topics for debate – they can be extracted by combining a member state's column on each topic and comparing the ratings of each type of national stakeholders.

2.3 Cross-country analysis of synergies

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected in the workshop, ordered after the eight topics and focusing on comparing answers between participating EU member states. For each topic the views held within a member state are held up against views held in the other member states to identify patterns in each member state and look for similarities and differences between member states. The guiding principle in analyzing the data has been to focus on the rating of synergies and then present the arguments that correspond to the rating of the synergy

2.3.1 EU's Action Plan on common standards versus national organic standards

The answers to the question of the relations between national standards and common EU standards varied very much between member states. The participants from Germany and the Netherlands make the most consistently negative and the most consistently positive ratings of synergies respectively.

The German ratings of synergies between common rules and the national organic standards were mainly negative. Four participants argued that the synergy was very negative and one argued that it was negative. Four out of the nine participants commented and while others thought there was uncertainty some feared the end of organic farming due to a softened and unclear regulation. All agreed that the proposal for revision of 2092/91³ published by the Commission in 12/2005 was problematic.

Five participants from the Netherlands rated the synergies between the common standards and national organic standards as very positive. Participants argued that sometimes the Netherlands are stricter than the rest of EU and sometimes the Netherlands are less strict.

³ COM (2005) 671: Proposal for a Council Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 on Organic Production of Agricultural Products and Indications referring thereto in Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs

In Slovenia five found that the relationship between national policies and EU's Action Plan was positive. The arguments were that there is a better recognition of organic products among consumers when there are common standards. The group argued that common standards will be well received in Slovenia since "we tend to copy everything from 'Europe'". The Slovenian group emphasized that the stricter standards will be important in relation to import from third member states and that the cooperation between the control bodies will be improved.

In between these two extremes there was a large middle group of member states where the synergies between national rules and policies and EU's Action Plan were rated both negatively and positively concerning the introduction of common standards.

In Denmark, the Czech Republic and Andalusia the participants argued that their own country had higher organic standards and stricter rules than the rest of the EU member states. These participants worried that the proposal of a new regulation would not allow for individual differences with higher standards than the common level.

In the Danish team the producer representative argued that although this was the case the higher standard included in the new proposal would however improve the general level so much that this would still be beneficial for Denmark since other member states will then be less able to undercut the prices due to lower level organic standards. Two of the Danish participants rated the synergy as very positive, three rated it as positive and one rated it as negative.

Also the Czech participants found the synergies between Czech policies and EU's Action plan to be mainly positive. Four rated the synergies as very positive, eight rated them as positive and only two rated the synergies as negative.

In the Andalusian group one rated the synergies as very positive, six rated the synergies as positive, two rated them to be neutral and five rated the synergies as negative.

The English team agreed to rate the relationship as neutral since they thought that it was too early in the process to tell what level of conflict and synergy there might be

when the process is being implemented. 4 of 7 participants spoke and agreed on that EU harmonization was a good thing but also that there was a real risk that the common baseline would be too low and that the EU proposal to restrict national certification bodies certifying to a higher level than the EU regulation is a great problem - particular for consumers.

The Italian participants rated the relation very varied. There were two very positive, three positive, one neutral, four negative and seven very negative ratings concerning the synergy between common and national standards. The Information-representative argued that the EU rule is an advantage for animal rights and organic standards. The Italian participants did worry that there will be problems with products traveling between the member states in EU. A product can have a certain description in UK but when it is exported to Italy it needs to have a description that is in agreement with EU regulations which might say that you are not allowed to use the original text.

To sum up, all member states dealt with how to interpret having a common baseline and changing the situation for private certifying bodies. Participants from Slovenia argued that there could be more strict rules for certain private labels also in the future. This is an interpretation which the participants from the rest of the member states seem to disagree with. But the synergy rating of this new situation is however not the same for these member states. Some were very worried about this change while others found the advantages to be stronger than the disadvantages.

2.3.2 EU's Action Plan on a common label versus private or national organic labels

Participants in Slovenia and England rated the synergies as positive. The participants of Denmark were mainly positive whereas the ratings in Andalusia and Germany were mixed. The participants from the Netherlands were rather neutral. Finally the Czech and Italian participants rated the synergies as mainly negative.

In the Andalusian workshop seven ratings of synergy were very positive, two positive, two neutral and five negative synergy ratings. The Andalusian group was disagreeing on whether there should be a logo both from the actual inspection body or certifiers and from the EU.

One argued that mentioning the inspection body might confuse consumers.

In the Czech group only one participant rated the synergy as positive, three rated it as neutral, seven rated it as negative and three rated it as very negative. The Czech participants worried how long it would take consumers to get used to the new EU logo and be able to recognize it. They thought it would be a disadvantage for consumers with only one logo; they find that consumers will lose 'orientation', since they cannot find more detailed information. The participants argued that for the purpose of export it is good to have one common logo and for import it is good to have separate logos in each country. Having both national and EU logos would be preferable. Combined with a logo from the certifier would be helpful.

Three participants from the Slovenian workshop rated the synergy as positive. The Slovenian participants were positive towards keeping the private logo and introducing the EU logo. Furthermore they felt that private labels are important since there are variations within the organic products and production methods. In favor of the common logo was that it will be a consumer advantage since it is easier to navigate with just one label and the Slovenian group expects that especially new organic consumers will rely on the EU label.

In the Dutch workshop only two assessments were made. One representative rated the synergy as positive and one rated it as neutral.

The Dutch team argued that it is impossible to ban the use of private organic labels because some organizations like the Soil Association of UK will react with firm resistance. Concerning having two logos they argued that according to EU's Action Plan one can use the European organic label and/or text on products. In the Netherlands there is no active policy on the use of a common European label or logo. The use of a double logo is permitted though. Further they pointed out that the introduction of a common label asks for a transition period in which a double logo may be used.

In the English workshop the group rated the synergy as positive and it did not see a problem with a standard EU label/wording – though it was agreed that too many logos can be confusing for the consumer (as suggested by the Certification participant). To the English participants there is neither a big advantage nor disadvantage to having a common label.

The German participants stated the most sceptical views on a common logo. Three rated the synergy as very positive, two rated it as negative, four rated it as very negative and two ratings were undecided but leaning on the negative side. The basic question of the German discussion was the possible conflict between a compulsory EU-logo and the already existing Biosiegel introduced in September 2001 on the basis of large public investments.

In Germany there is a very specific situation with different private organic labels, that are known by the consumers and that enjoy big support in the organic sector. The opinions concerning the variety and the market relevance of logos varied and the majority of participants favored the maintenance of the different private labels in Germany. Furthermore they felt that the EU logo is not a good design. A participant argued that one common EU-organic logo runs the risk for the whole sector in case of an organic food scandal to be damaged; this holds not true in case of the text "EU-Organic".

Finally the participants argued that since consumers think regionally, labels should also be developed from bottom up. One common EU-label does not hold the principle of subsidiarity in the views of the workshop participants.

The regional argument was also important for the Italian group. For instance the region Tuscany is creating a regional organic label or logo for the best local organic products. One member of the Italian team rated the synergy as neutral, one rated it as negative and four rated it as very negative.

Seven of the eight participants in the Danish workshop rated the synergy as very positive and one (the researcher) rated it as negative. The Danish comments reflect a standpoint different from the other member states since all participants except one agreed that the organic movements in the other member states need to be as flexible as it has been in Denmark and create a new foundation for their own justification. Therefore a common logo is no threat to the organic movement. The researcher however disagreed in this view point and argued that the common logo will become a problem for the private organizations in the other member states. He was not worried about the state of the certifiers but about the future of the whole organic movement. There was general agreement that for the consumers a common logo is a good thing.

Summing up this part it is clear that in all the member states there was a concern for how the common logo will influence the future of the organic movement. To some the common logo was seen as a threat for the certifiers. Concerning the consumer interests in Europe at large some member states argued that the consumer interest is to be given many options for choice. This was a view that was not shared in Denmark and England where there was agreement that a common logo would make shopping easier for consumers.

2.3.3 EU's Action Plan on the common market versus national organic market policy

In all the member states, except Slovenia rather mixed views were expressed on the common market versus the national and local organic market policy.

The topic of the relationship between EU's Action Plan regarding a common market and the national organic market policy was controversial in Andalusia although this was not reflected in the ratings. One part of the participants, namely the producer, the NGO representative and the certifier, supported the idea of enhancing local markets whereas the participants for consumers, researchers and training preferred a common European Market model. The synergy rating mentions three who found the relation to be positive. The rating has not been mentioned for the stakeholders advocating in favor of for the local markets.

In the Czech workshop two rated the synergy between the Action Plan and the national policy as very good, eight rated it as good, one found the synergy to be neutral and four argued that it was negative. Two stakeholders argued that the national rules for organic production and processing are too strict and make it impossible to reach the requirements. Common rules for a common market would be an advantage. Furthermore the processors have problems entering new markets due to the need to be recertified every time. They see a risk that Czech products are only sold as raw materials and not as the final product on the world market.

In Denmark two participants rated the relation as negative, one found it to be neutral and one was split between a very positive and a neutral view of the synergy between the Action Plan and national organic markets. The comments reflected worries about an ever present feeling of need for protectionism and that the Danish market is too closed off as it is now. A different take on this topic was that the situation might improve with a common market in theory but since there is a lack of transparency in the domestic market as it is organized today opening up the market will lead to problems. The discussion also touched on that opening up markets should not only be

within the EU. Relations to third member states like the US are also of importance but difficult to change.

One German participant rated the synergy as very positive. One rated it as positive, one saw it as neutral and three rated the level as very negative.

All the German participants saw the German market as very open to importers. For instance Biosiegel is open for every product that fulfills the EU regulation.

The German certifier argued that import to Germany is simple whereas export to for instance the British market is hampered. A common market will therefore be good for German exporters.

As opposed to this was the view that the common market brings too much flexibility in the market and following this there will be distortion of the competition. There was also a fear that standards will be lowered, that the market loses its roots and finally that the further growth of organic land in Germany will be stopped.

The participants in the English workshop saw the single European market topic and the international trade topic (see topic d below) were one and the same – therefore they discussed them as one topic. All participants rated the topic with elements that were both positive and very negative.

The Environmental and Animal welfare participants felt that there were global benefits in terms of animal welfare and environmental protection to be derived from EU and international trade (based on the necessity for equivalent standards across trading member states), but it was felt by the Research and Extension participants that EU/international trade goes against the principles of organic farming in general (specifically food miles) and is in definite conflict with the English Action Plan which is encouraging the development of local markets.

In general the feeling from participants was that a focus on the local market is more important for the English Action Plan, so a potential conflict exists here with the EUAP. The logic also follows through that there is a preference for local products, but for non-indigenous products there must be a high standard of international trade – this is seen as positive synergy.

One participant from the Netherlands' workshop rated the synergy and found the relation between the EU Action Plan and the Dutch policy to be neutral. The

participants found that there is a big difference of opinion regarding point 4 of the EU Action Plan⁴. The EU Action Plan is mainly focused on producers, while the Dutch policy includes the total organic production chain from producers to consumers.

The participants of the Slovenian workshop argued that import and export will be easier in the future with a strong common market and rated the synergy between national policy and EU's actions as positive.

The Italian experts decided to merge the common market topic with the international trade topic which from their point of view was similar their discussion was recorded in relation to topic therefore we present their views in the next sub chapter.

To sum up, the responses were very varied both inside the member states and between the member states. The Czech group argued that common rules would be an advantage for their producers since they will only have to get their products certified once. The Danish participants were also mainly positive since there was a fear among the participants that the country is already too protectionist. Against the common market idea were representative such as some in the English group who found that the idea of a common market is against the organic principle since the food has to be transported too far. The German participants worried that a more open market might distort competition and there was a feeling that the German market is already very open.

