

Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources

Key Action n° 5

Sustainable agriculture, fisheries and forestry, and integrated development of rural areas including mountain areas

## Concerted Action DOLPHINS

Development of Origin Labelled Products :  
Humanity, Innovation and Sustainability

Contract QLK5-2000-0593

### WP 3

Link between  
Origin Labelled Products :  
and rural development

*Final Report*

July 2002

**Project Coordinator :**

**France (B. Sylvander, INRA-UREQUA, Le Mans)**

**Project Partners :**

**France** [INRA-ESR ETIC, Toulouse] [INRA-LRDE, Corte] [CMC Avocats, Le Mans]

**Italy** [University of Parma - IEAF] [CRPA, Reggio Emilia] [University of Florence - DES]

**Switzerland** [SRVA Lausanne]  **Germany** [TUM-PFM, Freising]  **Spain** [SIA-DGA, Zaragoza]

**United Kingdom** [University of Newcastle - AEFM] [University of Edinburgh - IERM]

**Belgium** [FUL-SEED, Arlon]  **Finland** [University of Helsinki - DEM]

**Portugal** [INIAP-DEEESA, Oeiras]



# Contents WP 3

## Link between OLP and rural development

<b>Part I : SYNTHESIS</b>	<b>(Giovanni Belletti, Andrea Marescotti, Università di Firenze, DES, Italy)</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>		<b>7</b>
<b>1.1. FRAMEWORK</b>		<b>7</b>
1.1.1. Obligations of WP 3		7
1.1.2. Members of WP 3		7
1.1.3. Methodology		8
<b>1.2. MAIN FINDINGS</b>		<b>9</b>
1.2.1. The definition of the two terms of the link		9
1.2.2. General overview of the link OLPs - RD		10
1.2.3. Main issues : multifunctionality (co-ordinator : G. Allaire, INRA-ESR Toulouse, France)		11
1.2.4. Main issues : strategies (co-ordinators : G. Belletti, A. Marescotti, Università du Firenze, DSE, Italy)		13
1.2.5. Main issues : evaluation (co-ordinator : E. Stucki, ETHZ-IER, Lausanne, Switzerland)		16
1.2.6. Special focus on the role of PDO and PGI		17
<b>1.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW RESEARCH</b>		<b>18</b>
<b>1.4. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		<b>18</b>
<b>PART II : LITERATURE REVIEW</b>		<b>21</b>
Belgium	<i>(Marc Mormont, FUL-SEED, Arlon)</i>	23
France	<i>(Gilles Allaire, INRA-ESR/ETIC, Castanet Tolosan)</i>	29
	<i>(Jean-Antoine Prost, INRA-LRDE, Corte)</i>	37
Italy	<i>(Elisa Montresor, Università di Verona, DESI, Sezione Politica Economia Agraria)</i>	47
	<i>(Alessandro Pacciani, Giovanni Belletti, Andrea Marescotti, Università di Firenze, DSE)</i>	55
Portugal	<i>(Jérônimo Côte Real Santos, DRAEDM-DPA, São Torcato ; Laura Larcher Graça, INIA-EAN-DEESA, Oeiras)</i>	71
Spain	<i>(Antonio Colom-Gorgues, Universidad de Lleida, ETSEA, AEGERN)</i>	77
Switzerland	<i>(Stéphane Boisseaux, UNIL, Lausanne ; Erwin W. Stucki, ETHZ-IER, Lausanne)</i>	91
<b>ANNEXES</b>		<b>103</b>
01 - DSE Firenze, DEESA Oeiras, "WP3 Guidelines (Link between OLP and rural development) "		105
02 - Belletti G., Marescotti A., "WP3 (Link between OLP and rural development) Literature Review. Synthesis", sept 2001		111
03 - 2001 Florence Meeting – WP3 Session – Programme		121
04 - Basile E., Cecchi C., "Beyond the Sectors: an Analysis of economic Differentiation in Rural Economy"		125
05 - Pesce A. "The role of EU policies in fostering typical products: LEADER experience"		131
06 - Haussman C., "Valorisation strategies for typical products and rural development: problems and opportunities"		135
07 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Programme		141
08 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Belletti, "Produits typiques, multifonctionnalité et développement rural: cadre d'analyse et questions ouvertes"		145
09 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Olivier " Signes Officiels de Qualité: Comment évaluer leurs retombées socio- économiques et territoriales ? Une étude prospective dans la région Midi-Pyrénées (NUTS II)		163
10 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Stucki, " Proposition de méthodes pour évaluer l'impact économique régional de projets (projets à caractère d'investissement "		193
11 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Mormont "Multifonctionnalité et produits spécifiques. Pistes de discussion"		203
12 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Allaire " Multifonctionnalité et rôle des OLP dans le nouveau modèle européen d'agriculture: pistes de discussion"		213
13 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Montresor " Comment évaluer la contribution des produits typiques au développement des zones rurales"		221
14 - 2002 WP3 Barcelone Seminar – Boisseaux and Stucki, "Note for WP3"		227
15 - 2002 Paris Meeting – WP3 Plenary Session: Belletti-Marescotti, "Introductory Report"		233
16 - 2002 Paris Meeting – WP3 Parallel Session: Allaire, "Position paper on Multifunctionality"		237
17 - 2002 Paris Meeting – WP3 Parallel Session: Belletti-Marescotti, "Position paper on Strategy"		241
18 - 2002 Paris Meeting – WP3 Parallel Session: Boisseaux -Stucki, "Position paper on Evaluation"		251
19 - 2002 Paris Meeting – WP3 Plenary Session: Belletti-Marescotti, "Synthesis Report"		265