⁴ "Action 4: Allowing member states to top-up with aids the EU support devoted to producer organisations in the fruit and vegetable sector involved in organic production." (Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament COM (2004) 415 final).

2.3.4 EU's Action Plan on international trade versus the national policy on organic markets

The analysis of the Action Plan's approach to international trade in relation to the national policy on organic markets shows that the participants of the workshops in Slovenia and the Netherlands foresaw the best relation between these policies whereas the Italian had the most negative rating of synergies. The Andalusian, Czech, Danish, German and English participants were all disagreeing among each other on whether the synergy would be negative or positive.

Three members of the Dutch group rated the synergy as very positive. This was in particular based on the fact that the topic is included in the Dutch Action Plan and that the "Dutch Task Force for Market Development of Organic Agriculture" is now also active in the field of export and import of organic products.

Three members of the Slovenian group argued that the synergy was positive. In Slovenia itself the import from third member states is low. They are mostly buying in the EU. However Slovenia has now become an entrance point for imports from third member states to all of EU which the participants saw as a problem. The participants argued that importers and exporters from third countries will search for possibilities for acquiring a label that will document their fulfillment of EU standards.

In the Italian group two persons rated the synergy as very negative and one rated it as neutral.

The neutral rating was backed up with the view that important ethical topics had not been taken up in any of the two Action Plans. For example the moonlight work market and juvenile working conditions are national topics which have not been taken into consideration.

The negative assessments were backed up with the view that the proposed Revision of Reg. 2092 foresees for imported organic products to follow Codex Alimentarius rules which are less restrictive than those foreseen for national organic products. This situation could be penalizing for Italian organic products. In this sense there is a negative synergy between European and national policies. Another argument for the

negative synergy was that the Italian Action Plan has not dealt with the topic of certification in third member states.

In the Andalusian group two participants rated the synergies as very positive, two found it to be positive, two rated it as neutral and one rated it negatively. Some stakeholders thought that the international export market and the local production are entities that are not very compatible. They argued that this can lead to loss of identity and there is a democratic problem involved since the distance between the actors and the market increases and the sovereignty of the citizens is lost. Other stakeholders argued that both the local and the international market should be developed at the same time and that this was indeed possible.

Three of the Czech participants rated the synergy between EU's Action Plan's take on international trade and the national policy for organic markets as positive. Two found the relation to be neutral, eight that it was negative and one that it was very negative. However it is difficult to analyze these ratings since the discussion did not evolve around the question of international trade, but around domestic and particularly local trade topics. This was the case for participants' answers from all sides of the debate.

One Dane rated the synergy to be very positive and one rated it as positive. Although these participants did worry that the policy on open international markets might threaten the Danish organic farmers they argued that a more liberal international trade is an advantage for consumers. This statement was related to another assessment, namely that the possibility of import will ensure that the products are being grown in the right places, that is in the most natural and beneficial areas. One advantage that was mentioned was that the EU Action Plan makes it less difficult for the producers to be accepted. Concerning the world market a participant argued that today we have to trade on the American terms and use their standards and that by making a common policy in the EU we can begin to set the agenda.

Two German participants rate the synergy between EU's Action Plan on international trade and national policies as positive. One found the relation to be neutral, one argued that it was negative and one that it was very negative. The positive synergies were for processed goods and it was pointed out that it is very important to break up

trade distortions. On the negative side it was argued that the situation will be problematic for unprocessed goods of German origin. The very negative synergy rating was followed up by an argument in the similar vein; for Germany, the reduction of trade barriers brings only disadvantages and the national organic sector will suffer, as in Europe the marketing with the origin of a product is not allowed.

The English participants decided to merge the common market topic with the international trade topic which from their point of view was similar. Their discussion was recorded is analyzed in the sub chapter covering topic c.

In sum, the German group represented two important discussion points that were repeated in several member states. The group worried very much whether the increasing international trade would hurt German farmers on the unprocessed goods. However, breaking up trade barriers was still seen as a good thing for both German and international trade relations in general.

The Danish group in addition pointed out that liberalization will in particular be an advantage to consumers. The Italian group mentioned that EU's Action Plan does not take up how to handle certification in third member states and this was also an issue in Slovenia where it was argued that this country has become an entry point for import from third member states and that these external partners will try to acquire a label that shows fulfillment of EU standards.

2.3.5 EU's Action Plan on rural development policy versus the national policies and programs on rural development

The relation between EU's Action Plan concerning rural development and national policies in the same area was perceived quite differently in the various member states. The most consistently positive member states were the Czech Republic, England and Slovenia. Andalusia, Italy and Germany had participants with differing opinions on the synergy. Denmark and the Netherlands were each dominated by neutral assessments of the synergy rating.

Among the English participants there was a general feeling that the rural development program in the EU framework is providing a supportive structure for local initiatives and therefore that there is a very positive synergy between the EU Action plan and English Action plans. While there was agreement on this, two participants also raised that it is important to recognize that one measure might have very different effects in various member states.

In the Czech group four participants found the synergy to be very positive. The argument for this was that the Czech administration in itself is very bad in handling these programs itself as seen in the advisory system. Five participants argued that the synergy was positive. The representative of producers was to point at the implementation of EU regulation in Czech law. Three argued that the synergy was neutral since it is difficult to gather financial resources regarding for instance advice and extension. Finally two evaluated the relation as negative without stating reasons for it.

Three Slovenian participants rated the synergy as positive. They argued that EU's Action Plan has a positive impact on the national action plan and on formation of the Slovenian rural development program they wished to use EU's agricultural policy as much as possible. EU's Action Plan stimulates development of organic farming particularly on naturally sensitive areas. It is important for the Slovenian farmer to be conscious about maintaining production on these areas. There is financial budget for such areas such as measures in SAEP intended for organic farmers. Consequently the

interest for organic farming among farmers may increase. A very negative synergy is however that the requirements for projects (investments grants) are very strict and most farmers do not meet the conditions. EU has very strict conditions in the rural development program which is a problem particularly for the Slovenian farmers. The Italian participants did not agree among each other on the synergy rating. One rated it as positive, one as neutral and one as very negative. The positive synergy was seen as a result of that the quality projects foreseen in art. 69 Reg. (EC) 1782/2003⁵ not have been exploited. In the article it is written that Member States may retain up to 10 % of the component of national ceilings referred to each sector to grant additional payment for specific types of farming.

The neutral assessment of the synergy was made by a participant who argued that neither the national Action Plan nor EU's Action Plan deal with the topics of rural development.

Finally one participant argued that there are conflicts between the fund allocation to EU's Action Plan and the Common Agricultural Policies. The concrete realization of the CAP and the EU Action Plan context is varying very much.

The German participants did not agree with each other either. There were two very negative assessments of the synergy between EU's Action Plan and the national policies and programs on rural development. The participants said that there is a potential conflict with other regulatory frameworks that are not allowed to work in the rural area. In addition they found that there is a reduction of the second pillar of RDP as the heads of state had only pursued national policy goals. Also there was a critical question of whether the targets in the Action plan will be pursued in realpolitik. One participant in the German group wondered whether there could possibly be a positive synergy if EU recognizes the multiple positive functions of organic farming. One assessed the synergy to be neutral and one was undecided as to whether to rate the synergy as positive, negative or neutral.

Also participants in the Andalusian workshop had a mixed view on the synergy rating on the question of the Action Plans and rural development. The training, consumer

⁵ 69 Reg. (EC) 1782/2003 is named "Optional Implementation for Specific Types of Farming and Quality Production".

and producer participants argued that the rural development programs in the EU are sometimes not going far enough and that they are not adapted to the local necessities. The rest of the group agreed that the European scheme is supporting the local and national programs on this area. Two argued that synergy between EU's Action Plan on rural development and the national programs was negative, two found it to be positive, one argued that it was very positive and one found the relation to be neutral.

The participants in the Danish and in the Dutch workshop mainly found the synergy to be neutral.

All the Danish participants except the certifier representative agreed that the relation between national policy and EU's Action Plan was neutral. It worried the participants that the member states will have to finance these programs themselves. Only the certifier argued that it was a positive synergy since it was a good thing in itself that the Commission took up this area and then it is just natural that the member states finance the area themselves.

In the Netherlands all the three ratings were noting the synergy as neutral since the rural development policy is very weak on the national level. This policy matter is namely entirely left for the regions and most of these regions do not have a strong policy on the area.

Summing up, the English, Czech and Slovenian participants agreed that the rural development policy and its future in EU's Action Plan was positive and a supportive structure for local initiatives. Also the Andalusian group agreed on this but here it was pointed out that the rural development programs are sometimes not going far enough. The Danish group found that the area has not received funding from the Commission and a German participant worried whether this target will actually be pursued in real life politics.

2.3.6 EU's Action Plan on information and promotion versus the national policies on information and promotion

In the Dutch and the Slovenian workshops the ratings of synergy between the measures in EU's Action Plan and national policy were positive whereas the German ratings were negative. The Danish ratings were consistently neutral and the rest of the assessments were mixed with positive, negative and neutral ratings within each country.

In the Dutch workshop three participants rated the synergy as very positive. They argued that the reason for this was that the Dutch policy complies with EU's Action Plan, but offers even more possibilities. There is no conflict on this topic, because this national adaptation is possible.

The development of a toolbox for promotion campaigns as decided by the EU can be useful for Dutch promotion campaigns as well. It was in addition pointed out that in the EU Action Plan promotion is defined very narrowly and very supply oriented and not at all demand oriented as is the Dutch Action Plan. For example, promotion in shops is not included.

In the Slovenian workshop one participant rated the synergy as positive. There was a disagreement when the participant representing *Information* pointed out weak points by saying that the target groups are less accurately indicated in the national action plan. All other participants did not agree with this point. The *Information* representative withdrew her statement and said that she had probably misunderstood this. Still the synergy was seen as positive.

In the Danish workshop three persons rated the synergy as neutral. The discussion was circling around who should pay for the campaigns. One participant stated that the state should definitely pay for public goods, such as the positive effect that increased organic consumption and production would result in. Another participant asked in opposition why the state should pay for a campaign for the private sector and argued that it was problematic that some organizations only exist because of public funding.

One participant argued that action number one⁶ cannot change anything in Denmark since the country has already done a lot. Instead the action will be an advantage for the other member states. It was also assessed by one participant that the action cannot get any funding in Denmark.

In the German workshop one participant rated the synergy to be negative. It was pointed out that the actions will be in conflict with the promotion campaign for private labels. Like in the Danish group a German participant argued that the German organic marketing is well developed; the scheduled campaign (3 million € for an EU toolbox) will therefore not be useful for the German organic sector. However in other member states with less developed organic markets it can be useful.

In the Czech workshop three participants rated the synergy as very positive, seven rated it as positive and four rated it as neutral. The positive view on EU's Action Plan on this area focused on that the Czech Republic's budget for information and promotion campaigns is too small.

The neutral statements were connected with arguments of that it is necessary to publish more, for example to introduce features about organic farming. Although PRO-BIO topics a journal, it is not enough, the participant argued. Bureaucratic problems were also drawn out. One argued that people have not been informed about the possibilities of receiving financial support for promotion.

The Andalusian ratings were three positive assessments, one neutral and one negative. The EU Campaign will favor the dissemination of common relations among European citizens. But there are different base lines or starting points in the different member states. Promotion measures are therefore different. One of the participants argued that

⁶ "Action 1: Introduce amendments in Council Regulation (EC) No 2826/2000 (internal market promotion) which would give the Commission greater possibilities for direct action in order to organise information and promotion campaigns on organic farming.