**Part 1**

# **Synthesis WP 3**

**Link between Origin Labelled Products  
and rural development**

**Giovanni Belletti, Andrea Marescotti**

**Università di Firenze  
Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche  
Italia**

## INTRODUCTION

Rural development is progressively becoming one of the major objectives of the EU policies. Both a widespread literature and the policy adopted by the EU stress the importance of supporting Origin Labelled Products (OLPs) to attain this objective. Actually OLPs are strictly tied to their area of origin, as they derive their characteristics from the paedoclimatic, technical, organisational and cultural peculiarities of the "terroir" they come from. They are often considered useful "tools" to preserve local culture and traditions, and to keep economic and social activities and foster rural development, especially in disadvantaged and mountain areas (marginal rural areas).

The link between OLPs and rural development is an important aspect of the wider problem the whole Dolphins project is facing, because it pays attention on the very nature of OLPs, which, by definition, originate their specificity from the characters of the territory, and may be analysed as a component of rural economy and also of rural society.

The present document aims at synthesising the work done during Dolphins Concerted Action, Task 1 - Workpackage n.3 "Link between OLPs and rural development" and the main findings which have been found up to now.

## 1.1. FRAMEWORK

### 1.1.1. Objectives of the WP 3

Workpackage n.3 focused on the link between OLP products and rural development. As stated in DOLPHINS Technical annex, the objectives of WP3 were:

- ??Analysis of theoretical and analytical tools and methods used in the analysis of connections between OLP and rural development
- ??Analysis of the link between OLP and rural development: have OLPs an impact on rural development and to which conditions? How rural development can help to re-launch OLPs? Case-studies
- ??Environment and sustainability of OLP production and marketing systems in rural areas
- ??Impact on employment and income (firms and rural systems): analysis of the inter-connections between OLP and other economic, social and cultural activities in rural areas (tourism, craft, industrial activities, services, etc.); integrated sustainable rural development
- ??Role of information transmission, education, formation, training
- ??Marketing of OLP products in rural areas: the role of rural tourism and agri-tourism, landscape, and environmental, cultural, artistic resources in the marketing of OLP products; new OLP promotional and marketing methods linked to rural development
- ??Policies: analysis of public policies affecting the link between OLP and rural development, with special reference to EU rural development policies (Agenda 2000, Structural Funds, LEADER) and national-local rural development policies
- ??Assessing the legal protection of OLP with regards to EU and WTO regulations and providing EU with diagnosis of negotiations basis
- ??Identifying needs for further research

### 1.1.2. Members of the WP 2

WP3 was co-ordinated by Giovanni Belletti and Andrea Marescotti (DSE Florence - Italy). In the first phase (up to the First Plenary Meeting in Florence) the assistants were Antonio Fragata and Larcher Graca (IRIA - Portugal). From Florence Meeting up to the end of Task 1 the assistants were Erwin Stucki and Stéphan Boisseaux (ETHZ / SRVA - Switzerland).

Country	Partner	Researchers
France	INRA – ETIQ	G. Allaire, V.Olivier
France	INRA – LRDE	J.A. Prost
Italy	University of Parma – UNIPR	E. Montresor
Italy	University of Florence – DSE – UNIFI	G.Belletti, A.Marescotti, A.Pacciani
Switzerland	ETHZ / SRVA	E.Stucki, S.Boisseaux
Spain	Unidad De Economia Agraria Servicio de Investigation Agroalimentaria	A.Colom Gorgues
Belgium	Fondation Universitaire Luxembourgeoise – FUL	M. Mormont
Portugal	IRIA	A.Fragata, L.Graca, J.Corte Real Santos

WP3 had 14 participants, representing 8 Dolphins Units and 6 countries: Portugal, Spain, Italy, France, Belgium, Switzerland. In addition, other external experts took part during the two plenary meeting (Florence and Paris): in particular S.Lucatelli (OECD), E.Barham (University of Missouri-Columbia, Usa), C.Cecchi (University of Rome, Italy), A.Pesce (INEA, Rome), C.Haussman (Cogea, Italy).