Launch a multi-annual EU-wide information and promotion campaign over several years to inform consumers, public institutions canteens, schools and other key actors in the food chain about the merits of organic farming, especially its environmental benefits, and to increase consumer awareness and recognition of organic products, including recognition of the EU logo.

Launch tailored information and promotion campaigns to well-defined types of consumers such as the occasional consumer and public canteens.

Increase Commission cooperation efforts with Member States and professional organisations in order to develop a strategy for the campaigns" (Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament COM (2004) 415 final).

measures oriented at the European level will reinforce the organization of “good” national and local promotion campaigns.

The distance between the origin of the campaign and the beneficiaries could be an added difficulty.

In the English workshop agreement was reached on that the synergies were both very good positive and very negative.

A participant pointed out that there could be a positive synergy if a clear message is conveyed as to what exactly organics is.

Another possible positive element is that it can be a promotion of both legislation/logos and the organic system. Some member states have concentrated on the logo and some on promotion of particular food groups. The UK has one proposal with the Commission now and hasn't really made much use of the provision yet.

A crucial topic in marketing is to identify what consumers are interested in. It is hard to believe that this is common across Europe. It could be useful to have a core staff gathering evidence across Europe which could then be drawn on to support national campaigns. Could be a difference across member states in the way consumers perceive government information campaigns.

A general feeling emerged that if the EU supports national activities then there would be a positive synergy, but if it only promotes a pan-European homogenized message then this would be doubtful and even problematic and would result in a negative synergy.

Two of the Italian participants rated the synergy as very positive. Two found it to be neutral and one argued that it was negative.

A positive development is that in the new proposed regulation prohibitions on using non-environmental claims such as health or quality claims are not explicit anymore. What is problematic however is that there is a low synergy among Commission experts and between those and the member states. For example, in the specific context of the working group on promotion, there is not much involvement of stakeholders concerning the new regulation revision. These problems can also be found in Italy.

In sum, the Danish and the German participants felt that they were in a situation where a common campaign would not change much in their member states. A common information campaign would on the other hand be beneficial in member states that had done less themselves. This was agreed on in the Netherlands, Slovenia and the Czech Republic – where the participants argued that they needed more funding for a broader campaign. In England and Andalusia it was agreed on that a common campaign is positive but that there are certain risks, namely that one common harmonized message might not be well received by consumers since a campaign should be adapted to the receivers in each individual country. The Italian group argued that in order for a common campaign to be a success, it is necessary to cooperate better between experts from the member states and the Commission.

2.3.7 EU's Action Plan on joint research programs versus national research programs on organic food and farming

The Slovenian and English groups rated the synergies as positive. The participants from the Netherlands found the synergies to be neutral. There were no member states where the participants rated the synergies as entirely negative but in the Andalusian, the Czech, the German, the Danish and the Italian workshops ratings of the synergies were mixed based on positive, neutral and negative ratings.

The English workshop agreed on that the synergy was very positive between EU's Action Plan on joint research programs and national policies concerning research. They argued that the only resources available to tackle the big research topics will be European.

In Slovenia one participant rated the synergy as positive. The fact that the necessity of increased research in organic farming is expressed was positive, but the participants also found some negative elements in their discussion, namely that the topic was too vaguely described and there is a lack of support for implementation of this measure on the national level.

Five participants from the Netherlands rated the synergy to be neutral. The Dutch participants agreed on that the European research programs are not oriented towards and in balance with the needs of the European organic sector. In particular the Dutch participants argued that the European research programs should be more directed towards producers, processors and market actors. One mentioned that it should not only be *directed towards*, but that co-innovation must be done *together* with partners from the organic sector.

A problem is in the opinion of one participant that there is no research on the processing part of the organic food chain. Another participant responded that there is QLIF, but there are no European organizations of organic producers. Organizations like IFOAM are more research oriented.

As an example of how this can be organized the Dutch institution Bioconnect was mentioned. They coordinate research programs according to the demands of the Dutch organic food and farming businesses.

Among the member states with a mixed rating of the synergy the Italian participants were the only ones who did not rate the synergy as somewhat positive. One rated it as neutral and one rated it as negative. They stated that there is a lack of “Scientific Support to Policy (SSP)” research initiatives, also at the Italian level, which has been launched by the European Commission under the Sixth Framework Program for Research. Furthermore they found that the research topics were not foreseen in the National Action Plan. One participant argued that the funds should be spent for campaigns to awaken policy makers to organic topics, and not for simple research on organic farming.

Ten members of the Czech workshop rated the synergy between EU’s action plan and national programs as very positive. Two rated it as positive and two rated it as neutral. The relationship between research in conventional farming and organic farming was very much debated in the Czech workshop. One suggested cooperating more with conventional researchers – it is often possible to pick up elements from their experience. An opposing view on this topic was that it is a positive development that the whole research will be divided into two parts from 2007, one only for organic farming and one only for conventional. Earlier on the conventional research always discriminated the organic farming. This development is taking place due to elements in the Czech Action Plan.

One participant stated that the European administration makes the Czech administration do the research in organic farming.

Finally there was a wish to aim the research at the health aspects of bio-food in order to show consumers that bio-food is healthier.

In the Danish workshop three argued that the relationship was very positive and one rated it as neutral. They mentioned that there is a large degree of cooperation between the Danish and EU’s research programs already. Furthermore there is a huge internationalization in all research areas in general. One argued that there are

obstacles in the internationalization of research since it is difficult in other member states to focus on the international elements whereas Denmark is leading in this field. Skeptical statements also came out since one argued that the influence by EU is diffuse. Concerning the funding debate it was stated that the character of this topic was just like all the other topics; the action for internationalization of research is just as little binding as all the other actions.

Two of the Andalusian participants rated the synergy to be very positive, one rated it as positive, two rated it as neutral and one rated it as negative. As opposed to the worries in the Dutch group a participant from the Andalusian group argued that EU research programs do encourage the producers to participate in the research. The worries in this group were directed towards whether the research will be case sensitive enough. They argued that EU research programs not always are related to national or local interest. The EU programs look more on impact indexes. In opposition to this one participant stated that EU research programs do reinforce the national research programs. One pointed out that EU research programs do not help so much in a national context if there is no local national interest in organic farming research.

In the German group one rated the synergy as very positive, one rated it as positive and one rated it as negative. The positive rating was focused on the notion that Research must be international and EU-wide organized. The Organic sector is namely relatively small and so it has to cooperate in the research on an international level. It was pointed out that there is also a need for research on regional questions following the principle of subsidiarity. If there are funds on both the national and European level for research then there will be positive synergies but if either the national or the European level diminishes there will be a conflict.

In sum, the Danish, the English and the Slovenian groups were very positive towards creating joint research programs on EU level. In the Danish group some scepticism was raised since it was argued that the Action Plan talks about creating joint research programs but does not attach any funding to this topic. In the Netherlands it was argued that researchers do not cooperate enough with producers and that EU's Action Plan misses this point. The Andalusian group, however, argued the exact opposite by

saying that EU's Action Plan deals with this topic. In the Italian group responses were varied and they argued that the topic of research is not present in the national action plan and one argued that money would be better spent on making information and public relation campaigns instead of using them on research.

2.3.8 EU's Action Plan on environmental and other policy concerns versus national policy priorities

The final question was related to the synergies between the policies in EU's Action Plan on the environment and other policy concerns and national policy priorities. Only few made ratings here and that is important for the validity of the conclusions in this part of the analysis. In Germany, the Andalusia and the Netherlands a few participants rated the synergies of the topic and all gave negative responses. In Slovenian the two ratings given were neutral. In the Danish and the Czech workshop mixed ratings were given. The Italian group found that the topic was not present in the national action plan and therefore chose not to discuss it. Finally the English groups answered that they could not rate these synergies yet. They did however debate the question very much and their discussion will be presented here.

In the Andalusian workshop one participant rated the synergy as negative. The topic was not much debated. The participants from administration and training/extension said that both policy areas are complementary and work in the same direction. However the consumer participants and the NGO argued that there are in general some risks or problems due to the distance between where decisions are made and policies are applied.

Also among Germans one negative rating of this final topic was made. One rated the synergy between EU's Action Plan and national policies as negative and one rated it as very negative.

The researcher argued that German interests and targets are not fully congruent to the political priorities of the EU. For instance food security was seen as a big conflict by the training representative. The new organization of the organic inspection with the integration in 882/2004 and a strong European food-safety-thinking is an important topic here. The representative from the umbrella organization made a comment on this discussion saying that the consequences of linking the revised 2092 with 882/2004 are unclear. Instead the control ought to be more a part of the internal operational quality system. In fact the whole matter turned into a question about the function of the state and the principle of subsidiarity. The representative from the umbrella organization

finished the argument with the point that a judicial decree says that organic inspection is state business.

Two participants rated the synergy as negative in the Netherlands. One participant found that the synergies might be more positive after the elections to the Dutch parliament next year. The polls are indicating a shift to the left and this might lead to more emphasis on the environmental topics. For now the policies in The Netherlands are mostly oriented towards ensuring food quality and market development and not that much on public goods like environment.

In Denmark the ratings were mixed. One rated the synergies between EU's Action Plan and national policies on other public goods like the environment as positive while there were three negative ratings on this topic. In the discussion the consumer representative argued that the definition of sustainability is of importance when discussing other public goods and environment. He argued for a three fold definition with emphasis on the economy, the environment and social sustainability at large in society. The processor however argued that the foundation for development and in particular sustainable development is rooted in the individual farm that should be economically viable and sustainable in relation to the environment.

The certifier argued that the path the Action Plan sets out to follow on GMO is not any news and that in relation to Denmark it doesn't change anything.

Czech participants rated the synergy between national policies and EU's Action plan very mixed. Two argued that it was very positive, six rated the synergy as positive, four rated it as neutral, one rated it as negative and finally one rated the synergy as very negative.

The very positive rating was followed up by the argument that there is hardly any national policy addressing the environmental topics in the Czech Republic. The policy is better in EU's Action Plan. Another argument from this side was that each state is different and therefore it is bad to order what each state should do but still we should learn to work with instruments which the European Commission offers and not only criticize these measures.

The participants felt that their ministry is weak on these questions and that there are no priorities in the national policy.

Two members of the Slovenian group rated the synergy as neutral. The positive elements in the relation between EU's Action Plan and Czech policies were that there will be introduced organic tourism. Furthermore the certification representative argued that there will be a stimulation of organic seed production. However the research representative pointed out that unfortunately EU's Action Plan does not give any support in this topic.

Another positive synergy will be that there will be a consistent control with and inspection of GMO labeling. What is more problematic is that the problem of co-existence between GMO and organic products is not yet solved and that EU's Action Plan gives no support in this direction.

Using organic farming as a tool for improving the environment and conserving biodiversity is not an element in EU's Plan which is a negative synergy.

The Italian participants pointed out that these topics were not present in their national action plan which is why they chose not to discuss this point.

In England the facilitator commented that this was a difficult topic on which to compare the action plans as both the EU and English Action Plans use environmental aspects to justify the plans, but neither elaborates on how actions could be taken to promote this. The feeling was that there is not enough data on which to make a decision at this time – participants would not state, therefore whether they perceived a positive or negative synergy. They did however discuss the topic.

The environmental NGO representative pointed to the bottom bullet point on EUAP action 6: “organic farming as the preferred management option in environmentally sensitive areas”. He stated that the UK tends to ask where organic farming would give the biggest bio-diversity benefit i.e. intensively farmed areas. The EU looks at it from a different perspective with a view to preventing land abandonment in areas where agriculture is required to maintain a sensitive landscape and what is the agricultural system that is most likely to keep these areas operating (often organic farming in ecologically sensitive areas). There are two very different answers to the question if approached from these viewpoints. This led to that the participants felt that they did not have enough information to target where organic farming should go on the basis

of environmentally sensitive areas. A different problem is that there are insufficient data that identify the effect of having large and small areas of organic farming.

Summing up, the answers to this topic were scattered since it was a broad question and since not all member states' national policies or action plans were dealing with the topic. In the German group participants argued that there was an issue of subsidiarity since the organic inspection should be a state affair and not a common EU affair. There were general worries in the German group that food safety is in jeopardy. The Danish participants discussed what sustainability really is and which level should be sustainable –is regional level, country level, EU level or farm level the appropriate focus point here? The Czech group found that the involvement of EU's Action Plan's involvement in environmental affairs is positive since the national level does not handle this very well for the time being. The Slovenian group did however argue that EU's Action Plan was not progressive concerning environmental affairs in farming and did not present a possible solution for how to handle the co-existence of GMO and organic products. The English group chose a different focus point; they argued that the English approach to organic farming is that it should enhance bio diversity whereas the EU approach tends to be that organic farming can prevent land abandonment.

2.4 Supplementary analysis – Stakeholder perspective

In order to analyze the stakeholder perspectives in the eight different questions about how EU's Action Plan matches national Action Plans and policies we created an overview scheme of ratings for each topic⁷.

All these tables can be seen in the appendix. Each stakeholder's rating of the synergy is shown for each of the eight member states we studied. In order to demonstrate how we can find the interesting response patterns for the topic in question we have shown the ratings for the first question below.

The first question was *“To which degree does the EU Action Plan on common standards match the national policy needs on organic standards?”*

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SL
Information	+	++			0	-, -, --		
Training/extension	0	++	--	+	0	++, + -	++	+
Training/extension no. 2	+, -, -							
Research		+	--	++	0	--	++	
Research no. 2		-	-				++	
Producer	-	+		+, -		+		
Producer no. 2								
Processor	-	+				++, -		+
Market actor	+	-				--, --	++	+
Consumer	+, -	+		++				
Consumer no. 2		+						
Certification	+	+		C	0	0, --, --, --		
Certification no. 2								
Administration	++, +	++	--		0	+		+
Policy-maker		+		+			++	+
Policy-maker no. 2		+						

⁷ As explained in the outline on page 11 the schemes used in the analysis in chapter 2 and 3 are the same.

Environmental/animal NGO	0	++			0			
Environmental/animal NGO no. 2					0			
Umbrella organization			--					

As can be seen from the circles there are some similarities in the first topic concerning how the stakeholders from the same category responded. But although there are some stakeholder categories that answer fairly the same on this topic they do not repeat this systematically on the following topics. For instance the policy makers, the NGOs or the consumers do not repeat a systematic agreement pattern in the discussions regarding logos.

We further studied whether there is agreement between stakeholders from certain regions. But we did not see that for instance one type of stakeholders from Eastern European member states agreed more with each other than with the same stakeholders from other parts of Europe.

Stakeholders were asked to consider how EU's Action Plan related to the national policy on organic food and farming, and as national policies differ in each member states, answers differed - following national lines rather than lines of stakeholders.

The reasoning can be specified further. There seems to be no pattern where any given type of stakeholder expresses similar views on synergies emanating from the EU Action Plan.

The patterns in the views on EU's Action Plan seem to be stronger for the national level than for the level of stakeholders. From the table it is clear that there are a number of very clear country specific response patterns. The participants answered very much alike within for instance the Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, England, the Netherlands and Slovenia. As can be seen from the appendix this is also the case for the rest of the member states when we look at the other seven topics.

However if we try to study how the stakeholders responded across the member states the result becomes very blurry.

We set out to study the response patterns within each country and within each stakeholder group. We have now found that there is a particularly important pattern at

country level to take into consideration when we evaluate EU's Action Plan and the interplay with national action plans.

Hence we have found that it is particularly interesting to study the national policy contexts to increase the understanding of the interplay between the EU Action Plan and national policies and the various roles stakeholders may take in this interplay in order to cope with the issue of developing tools for evaluating action plans for organic food and farming.

2.5 Important discussions in the eight member states

The findings of this study are to feed in to an in-depth analysis of how the implementation of the EU action plan in member states can be expected to be influenced by processes of interplay between public agencies and private stakeholders involved in the development of organic food and farming. The in-depth studies will take place in the form of focus group interviews in the eight member states analyzed here. The findings of this report thus help preparing the focus group interviews. The findings suggest that stakeholders' views on policies in support of organic food and farming are mainly of a national character and less relating to common interests among stakeholders in different member states. Against this background it is clear that focus groups should focus on the national discussions rather than trying to identify common stakeholder views. The material collected here can also help specifying some of the main topics among stakeholders in the various national contexts by identifying where national stakeholders disagree. This is the purpose of this chapter. The method is to compare ratings and comments from all topics within each member state to find out which topics sparked debate and disagreement in the national workshops.

The level of agreement was quite different in the eight workshops. In four workshops (in Slovenia, the Netherlands, England, and Italy) there was much agreement and in four workshops (in Germany, the Czech Republic, Denmark and in Andalusia) there was more disagreement when presented with the questions of synergies between EU's Action Plan and national Action Plans or policy programs.

The four workshops with participants that agreed the most:

In the *English* workshop all participants rated every topic similarly. Although it was not the idea to create unanimity the participants found themselves agreeing among each other when rating the synergies. This was also reflected in the comments, there were not reported any comments from stakeholders that disagreed with the general opinion.

In the *Dutch* workshop there was also general agreement on the eight topics although the participants did not make one common assessment on the ratings. Only concerning topic b on labels there was slightly different assessments. One participant rated the synergy as positive and one rated it as neutral. This difference in rating and the comments made in connection with the topic were only marginally different however.

The participants in the *Slovenian* workshop also agreed overall on the topics presented to them. However on topic c (concerning the common market and national organic market) there were small differences in comments and ratings. One participant argued that it was positive that importing and exporting will become easier while another participant found that EU's focus on creating organic farming in sensitive areas was too vague, instead the participant thought that all of the Slovenian farming should be organic.

The Slovenian participants also presented small differing opinions on topic e (concerning the Rural Development Policy) where one participant argued that forming the Slovenian RDP is positively influenced by EU's Action Plan. As opposed to this one participant argued that the requirements for receiving investment grants to new projects are very strict and that most Slovenian farmers cannot fulfill the demands.

In the *Italian* workshop participants disagreed on topic a (on common standards) some participants argued that the synergy between EU's Action Plan and national Action Plans would be positive while others thought this would be a negative synergy when considering barriers for circulating food products in the EU.

The four workshops where the participants were disagreeing the most:

In the *Czech* workshop two participants made a negative assessment of the synergy for topic a (common standards) while all other participants rated the synergy as positive or very positive. They did not however make any statements about why they rated the synergy differently.

Concerning topic b one participant rated the synergy as positive while all others rated it as negative, very negative or neutral. No comments clarify this difference in rating.

Concerning topic c (common market and national organic markets) there was more disagreement in the rating and in the following debate. The negative synergies were followed by arguments about that it is too difficult for Czech farmers to have their products properly certified for exports in Europe. Others found that the synergy was positive since the increased import will ensure a much larger assortment in Czech shops.

When discussing topic d (international trade) the participants rated the synergy very differently. The discussion however was not really focused on the topic at hand.

Topic e (Rural Development Policy) was also rated differently but the statements were only given by participants on the positive and neutral side. The two negative ratings were not explained.

The participants were agreeing the most on topic f (information and PR), g (joint research) and h (environmental and other policy concerns). The latter was not rated the same way by all participants, but the discussion shows that they were having the same optimistic opinion that Czech politics will benefit from EU's Action Plan since they saw it as more actively engaged than Czech programs on these policy concerns.

In the *Andalusian* workshop participants agreed on topic f (information and PR), g (joint research) and h (environmental and other policy concerns). Topics a through e were all more or less controversial.

Topic f (information and PR) was not rated exactly alike among all participants, but the organizers found that the group agreed on that the European Union's and the national campaigns complement each other.

The ratings of topic g (joint research) show a little discrepancy in the participants' view of the synergy. But the organizers pointed out that there was agreement among the participants on that the joint EU research programs reinforce the local and national programs.

Concerning topic a (common standards) the participants did not agree on all elements in the discussion about regional standards. They did however agree that there is a need for a common legal European framework that can be adapted to local issues.

Topic b (labels) was very controversial to the participants of the *Andalusian* workshop who did not agree on whether to favor a common EU logo, a national logo or a national logo with added information about the inspection body.

Also topic c (common market) was controversial since some participants supported the idea of enhancing local markets whereas others preferred a common European market. This is not shown in the ratings but in the added comments.

The discussion in topic d (international trade) went along the same lines as in topic c. Some thought that internationalization will lead to a loss of identity and sovereignty while others found the local market and international trade to be compatible.

The Rural Development Policy that was addressed in topic e was less controversial but participants did disagree whether the European Action Plan can really adapt to local needs.

In *Denmark* there was agreement on several issues, but also important and strong disagreements on how to rate the synergies which was reflected in the comments reflected too.

The participants disagreed with each other on three topics. The first was the debate about the common label (topic b). Here one participant argued that the common label could jeopardize the organic movement in Europe while the rest of the participants disagreed.

The second topic that revealed some level of disagreement among the participants was topic c, concerning the common market. This topic received mostly negative ratings but also one very positive rating by a participant who argued that trade between EU member states will become easier which will benefit the diversity of the offered products. The common rules will also be positive when trying to move into the American market.

The third topic that sparked disagreement was topic h concerning EU's Action Plan on environmental and other policy concerns. The debate circled around how to define sustainability and there was not agreement on how EU's Action Plan will influence the environmental and other policy concerns.

In the *German* workshop the participants agreed on topic a (common standards), since all found that there was a negative synergy between EU's Action Plan and the national Action Plan.

Also topic f (information and PR) was rated as having an entirely negative synergy. Only one made an assessment here and argued that there would be a conflict between

the marketing of private labels and that the proposed campaign did not fit the well developed state of the German organic sector.

Concerning topic g (joint research) there was a general agreement on a positive rating of the synergies between EU's Action Plan and the national Action Plan.

Topic h (environmental and other policy concerns) was also generally rated negatively and the question of subsidiarity was in focus in the debate.

Topic c (common market) was an example of a debate where there was agreement on that the German market is very open to importers. Depending on the origin of the participant the view on a better organized European market was either skeptical or optimistic.

Topic b (common labels) was more controversial and the ratings varied very much. Many thought that there would be a conflict between the national and private logos and the EU logo. Some argued however that a common label is a necessity.

Also topic d (international trade) was a topic where the German did not find a common consensus or general opinion. One participant argued that reduction of trade barriers will only bring disadvantages to the German organic sector. Others found that trade distortions should be solved and that the EU Action Plan was leveling with the national Action Plan on this matter.

Finally when discussing topic e (Rural Development Plan) there was disagreement on what the synergies would be like between EU's Action Plan and the national programs. Some participants foresaw very negative synergies since they thought that the EU Action Plan was not detailed enough and too far from real world issues. A positive assessment was made by a participant who argued that if the EU recognizes the multiple positive functions of organic farming then there can be a constructive relationship between the two Action Plans.

Summing up the conclusions about controversial topics in the eight member states, we have produced the following table to illustrate the findings. It shows which topics appeared most controversial and sparked the most disagreement between the participants in the various national workshops:

	Topic a	Topic b	Topic c	Topic d	Topic e	Topic f	Topic g	Topic h

Andalusia	X	X	X	X	X			
Czech Republic	X	X	X	X	X			
Denmark		X	X					X
Germany		X	X	X				
England		X						
Italy	X							
The Netherlands		X						
Slovenia			X		X			

The table will serve as basis for preparing the main issues to be included in the focus group interviews to be held in the eight member states compared here about the expected impacts of potential positive and negative synergies on national implementation of the EU Organic Action Plan.