### 1.1.3. Methodology

#### Phase 1 (from month 0 to the First Plenary Meeting – Florence)

The main steps in the phase 1 were:

- Distribution of the Guidelines by the WP3 co-ordinators (Annex n. 1) in order to prepare the Review and Discussion Reports;
- Review and Discussion Reports from each partner (Part II : Literature Review);
- Florence Meeting (see programme of WP3 session in annex n. 3):
  - paper presentation by external experts: Claudio Cecchi, University of Rome – La Sapienza, Italy (Annex n. 4); Alessandra Pesce - INEA – Rome, Italy (Annex n. 5) and Carlo Haussman - COGEA, Italy (Annex n. 6);
  - analysis and discussion of the Review and Discussion Reports;
  - paper presentations by WP3 members (see Dolphins Web page for papers presented);

The first Plenary meeting (Florence Meeting) allowed each participant to bring experiences and results of research activities in his/her country of origin with reference to the objectives of the WP, and to exchange research results and methodologies, to discuss the main issues in order to meet the objectives, and to select relevant common issues to be developed.
- Analysis and synthesis of Review and Discussion Reports prepared by the WP3 co-ordinators on the basis of Florence Meeting discussions (see Synthesis of Review and Discussion Reports – annex n. 2).

#### Phase 2 (seminars, reference to the working papers and progress reports, interviews, cross readings, etc..)

- The phase 2 aimed at deepening three main issues identified during the first months of work and during the First Plenary Meeting in Florence. The issues identified as the most relevant for exploring the link between OLPs and rural development were:
  - 1) multifunctionality of OLPs and rural development;
  - 2) OLPs-based strategy and rural development;
  - 3) evaluation of OLPs impact on rural development.

Development of selected issues was based on bibliographical research, discussions and interviews with firms, public institutions and other relevant operators, and information and experience exchanges within WP3 participants.
- A Seminar was organised in Barcelone on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2002 (see the programme in Annex n. 7) in order to discuss some papers produced by WP3 participants on the above mentioned three main issues (annexes nn. 8-14).
- After Barcelone Seminar WP3 participants exchanged notes about the specified issues, and prepared basic documents for the Second Plenary Meeting. In addition, as stated in Paris Steering Committee (march 2002), WP responsables prepared Cross Reviews on the Synthesis of Review and Discussion Reports. WP3 responsables received useful reviews from Luis Miguel Albisu (WP2 responsible) and from François Casabianca (WP1 responsible)

#### Phase 3 (Paris meeting: working papers, reports and discussions)

- The second Plenary meeting (Paris, 6-7<sup>th</sup> may 2002) put together further developments of research activities, and the results of the activity brought on to develop the selected specific issues.
- During the Second Plenary Meeting the co-ordinators produced an Introduction report (see annex n. 15) and a Synthesis Report (see annex n. 19) for the plenary sessions.
- The WP3 parallel session was divided into three parts, according to the three main issues identified. During each part a discussion was held among WP3 participants and other external participants on the basis of three position papers prepared by Issue co-ordinators (see annexes nn. 16-18). A synthesis of the results of the discussion is reported in this Final Report (see point 1.2, "Main findings").

## 1.2. MAIN FINDINGS

### 1.2.1. The definition of the two terms of the link

Review & Discussion (RD) Reports from participants underlined the lack of scientific work - both theoretical and practical - on this subject, and very few contributions specifically deals with this subject. As preliminary step, WP3 focused on the definition of OLPs, and on the definition of rurality and rural development.

#### **a) for a definition of OLPs.**

As regards the definition of OLPs many RD Reports (Part II : Literature review) underlined that OLPs are non only the products which are protected on the basis of some national or European regulations, but each product which is tightly linked to a specific geographical origin. OLPs are based on some kind of specific rural resource, both material or immaterial, that cannot be reproduced outside that particular local context, due to physic and climatic resources, but also to immaterial resources.

This recalls the importance of considering the nature of "patrimonial good" of OLPs (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-LRDE, Corte]), and the role of local community, culture, identity, and contextual knowledge. OLPs are very often characterised by a "collective dimension", in the sense that they are linked not only with the skills of more firms, but also with locally created public goods and with the history, habits and culture of the local community. OLPs are known outside their production area not principally by means of the firms names (private marks), but by means of "geographical name" of the territory they come from, which can be used also unfairly by local firms not complying with "local rules" (written or not) and also by non local firms.

OLPs can also be seen as a social construction made by some actors along time on the basis of some local resources, and which is validated by the outside by means of geographical indications or other tools. The construction of the link between the product and the geographical origin can be based on a differentiated combination of local resources.