2.6 Conclusion

This paper has presented an analysis of the debates in eight national workshops concerning the relationship between EU's Action Plan on Organic Food and Farming and national action plans.

We were interested to see which response patterns we could find in each country and within the stakeholder groups.

We found that there were many interesting and important patterns to be uncovered within each country and between the member states. The responses were clearly organized so that participants generally agreed with each other within the country and also some issues were seen as particularly important in some member states as opposed to others. In particular the questions of common standards, common labels, a common European market, international trade and the future of the Rural Development Policy were important and sparked a lot of debate in the workshops.

We also studied the stakeholder groups in order to see if we could document that there were cross cutting interests or arguments to be found. Although we found some similarities in the responses they were mostly scattered and unsystematic.

We recommend that these insights feed into the next task in the project; we will make in depth interviews and studies in each of the participating member states with important stakeholders in order to uncover the relationship between EU's Action Plan and national policies. This study has been an empirically based introduction to which topics we can take up in future considerations about the evaluation of EU's Action Plan.

3 Part II – Objectives and Indicators

3.1 Introduction and methods

The purpose of this part of the workshop was to review the objectives and related indicators used in evaluations. This is not a simple task as stakeholders may have different material and ideological interests and views on separate issues. Hence, any discussion on objectives and indicators (whether concerning organic food or any other issue) is essentially about values and interests. The workshop is not to deliver one theoretically derived result, but should indicate how the different stakeholder backgrounds are manifested in assessments of objectives and indicators – and the extent to which it is possible to reach mutual understanding and agreements among stakeholders regarding the interpretation of objectives and indicators.

In this session of the national workshop, participants were asked to concentrate on defining the most central objectives to EU and National Action Plans in support of organic food and farming, identify the kind of data the fulfilment of objectives is to be indicated, what kind of reliable data are available in the national context and how indicators should be assessed. The basis for national discussions was the expectation that stakeholders and public agencies differ in their views on objectives in organic action plans, but that they are able to discuss the relevance and availability of indicators for different objectives and that each participant can specify evaluation criteria relevant to their views on objectives.

The following steps were undertaken in the workshop process:

- discussion of the key sectoral and societal objectives (see Section 3.4 below)
- prioritisation of the sectoral and societal objectives
- indicator development for the key objectives
- discussion and proposed indicators with respect to data requirements and availability

3.2 Participants

It was commented on in most national workshops, that it was very difficult to get the desired range of participants to attend the workshops. One of the main reasons for this was that the types of stakeholders that could provide valuable input into a process such as this are generally very busy people. This makes it even more important to acknowledge and thank those participants that did manage to attend the workshops in each country. Participant numbers ranged from 5 in NL to 14 in AND and CZ. A breakdown of the participants that attended in each country is presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Participant breakdown for each country*

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information	X	X	X		X	X		X
Training/extension	X	X	X	X	X	XX	X	X
Research	XXX	XX	XX	X	X	X	XX	X
Producer	X	X		X		XX		X
Processor	X	X		X		X		X
Market Actor	X	X	X			X	X	X
Consumer	XX	XX		X				
Certification	X	X	X	X	X	XX		X
Administration	XX	X	X	X	X	X		

Policy maker		XX		X			X	X
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO	X	X	X		XX			
Other			X		X			
Total Participants	14	14	9	8	8	11	5	8

* bold indicates participants who made significant contributions to discussion throughout.

3.3 Objectives

Organic action plans exist to promote organic food and farming. According to the EU Action Plan, the promotion of organic food and farming rests on two main aims:

- satisfy market demand in terms of consumers needs and market penetration of organic products on the food market
- delivery of public good primarily through benefits to the environment, animal welfare and rural development.

It is also possible to differentiate between:

- organic sector-level objectives, which focus on the development (growth and improvement) of the organic sector, and
- societal-level objectives, which focus on broader policy goals where the expectation is that growth and improvement of the organic sector will make a positive improvement.

For the purposes of the workshop, the participants were asked to consider the following list of generic objectives (i.e. applicable to most action plans) which contribute to the above aims:

Sector level objectives

1. Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses
2. Increasing the scale of the organic sector
3. Meeting consumer demands for choice and quality, safe, affordable food
4. Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic farming regulation and reducing bureaucracy
5. Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food
6. Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society

Societal level objectives

7. Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources
8. Maintaining and enhancing the environment (including biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)
9. Maintaining and enhancing animal health and welfare
10. Maintaining and enhancing the social and economic well-being of rural communities
11. Maintaining and enhancing the competitiveness of European agriculture
12. Promoting public health and food security

3.3.1 Discussion of list of objectives

Sector level objectives

1. Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses

In ENG it was pointed out that “financial performance” should actually read financial viability and in CZ and NL it was felt that the emphasis seemed to be on production and that processing and marketing could be specifically mentioned instead of “related food-sector businesses”. The DE group discussed the objective and concluded that it encompasses two separate aims. The participants therefore decided to split the objective into “agricultural production” (objective 1A) and “processing and marketing” (objective 1B).

2. Increasing the scale of the organic sector

In AND it was suggested that “developing the internal market” was a crucial part of increasing the scale of the organic sector, therefore this was added as a qualifying statement onto this objective.

3. Meeting consumer demands for choice and quality, safe, affordable food

In ENG it was felt that objective 3 (as a sectoral objective) should include something about market extension such as fibre and fuel, but should also link with the RDP to include tourism. It should also be modified to suggest expansion of availability, rather than just meeting existing consumer demand – i.e. *increasing the availability and* meeting consumer demands for choice and quality, safe, affordable food, *fibre and other products*. Participants in the DE workshop felt that objective 3 concluded different aims that were partly in conflict with one another.

4. Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic farming regulation and reducing bureaucracy

In the NL it was suggested that the objective be worded as “Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic *production, better market level playing field (harmonisation of the European market)* and reducing bureaucracy. In AND it was suggested that “integrating social standards” be included at the end of this objective.

5. Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food

It was felt in the NL that a good definition of “integrity” is missing and therefore this word should be left out of the objective. In DE a new objective was suggested by the certification participant: ““Harmonization of the implementation of the guidelines, for example with harmonized and effective implementations” and it was decided by the group that this could be incorporated into objective 5.

6. Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society

In ENG, improving the understanding of the impacts of organic farming was put forward as a new objective. It was suggested that this could be incorporated into objective 6 by stating that the promotion and development of understanding of the concept and potential of organic food and farming should be based on sound evidence. Also in ENG, consumer education was thought to be missing from list. The suggestion was made that this was covered in Objective 6 which includes “promoting

understanding...”. It was also suggested in ENG that food be included in the objective as well. The final Objective 6 read: Promoting *and developing* understanding (*using evidence*) of the concept and potential of organic *food and* farming in society. Participants in the DE workshop felt that objective 6 mixes both the method and the aim. The research participant in DE suggested a new objective “Acknowledgement of organic farming as an example for the whole farming sector” and it was decided by the group that this could be included within the scope of objective 6.

Societal level objectives

7. Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources

8. Maintaining and enhancing the environment (including biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)

In the DE and IT workshops, the participants could not distinguish between the objectives of 7 and 8 – the question arose as to whether a difference exists between resources and environment. Their conclusion was to join the two objectives into one “promoting the sustainable use of natural resources and maintaining and enhancing the environment (including biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)”.

9. Maintaining and enhancing animal health and welfare

In ENG it was suggested that animal health is implicit in welfare rather than separate and that “high levels” of welfare should be incorporated into the objective. A re-worded objective was: “maintaining and enhancing *high levels* of animal welfare, *including health*”.

10. Maintaining and enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of rural communities

It was suggested in ENG that objective 10 should be expanded to include reference to the regeneration of disadvantaged communities. In IT it was felt that labour issues were not addressed specifically in any of the objectives, therefore “(including employment)” was added at the end of this objective.

11. Maintaining and enhancing the competitiveness of European agriculture

In the NL it was suggested that the objective be amended to “Maintaining and enhancing the competitiveness of the European *food sector (by a demand driven chain approach)*”.

12. Promoting public health and food security

The CZ group thought that the objective could be reworded to “Public health improvement” and the NL group thought the term food safety should replace food security as food security has an entirely different meaning to what they feel the objective is aiming for.

3.3.2 New objectives introduced

The following list of new objectives was raised from the discussion. The numbers in the brackets indicate where the authors could potentially see these new objectives being incorporated into the existing list of 12 objectives.

1. Shorter, more producer-controlled supply chains (ENG) (1)
2. Stimulation of research and search for improvements on all stages of organic offer (SI) (1)
3. Contribution to organic education. (CZ) (6)
4. Public health improvement. (CZ) (12)
5. Organic food quality. (CZ) (3, 12)
6. Alternative to traditional/conventional farming. (DK)
7. Protect the identity and the contextual knowledge of the territory (IT)
8. Maintaining and enhancing consumer awareness and trust in organic food. (NL) (3, 5, 6)
9. Reinforcing internal organization of the organic sector (AND) (1, 4)
10. Better informed public of the benefits and externalities of organic farming (AND) (6)
11. Protecting and assessing handmade and traditional production systems and the local culture associated (in extinction danger) (AND)

Objective 2 on the above list, could potentially form part of the sector level objective “Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses” and they both refer to technical development. Objective 4 above is very similar to the societal-level objective of “Promoting public health and food security”. There are three objectives in the above list (6, 7 and 11) which deal with Traditional/cultural aspects of agriculture and the issue of regional/territorial origin of food. Objectives 7 and 11 highlight the role organic farming might play with respect to the maintenance of traditional farming and regional products, whilst objective 6 offers organic farming as an alternative to traditional farming. Objective 8 above could potentially be incorporated into the sectoral-level objectives of “Meeting consumer demands for choice and quality, safe, affordable food, “Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food” and “Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society”.

3.3.3 Objective voting and prioritisation

Table 2.1 Objectives developed and priority order

Key: No. 1 objective = 3, No. 2 objective = 2; No.3 Objective = 1, not voted for = 0

Objective	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI	Av.
1 (technical and financial)	3	2	2	0	2	3	0	0	1.5
2 (scale)	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0.6
3 (consumer demand)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
4 (regulation)	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0.5
5 (integrity)	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0.5
6 (promoting concept)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.5
7 (natural resources)	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	0.8
8 (environment)	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	2	1.0
9 (animal welfare)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.1
10 (rural communities)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.1
11 (competitiveness)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
12 (human health)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
New A (traditional systems)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
New B (consumer awareness)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.1

Table 2.2 Final list of objectives developed

Objective No.	
1	Objective 1A Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms Objective 1B Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic food-sector businesses
2	Objective 2 Increasing the scale of the organic sector
4	Objective 4 Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic farming regulation and reducing bureaucracy
5	Objective 5 Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food
6	Objective 6 Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society
7	Objective 7 Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources
8	Objective 8 Maintaining and enhancing the environment (including biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)
9	Objective 9 Maintaining and enhancing animal health and welfare
10	Objective 10 Maintaining and enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of rural communities
New A	New Objective A - Protecting and assessing handmade and traditional production systems and the local culture associated (in extinction danger)
New B	New Objective B - Maintaining and enhancing consumer awareness and trust in organic food

The emphasis after the objective voting process was very much on the sectoral-level objectives with only the “sustainable use of resources” and “maintaining and enhancing the environment” society level objectives being prioritised in more than one country. “Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses” was the most popular objective, being prioritised in 5 of the 8 countries/regions. Of the new objectives voted for, “protecting and assessing handmade and traditional production systems and the local culture associated (in extinction danger)” is original to AND and cannot easily be incorporated into any of the existing objectives. The other new objective “Maintaining and enhancing consumer awareness and trust in organic food” could arguably be integrated into existing sectoral objectives 3 “Meeting consumer demands for choice and quality, safe, affordable food”, 5 “Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food” and 6 “Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society” – though the new objective does place the focus on the consumer in relation to these issues.

3.3.4 Objective 1 – Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses

3.3.4.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 1 was ranked top priority in AND and IT, second in both CZ and ENG and second and third in DE where it was broken down into two objectives relating to a) organic farms and b) related food-sector businesses, respectively. In IT this objective received 16% of the vote, in AND 10% and DE 26%. In both CZ and ENG this objective received 11% of the vote but in ENG it received the same number of votes as three other objective (9, 7 and 2) and therefore further discussion was required to identify which of these was most important to the group to take forward (objectives 1 and 9 were eventually developed).

3.3.4.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information	No Data	++	+		++	+		
Training/extension		++	++		++	+		
						++		
Research		+	++		+	++		
		++	++					
Producer		++				++		
						++		
Processor		++				++		
Market Actor		++	++			++		
Consumer		0						
		++						
Certification		+	++		++	+		
						++		
Administration		++	+		++	++		
Policy maker		++						
		+						
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO		++	++		+			
					++			
Other			++					

3.3.4.3 Indicator development

AND	CZ	DE	ENG	IT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of training courses taken by each organic farmer • Revenue of organic farms • Number of advisors and specialists in organic farming and organic groups (territorial area covered, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profit and profitability • Statistics on organic products • The volume and share of bio food in the total foodstuffs consumption and in the import • Average depreciation to investment • Turnover farms • Statistics of organic farms by number and area • Total profits per hectare – productivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variety of products • Sales Increase (tech. Improvement) • Expenditures on organic products / inhabitants • Number of digestion- and marketing-institutions • Turnover • Consumer price • Amount of investment expenses • Handling costs, comparison of leading products like milk organic and conventional farms • Increase of market, without shelf-filling effect (Increase / m² product expanse) • percentage growth of new companies in the digestion- and marketing-sector • Capital resources rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of organic farmers (workers) on welfare. • Price paid for organic and non-organic goods. • % of organic farmers (land) subject to enforcement action/year. • Development (number and quality) of web based market information. • Increase in employees in organic food sector businesses (interaction with technology?). • Number of business plans. • Increase and withdrawals of absolute organic land area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of organic farms in business for 8 years or more • Productivity (kg/ha or £/ha) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increase in total turnover of certified businesses • Organic farm incomes per unit of labour/land/capital compared to the national average wage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased financial profitability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic farm net income • Share on food market • Organic farms investment • Evaluation of product quality parameters • Impact of organic on UAA total specific for product • Amount of organic product sold as organic in market • Economic balance of the sector • Dynamic of soil fertility (% of organic matter) • Decrease of extra-farm inputs use per ha and for specific crop (data can be found from compulsory farm register on X sample farms) • No. of research projects whose output is used in training & extension • Organic turnover/farm turnover (FADN) • Production yields (ton/ha) • (Maintaining direct payment to the organic sector)

3.3.4.4 Indicator Prioritisation and Discussion

INDICATORS	% of final vote	AND	CZ	DE	ENG	IT
Organic farm income (per unit of labour/land/capital compared to the national average wage)	CZ (30%) IT (22%) AND (?) ENG (33%)		Would not take into account the fixed costs of the business and is reliant on the business submitting accurate income and cost data (via FADN). Difficulties comparing profit directly between different farm types or businesses. Support payments would need to be removed from any calculations (variable between countries)		Research participant noted their disquiet over the focus of the income indicator being on FTE's and national average wages - return to capital should not be ignored.	This indicator should be compared with corresponding conventional farms and with the trend of the organic farms
Organic farming statistics (farm number and area)	CZ (23%)					
% share of organic in total food market (and imports)	CZ (13%) IT (16%)					Official statistics on organic food market share do not exist. Another criticism was: % sold through organic channel is not relevant since selling organic product on the conventional market also allows good technical and financial performance.
Productivity (kg/ha or £/ha)	ENG (20%)				Deals with technical performance to some extent other others include: food quality; environmental and resource use conservation; measure of knowledge and research (number of farmers attending training events –crude)	

INDICATORS	% of final vote	AND	CZ	DE	ENG	IT
Number of organic farms in business for 8 years or more	ENG (13%)				There would be data available in the UK from a number of sources that could be integrated to calculate the number of organic farms in business for 8 years or more, though data is rather currently rather scattered and somewhat intermittent. Similar data may not be available in other EU countries.	
Expenditure on organic products / inhabitants	DE (31%)			Societal relevance and acceptance. Criteria include: whole sales area, square area of shelves, rate ((organic+conventional)/organic). Risks include "quality" of expenditure (e.g. local market vs discount retailer)		
Turnover	DE (22%)			Easily measurable, relatively stable. Criteria include: operating margin, operating increase, operating rate (org. compared to conv. market)		
Capital resources rate	DE (20%)			Degree of independence and stability. Difficulties include measurability and significance during growing period		
Number of training courses taken by each organic farmer	AND (?)					
Number of advisors and specialists in organic farming and organic groups (territorial area covered, etc)	AND (?)					
Organic farms investment	IT (13%)					Indicates that the farm has resources to use and this implies that the farm plans further development. FADN database provides farm data, no data for rest of supply chain (research needed).

3.3.5 Objective 2 – Increasing the scale of the organic sector

3.3.5.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 2 was voted the first most important in the NL (17% of the votes) and second equal with objective 5 in DK (18% of the votes) - it did not feature in the top three objectives of any other country.

3.3.5.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information								
Training/extension				++			++	
Research				++			+ ++	
Producer				++				
Processor				++				
Market Actor							++	
Consumer				++				
Certification				0				
Administration				0				
Policy maker				++			++	
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO								
Other								

3.3.5.3 Indicator development

DK	NL*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area converted • Share of the food market • Economic results • Share of animal production • Larger selection of goods • Y% of the production value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of organic farming (ha). • Number of organic producers, processors, retailers and consumers. • Organic production volume (m³/tonnes) and value (€). • Volume (m³/tonnes) and turnover (€) of organic sales, differentiated to market channel and product category.

* A second round of voting was not carried out – this was also the final list of indicators.

3.3.5.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	DK	NL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of organic farming (ha). 	DK (43%) No second round voting for NL	Total area converted makes sense from a national perspective but in new member states it is actual production areas that are interesting. Converting to organic in intensive production areas may result in greater environmental benefits for example than converting to organic in less intensive farming areas. The benefits derived from organic farming conversion very much depend on the type of land/farming systems etc. prior to conversion.	Collected in The Netherlands and published by Biologica in the Ekomonitor yearly reports (www.biologica.nl). Framework suitable at EU level.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of organic producers, processors, retailers and consumers. 	No second round voting for NL		As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organic production volume (m³/tonnes) and value (€). 	No second round voting for NL		As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume (m³/tonnes) and turnover (€) of organic sales, differentiated to market channel and product category. 	No second round voting for NL		As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economical results 	DK (50%)	A clearer definition of this is required to be a useful indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Larger selection of goods 	DK (7%)		

3.3.6 Objective 4 – Better regulation, i.e. improving transparency of organic farming regulation and reducing bureaucracy

3.3.6.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 4 was voted the second most important in the Netherlands (with 11 % of the vote) and Andalucía (9 %).

3.3.6.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information	No Data							
Training/extension							++	
Research							++ 0	
Producer								
Processor								
Market Actor							No data	
Consumer								
Certification								
Administration								
Policy maker							++	
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO								
Other								

3.3.6.3 Indicator development

AND	NL*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of documents or forms needed for applications and bureaucratic registers (time, pages, words, extension, etc) Frequency of new standards and standards revisions (consolidated) Number of farmers integrated in participatory social organic certification programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of deviations in relevant regulations on organic production between EU-countries. Market share of organic products according to additional standards on top of EU standards.

* A second round of voting was not carried out – this was also the final list of indicators.

3.3.6.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	AND	NL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of deviations in relevant regulations on organic production between EU-countries. 	No second round voting for NL		Indicators are not available yet, but can be made available by periodic desk research on deviations in regulations and market research on additional standards in all EU countries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market share of organic products according to additional standards on top of EU standards. 	No second round voting for NL		As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of documents or forms needed for applications and bureaucratic registers (time, pages, words, extension, etc) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequency of new standards and standards revisions (consolidated) 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of farmers integrated in participatory social organic certification programmes 	Favoured in AND		

3.3.7 Objective 5 – Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food

3.3.7.1 Discussion of Objective 5

In DE “harmonization of the implementation of the guidelines” was proposed as a new objective in earlier discussion, however, it was decided by the group that this could be added as a qualifying statement to objective 5 – “Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and organic food (e.g. with harmonized and effective implementations)”.

3.3.7.2 Voting for Objective

Both DK and DE identified objective 5 as being a priority, in DE it received 24% of the vote and was the highest priority, and in DK received 17% of the vote and was the third most important objective.

3.3.7.3 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information			++					
Training/extension			++	++				
Research			+	++				
			++					
Producer				++				
Processor				++				
Market Actor			+					
Consumer				+				
Certification			++	+				
Administration			++	+				
Policy maker				+				
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO			++					
Other			++					

3.3.7.4 *Indicator development*

DE	DK
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of each other (int. level; acceptance of foreign products) • Image of the organic food sector from the point of view of consumer and representatives of the sector • Consumer and representatives of the sector • Inspection costs (per farm) for control department and farm • Satisfaction of several representatives with the situation • Harmonisation - Number of deviations (exceptions, different realization of the guidelines in EU) • Coherence of demand/ objective and detail rules/ realization • Number of positive publications concerning guidelines in organic farming • Control intensity (esp. number of samples and control of control) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% independence of conventional farming • Fulfillment of the principles • Processes in action on ecology • Good husbandry instead of chemistry • Consumer knowledge and trust

3.3.7.5 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	DE	DK
100% independence of conventional farming	DK (45%)		Fulfillment of the organic regulations is a type of data that could be used to calculate this indicator – not available centrally. More of a goal than an indicator – cannot attain 100% independence whilst exporting product from system.
Fulfillment of the principles	DK (33%)		Different organizations have different principles (e.g. IFOAM, EU etc) – difficult to compare principles. Could monitor development of regulations and whether they are tending toward greater alignment with principles. Data does not currently exist.
Consumer knowledge and trust	DK (15%)		Could use purchasing data but it is unknown to what extent purchasing data reflects trust. Danish poll showed two thirds of Danes trusted ecological agriculture but still two thirds of food sold is conventionally produced.
Harmonisation - Number of deviations (exceptions, different realization of the guidelines in EU)	DE (36%)	Three sub-indicators developed 1) the number of deviations – easy to collect through certification bodies but may be differences between Laender 2) frequency and extent of transition periods - measurable 3) frequency and duration of “flexibility options” – precondition that there is satisfactory implementation of flexibility in the EU revision.	
Image of the organic food sector from the point of view of consumer and representatives of the sector	DE (24%)	Not discussed further	
Inspection costs (per farm) for control department and farm	DE (16%)	Data difficult to collect on a farm level and individual farm types would not be identified. Need a baseline minimum standard across which to compare the different certification bodies. The indicator could be broken down further into costs for regular (annual inspection) and costs for random and additional required inspections.	

3.3.8 Objective 6 – Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society

3.3.8.1 Voting for Objective

Both CZ and SI voted for Objective 6 –it was the most important objective (equal with objective 8) in the SI workshop (20 % of vote) and the third most important objective in the CZ workshop (10 % of vote).

3.3.8.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information		++						0
Training/extension		++						+
Research		+						++
		++						
Producer		++						++
Processor		++						++
Market Actor		++						++
Consumer		0						
		++						
Certification		+						+
Administration		++						
Policy maker		+						+
		++						
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO		++						
Other								

3.3.8.3 Indicator development

CZ	SI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of the positive interest media in organic farming. • Public opinion and understanding of organic farming • Knowledge of bio products (bio mark) in % of inhabitants. • Share of bio food (in total market, per consumer etc) • Number of bio businessmen (i.e. people involved in organic businesses) • Role of the bio businessmen in a social relation. • Improvement in of quality environment, reduction in sickness rate, understanding function of nature and landscape as a complex system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of publications, commercials, news about organic offer in media • Share (%) of organic food / products in public tenders, school kitchens, canteens etc. • % (share) of consumers who are regularly/occasionally buying organic products • % of experts qualified for organic farming and active experts in organic farming sector out of all experts (for exp. • Annual financing from national budget earmarked/spent for OF and number of employees in public sector for stimulation of OF per organic farm (= /no. of organic farms) • advisors, professors, traders...) • Growth of sustainable approaches /technologies on every stage of organic supply • Number of organic programs in educational institutions

3.3.8.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	CZ	SI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % (share) of consumers who are regularly/occasionally buying organic products 	SI (32%)		Collected through national research supported by the Ministry of Agriculture or the Ministry of Environment. Alternative indicator proposed is % turnover of organic products which is linked to an existing objective in the national action plan for organic food and farming.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share of bio food. 	CZ (31%)	Conflicting views on the usefulness of this indicator. One view that is was linked to purchasing power of MS inhabitants and therefore not comparable between MS. Alternative view that is comparable between MS.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of experts qualified for organic farming and active experts in organic farming sector out of all experts (for exp. advisors, professors, traders...) 	SI (21%)		After discussion, incorporated into "no. of programs in educational institutions" indicator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual financing from national budget earmarked/spent for OF and number of employees in public sector for stimulation of OF per organic farm (= /no. of organic farms 	SI (16%)		Data available already. Specific criteria proposed include: has the proposed national budget spending takes place (yes or no); the level or number of employees over time in the public sector responsible for stimulating organic farming.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of organic programs in educational institutions 	SI (16%)		Obtained through new research – would be possible to collect data at all stages of schooling with the support of the Ministry of Education. Specific criteria for this indicator would be to measure change over time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public opinion 	CZ (26%)	No further discussion	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of bio businessmen. 	CZ (17%)	No further discussion	

3.3.9 Objective 7 – Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources

3.3.9.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 7 was a priority objective for both SI and DK. In DK it was the highest priority objective receiving 25% of the vote and in SI it was the third most important objective, receiving 10% of the vote. In IT objectives 7 and 8 were combined into one objective "Promoting the sustainable use of natural resources and maintaining and

enhancing the environment (including biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)”. This objective was the second highest priority and received 20% of the vote.

3.3.9.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information						++		
Training/extension				++		+		++
						++		
Research				++		++		
Producer				+		+		
						++		
Processor				++		+		
Market Actor						++		+
Consumer				++				
Certification				++		++		
						++		
Administration				++		++		
Policy maker				++				
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO								
Other								

3.3.9.3 Indicator development

In SI, the discussion surrounding indicator development for this objective showed that the objective was problematic - only two participants (training/extension and market actor) identified a total of three indicators. The remaining participants agreed that it was very difficult to develop relevant indicators even though it passed through the voting process as the third most important objective. Participants suggested that the 12th objective “promoting public health and food security” would be a much better choice and would allow them to develop more useful indicators – limited time however did not enable them to develop this objective as an alternative. However, the research representative was able to suggest (after the discussion) another indicator (on the basis of a measure in the national action plan): “No. of innovative development projects promoting OF in nature protection areas (Natura 200 etc.).”

DK	IT	SI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy efficiency (fossil energy) • Biodiversity • Knowledge • Area necessary for production of human needs • Taxes • Output in relation to input • All three elements are equally worthy • New non food products • Larger organic area • Reduction in the number of pesticides. • Closed cycles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy consumption per unit product • Biodiversity indicators • Quantity of farm purchased inputs used • Organic/in conversion UAA in parks and in protected areas • Environmental balance per farm • Water use per organic UAA • Cultivation/breeding variety/breed-races indigenous and/or ancient • % of organic matter in soil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of visits (tourists) on organic tourist farms • No. of innovative development projects promoting OF in nature protection areas (Natura 200 etc.). • No. of organic farms in nature protection areas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of farm conversions 	
--	---	--

3.3.9.4 Indicator voting and discussion

See next page

Indicators	% of final vote	DK	IT	SI
Energy efficiency (fossil energy) (40 % of vote)	DK (40%) IT (16%)	Data does not exist, expensive to collect	Increase FADN data collection required as energy consumption is currently expressed in value and not in quantity. Also necessary to make a supply-chain analysis, with specific emphasis on inputs. The national Action Plan should consider these elements and should insert some limits on the energy consumption and on natural resources.	
Closed cycles (20 % of vote)	DK (20%)	Things other than energy important here. Scale (farm, regional etc) of indicator undecided. A small input of energy into otherwise closed system can result in sig. yield increases – this actually very sustainable. Differing opinions on data availability amongst participants.		
Knowledge (18 % of vote)	DK (18%)	Data does not exist. Opinion polls best source of data but expensive. Survey of knowledge should not be limited to Danish “Ø-mark” as knowledge of this does not necessarily relate directly to knowledge about sustainable use of natural resources.		
Biodiversity indicators	IT (26%)		Intended to cover both natural and crop biodiversity. Relevant for sustainability but no easily accessible data are available - requires specific surveys to gather data. Another suggestion was to analyse the number of applications presented for the sustainability measure within the Rural Development Plan	
Quantity of purchased farm inputs used	IT (26%)		Intended to be a comparison between conventional and organic farming. Data to calculate this easily available from the FADN and ISTAT databases.	
No. of visits (tourists) on organic tourist farms	SI (80%)			Data to calculate is available but reliability questionable (generally underestimate). Criteria would be to monitor change over time.
No. of organic farms in nature protection areas	SI (20%)			As above

3.3.10 Objective 8 – Maintaining and enhancing the environment (includes biodiversity, pollution and climate change issues)

3.3.10.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 8 was identified at the highest priority in ENG (17 % of the vote), first equal with Objective 6 in SI (20 % of the vote) and the second highest priority in CZ (10 % of the vote).

3.3.10.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information		++			++			+
Training/extension		++			++			+
Research		++			++			++
Producer		++						+
Processor		++						++
Market Actor		++						++
Consumer		+						
		++						
Certification		+			+			++
Administration		+			++			
Policy maker		++						++
		++						
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO		++			++			
					++			
Other								

3.3.10.3 Indicator development

CZ	ENG	SI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share of organic land and number of farms. • Biological monitoring. • Technical monitoring especially in the area of soil • Average number of crops in farm. • Increase turnover and proportion in foodstuffs market. • Volume fertilizer production and sale and pesticides (comparison with the number of organic farms). • Improvement of water retaining capacity in soil. • Decrease some health problems in society, for example allergy. • Content of chemical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total organic land area (qualified by type/AES/additional activity) • Increased species/habitat regeneration • Plant biodiversity survey – organic vs non-organic • Number and diversity of birdlife • Nitrate loading per hectare • Nutrient leaching – organic vs non-organic • Reduction in derogation requests for pesticide/veterinary treatments • Broad range of option uptake under agri-environment schemes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of UAA in organic farming • % of UAA with intensive production (all apart from grassland) within total organic UAA in absolute terms (as share of total UAA) • Annual finances from state budget for organic UAA • Increase of number of individuals (animals and plants) of species that are endangered because of intensive farming, in specific areas (where OF has a substantial share)

<p>residue in foodstuffs, comparison bio x conventional.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share of finances on AEO in time (change). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy and green house gas emissions audit • % of organic land covered by whole farm plan process • Improvement in water quality (reduced pollution incidence) 	
---	--	--

3.3.10.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	CZ	ENG	SI
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and diversity of birdlife 	ENG (26%) CZ (30%)	<p>Biological monitoring in general – no specific indicators identified. Conflict regarding indicator suitability. Negatives: difficulties and expense of collecting such data; difficulties identifying differences due specifically to organic farming and difficulties comparing a wide range of environments and regions; impossible to keep track of just one indicator and that sometimes organic farming would not necessarily come out any better than conventional farming (e.g. areas of permanent grassland and fodder crops).</p> <p>Positives: If biological monitoring did show significant benefits from OF, it would add support to the argument for increased organic land area and should be used to promote organic farming and food.</p>	<p>Hard to allocate all votes for these - environmental participant not happy with any indicators. Data would be available to compare organic and conventional farms; however birds have produced the least impressive results in much of the comparative research - may need more landscape scale solutions rather than islands. British Bird Survey data will allow direct comparison with non organic on a large scale - results might flatter organic farming. Plant biodiversity survey data is available through Wild Life Trust offices, but not collected systematically, therefore may be of limited use.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total organic land area (qualified by type/AES/additional activity) 	ENG (22%) SI (64%)		All ready adopted by EU as an indicator	Data available at national and EU level – need interim target setting to monitor progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nitrate loading per hectare 	ENG (17%)		<p>The Environment Agency (EA) not convinced that OF delivers the objective of decreased nutrient leaching - will not accept area of OF as a proxy for nutrient leaching. Therefore need detailed research on nutrient leaching - expensive and impractical. Alternatively rely on farm gate nutrient budgets but collection of data on farm and from certification bodies would be onerous. Could also</p>	

			use Farm Business Survey (FBS) data - time consuming and relatively crude.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy and green house gas emissions audit 	ENG (17%)		Nutrient and energy budgets are possible to calculate from FBS data, but not easily. Another option is to take environmental benchmarking forward and link it with agri-environment incentives.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase of number of individuals (animals and plants) of species that are endangered because of intensive farming, in specific areas (where OF has a substantial share) 	SI (25%)			No discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of UAA with intensive production (all apart from grassland) within total organic UAA in absolute terms (as share of total UAA) 	SI (11%)			No discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical monitoring especially in the area of soil 	CZ (24%)	No discussion		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content of chemical residue in foodstuffs, comparison bio vs conventional 	CZ (16%)	No discussion		

3.3.11 Objective 9 – Maintaining and enhancing animal health and welfare

3.3.11.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 9 was voted the third most important in ENG with 11 % of the vote. This objective was not voted for in any other country.

3.3.11.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information					++			
Training/extension					++			
Research					+			
Producer								
Processor								
Market Actor								
Consumer								
Certification					++			
Administration					+			
Policy maker								
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO					++ +			
Other								

3.3.11.3 Indicator development

ENG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heightened achievement of welfare potential through robust inspection against standards compliance and outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduction in animal cruelty prosecutions, increased use of animal welfare planning, increased use of welfare scoring, reduction in veterinary derogations. Stocking rates/ha for organic vs non-organic Distance (km) of final journey to slaughter Number of farms adopting increased welfare standards Increase in veterinary practice turnover from advisory contracts Heightened standards progressively, particularly in areas of breed, housing and feeding regime Longevity of breeding stock <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced mortality <p>Reduction in veterinary drug spend per livestock unit</p>

3.3.11.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	ENG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longevity of breeding stock 	ENG (23%)	Would apply to all farms – limitation is some policies focus on higher breeding turnover and therefore earlier culling.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of farms adopting increased welfare standards 	ENG (13%)	Confusion over what is meant by “increased welfare standards”. Presumption would be that all organic farmers would comply with the higher welfare standard, so perhaps the number of farmers is not the right indicator. A paradigm shift is necessary and the focus

		needs to be on welfare outputs (e.g. welfare scoring) rather than welfare inputs (organic farming standards). Certification inspection currently only monitors the inputs, not the outcomes. Data limited to certification and veterinary statistical returns. Alternative is no. of cruelty prosecutions – potentially bad public relations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in veterinary derogations 	ENG (13%)	Data currently not available. Should be simple case of asking certification bodies for data.

3.3.12 Objective 10 – Maintaining and enhancing the social and economic wellbeing of rural communities

3.3.12.1 Voting for Objective

Objective 10 was voted the third most important in Italy with 16 % of the vote. This objective was not voted for in any other workshop.

3.3.12.2 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information						+		
Training/extension						++ ++		
Research						++		
Producer						+		
						++		
Processor						+		
Market Actor						+		
Consumer								
Certification						++ ++		
Administration						+		
Policy maker								
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO								
Other								

3.3.12.3 Indicator development

IT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in agricultural workers • Demographic balance of residents: immigrants-emigrants • No. of organic workers in rural areas • No. of organic agro-tourism ventures • Farms income • Rate of farms closing down/total farms • UAA/total land area • Organic certified local products: traditional speciality • Organic UAA/tot UAA per Leader + area • Increase of income share deriving from agricultural business • Rural community dimension • Increase of commercial relations among organic farms in the community (% of sale in an area < 100 km) • Organic districts

3.3.12.4 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	IT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of agricultural workers 	IT (24%)	Participants highlighted that there is a strong link between organic agriculture development and rural development in

		<p>general. Further discussions led to refinements of the first indicator to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase of organic workers not only in agriculture (no. of workers in organic/total workers)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic balance of residents: immigrants-emigrants 	IT (20%)	No discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of organic worker in rural areas 	IT (14%)	No discussion

3.3.13 New Objective A – Protecting and assessing handmade and traditional production systems and the local culture associated (in extinction danger) - AND

3.3.13.1 Discussion of Objective

This objective was raised by participants to reinforce the hand made products initiatives and give more relevance to handmade products and traditional processing activities and industry.

3.3.13.2 Voting for Objective

This objective was ranked fourth in the Andalucía workshop, but has been selected for development here rather than the third ranked objective (another new objective “Reinforcing internal organization of the organic sector”) because it was the top ranked societal level objective (the three highest ranked objectives were all sector level).

3.3.13.3 Stakeholder relevance

No data provided

3.3.13.4 Indicator development

AND	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of companies registered and recognized as handmade production• Improvement of services, structures and resources for organic farmers• Differentiation of production systems (quality)	

3.3.13.5 Indicator voting and discussion

Indicators	% of final vote	AND
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improvement of services, structures and resources for organic farmers	AND (55%)	No discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of companies registered and recognized as handmade production	AND (36%)	No discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Differentiation of production systems (quality)	AND (9%)	No discussion

3.3.14 New objective B – Maintaining and enhancing consumer awareness and trust in organic food - NL

3.3.14.1 Discussion of Objective

This new objective was thought to incorporate the former sectoral objectives 5 “Maintaining and enhancing the integrity of organic principles and food” and 6 “Promoting understanding of the concept and potential of organic farming in society”.

3.3.14.2 Voting for Objective

This objective was ranked third in the NL with 11% of the total vote. Objectives 4 and 9 also received 11% of the vote but subsequent discussion resulted in objective 4 being ranked second and objective 9 fourth.

3.3.14.3 Stakeholder relevance

	AND	CZ	DE	DK	ENG	IT	NL	SI
Information								
Training/extension							+	
Research							+ No data	
Producer								
Processor								
Market Actor							No data	
Consumer								
Certification								
Administration								
Policy maker							++	
Environment/Animal Welfare NGO								
Other								

3.3.14.4 Indicator discussion*

Indicators	% of final vote	NL
• Market research	No data	Collected by Biologica in the Ekomonitor yearly reports or can be derived from additional qualitative market research by GfK.
• Sales of organic products in % or €	No data	Collected by Biologica in the Ekomonitor yearly reports or can be derived from additional qualitative market research by GfK.

* These were the only two indicators provided, therefore the voting process did not take place and both indicators were discussed.

3.4 Workshop Evaluation

3.4.1 AND

The level of conflict between participants was low as they all belonged to the organic movement - invited conventional organisations sent their organic section representatives as participants. The major areas of conflict in the workshop

surrounded the issue of the EU Logo, common EU Standards and international and national organic markets. The comparison of the 8 national Action Plans presented by the ORGAP project team was criticised, because it suggested that Actions Plans with quantitative goals are better than those with only qualitative aims e.g. Andalusian Action Plan, in which stakeholders decided the formulation and did not specify quantitative goals.

3.4.2 CZ

The workshop was mutually enriching for participants who picked up a range of new information related to the organic farming sector from other participants who came from a broad range of backgrounds (consultancy, manufacturing industry, agriculture, economics etc.). Discussion was dominated by a mostly friendly atmosphere and participants endeavoured to collectively find a solution to discussion issues. Most participants very positively evaluated the workshop and enjoyed the interactivity of moving around the room to fill in indicators etc.- they had not passively sat down and the workshop was very alive.

3.4.3 DE

Workshop guidelines had to be slightly adapted to the expectations of the workshop participants (no further work on the societal goals of the European Action Plan) The pre workshop material for participants was too voluminous therefore not all had read the material. The quality of the participants was very high (known and powerful representatives of the German organic sector), resulting in interesting discussions without fundamental conflicts between the participants. It was very difficult to get the full range of participants to the workshop despite best efforts. The workshop corroborated the urgency to debate the revision of the organic regulation together with (including) the organic sector. Development of the indicators was exciting and partly very creative / productive and debate on objectives / indicators highlighted where a deeper activity in the development of the indicators is needed i.e. less on the Societal level objectives, more on the Sector level objectives). The ORGAP team from Hohenheim as well as the participants were very content concerning the process of the workshop, the successful teamwork of the participants and its results.

3.4.4 ENG

The input we received from participants attending the workshop was valuable and the general consensus was that the workshop was of value for them to attend. Of the participants that attended for the entire workshop, three had considerable experience in the organic sector, the organic action plan and previous similar workshops, and three had less experience but none the less made a valuable contribution. It was very difficult to get the whole range of participants to attend the workshop and whilst it would have taken slightly longer to get through the day with more people present a wider range of backgrounds and views of participants would have been valuable. Most participants that attended highlighted the value to the day for them personally.

3.4.5 IT

Three of the people invited did not participate without informing the facilitator and due to the fact that there were elections on the 9th and 10th of April no policy-maker or environmental/animal welfare NGOs representatives were present at the workshop.

A lot of time was spent on the synergies and conflicts session (1 hour longer than the agenda allowed). In addition people did not find the session very interesting since the list of main areas of potential synergy between the EU action plan and national policies did not fit to the Italian Action Plan. In general, the workshop had a friendly atmosphere. During the effective discussion there was good communication and interesting conversation.

3.4.6 NL

The programme, procedure and instructions for the workshop were sufficiently outlined in the guidelines and other documents received from Wales and Denmark. The amount of paper work including background documents was too much though and the time span between finalizing the documents and the actual workshop too short. The participation in the workshop was lower then we had hoped for, but the quality of the participants present was high. Therefore we are satisfied with the final results of the workshop. The next national workshop beginning 2007 should be planned more in advance to ensure higher stakeholder participation. Furthermore, the programme of the workshop should preferably be agreed upon with the main stakeholders in The Netherlands. Perhaps it can somehow be combined with the actual evaluation of the Dutch Action Plan, which is planned for 2007 as well.

3.5 Participant evaluation

Positive Comments	Negative Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory methodology of the workshop very dynamic – scoring • Measuring abstract ideas in practical way • Well organised • Sending written information in advance • Building up consensus • Ideas exchange • Diversity of opinions and points of view • Good leadership – keeping track of clear target and its accomplishment • Schedule was followed • Friendly atmosphere • Delicious refreshment • Constructive working atmosphere of the participants • Fast and effective working on a high level • Stimulating discussion with a glance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small participant group • Not much time for discussion • Some sectors representatives were not present in the discussion • Too many things to discuss in one day • The assignment was complicated and asked for high expertise in this area (self-criticism, not for other stakeholders). • Needed better understanding of the aim of the workshop (English and Czech) • Doubt about the influence on policy decisions • Fear, that as a participant of the workshop / stakeholder of the organic sector one is exploited by the Commission, as through participation one partly accepts the Action Plan (the same is guilty for cooperation as a contractor, e.g. the information + marketing campaign of the EU) • Development of indicators needs

<p>in the future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation team and facilitator found the balance between the project needs, the utility for the participants, the time schedule and principal openness • Seldom experienced such a broad and deep discussion as in the morning – enjoyed it very much • Learnt much about the European Action Plan, got new ideas about it • Broad spectrum of participants • Good preparation helped to bring all participants – with different backgrounds and experiences – to a good and common level for the cooperative work • Very keen to be involved in the process as it unfolds and receive papers/updates etc. as they become available. • Keen to help and input into the process in anyway that I can and will to input (provide updates etc) and provide back to Defra policy colleagues and Organic Action Plan members if that would be useful. • Objectives ok(ish). Business approach would say that you can't manage what you can't measure. Objectives should be smart etc. Rather than trying to pitch the sort of indicators we were considering, the alternative might be detailed monitoring on a sample of organic farms then multiplying this up by the organic area. • Good venue and hospitality • Interesting day which went fast. • Interesting methodology • Good generic objectives selection • Clear process. • Open conversations. 	<p>more time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time limitations meant important topics (indicators) couldn't be discussed – limited reflection and brainstorming • Missing policy makers and practitioners (farming, processing) • It would have been helpful to get some insight into the evaluation tool-box prior to the workshop • Methodically: the criteria in the beginning should be wider stretched [broader fundament for the criteria] • Generally sceptical and critical about the EU Action Plan – absurdity of the EU-policy is reflected in the EU scientific projects • Some individuals dominated discussion but were not very open to other people's views. • A pity that key individuals were absent. • Indicators definition should be based on a cost/benefit analysis, in other cases we have just theoretical indicators • Objectives should be defined with more precision • Methodology concerning the vote system should be improved • Distribute information more in advance. • More information needed on comparison with EU member states. • A small group of participants. • Overlap of some objectives (sector and societal). • I would have preferred to receive the Dutch and EU Action Plan prior to the workshop.
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice to receive the action plans in advance. • Active participation of all participants. • All relevant participants were present. 	
--	--

3.6 Workshop organizer review

From the workshop organizers reports and the participant feedback, it appears that the workshops ran smoothly and achieved what was required in the rather restrictive time allowance of a one day workshop. Many participants were complementary of the workshop methodology which enabled them to move about the meeting room and allowed equal participation through the sticker voting process. One of the main negative criticisms was the lack of certain participant categories from the groups which narrowed the focus of discussion somewhat. This issue was also highlighted by workshop organizers who found it very difficult to get the full range of desirable participants present on the same day. Most participants who attended showed a desire to be kept up to date with the workshop outcomes and developments and also to be kept informed about the wider ORGAP project.

3.7 Conclusions

The emphasis after the objective voting process was very much on the sectoral-level objectives with only the “sustainable use of resources” and “maintaining and enhancing the environment” society level objectives being prioritised in more than one country. “Maintaining and enhancing the technical and financial performance of organic farms and related food-sector businesses” was the most popular objective, being prioritised in 5 of the 8 countries/regions.

Prioritised indicators were developed for each of the objectives identified in the workshops as being of high importance. These outputs from the workshop will now be used to develop the ORGAP Evaluation Toolbox Section C3 (Defined objectives and indicators) where key issues identified in the workshops will be taken up.