If we adopt a wider concept of OLP, not only a "unique" product, but just as identified for their provenience (local or regional), conclusion WP3 has reached may change a lot.

#### **b) for a definition of rural areas, rural economy, rural development.**

The definition of rural areas is quite vague and variable both in economic literature and in statistical sources. There are many definitions of rurality, often depending on the objectives of the researchers or policymakers analysis. Often rural areas are simply defined as "non urban", stressing low demographic density, sometimes coupled to the importance of agricultural activity. Also in many WP3 R&D Reports (Part II : Literature Review), it is implicit a different concept of "rural": sometimes rural is very close to "agricultural", other time close to "local" (with special emphasis on local development and small-medium enterprises). There is also a concept of rural which refer to "regional", and finally the term is used to refer to the concept of rurality, and more exactly rural development, chosen by the European Union.

The meaning of the term "rural" changes along time, adapting to the more general economic and social change. Especially in recent times, the "agrarian" and the "non urban" concepts has been substituted by a more articulated one, following the social and economic changes observed in "non urban" areas and the variability of situations and trends. Sector and spatial economic differentiation and integration are now considered key elements of rurality. In more dynamic terms, many researchers underline the importance of characterising rurality according to the presence of a dependency/autonomy relationship regards to other development centres (industrial sectors, urban areas).

Rurality should be seen as the result of a global interrelation between agriculture and society: new economic models emerge, no more based (only) on scale economies but rather on scope economies, diversification, new connections between the actors. This lead to a new agricultural and rural development model. These transformations affects also transformations at the firm level (redefinition of identities, strategies, practices, interrelations and networks). The rural is no more the monopoly of farmers: new actors emerges.

Rural development is no more agricultural growth or development only, but it should consider multifunctionality of agricultural firms and more generally the integration of all the economic and social activities at a local level (tourism, craft or industrial manufacturing, services, social activities).

Starting from the middle of the Eighties, the concept of rural development has started to be inserted in the Common Agricultural Policy with a quite clear definition. Rural Development policy of the European Union is more and more oriented towards a support of diversification of economic and social activities in rural areas, in order to increase quality of life and rural resources for local and external citizens. Besides, recent approaches consider Rural Development in an endogenous and sustainable dimension: this means that community participation in the definition of objectives (bottom-up), the role of local resources (goods, skills, contextual knowledge) and the respect of natural and social environment, take a central role in rural development process (annex n. 2).

## 1.2.2. General overview of the link OLPs - RD

Some contributions (Part II : Literature Review Belgium, Italy [Univ. of Florence and Univ. of Parma], Switzerland and annex n. 4) stressed the effects of the process of "homologation" / modernisation of agriculture, caused by the diffusion of behaviour models that are typical of the urban and industrial sector, both at the production and consumption level. The so-called homologated agriculture tends to lose part of its sector specificities, and to attain an efficient use of resources through scale economies and also through the transfer of resources to other sectors. Nevertheless the homologation process doesn't involve the whole agricultural sector in a uniform way, and in particular the most marginal and disadvantaged areas, where the capacity of reacting to the evolution of production techniques and competitive pressures is limited. Therefore a non-homologated agriculture persists. Production factors of non-homologated agriculture – owing to their specificity – are not easily transferable to the homologated model, and hence they cannot gain an adequate remuneration. This process results in a crisis of traditional farming and processing systems, and in a growth in marginality and abandon of agriculture in marginal rural areas, with evident deep social effects.

Production and valorisation processes of OLPs are frequently based on specific non-transferable local assets (both of material - i.e. specific plant varieties or animal breed - and immaterial kind - i.e. local knowledge and culture). The production of OLP often represents a founding part of non-homologated agriculture, within which the resources, locked into rural areas, are the basis of rural development processes. As a consequence, the OLP may work as a rural development tool which the local community may use to allow a remuneration and therefore a reproduction of the resources, included the social, cultural and human capital. As a matter of fact empirical evidence shows how the typical product is often used as a pivot in the collective strategies of rural development.

OLPs are often considered as representative of agriculture (and rural society) resistance to modernisation and globalisation ("anti-mainstream" vision: see Part II : Literature Review Switzerland), but sometimes this vision is brought on by consumers or cultural associations rather than farmers associations (see Part II :Literature Review Belgium and Italy [Univ. of Florence]).

OLPs-based initiatives are hence a part of a more general model of quality differentiation which characterises recent evolution of agro-food system, and they make reference to the innovation based on hedonic and cultural attributes, and on identities. The post-Fordist transition requires flexibility and differentiation. Competition is based on quality and differentiated food for the new consumption patterns, and production costs are less important than "quality".

In the previous points implicit reference has been made to an «archetypal» model of OLP (conceptualised by Stéphane Boisseaux during Barcelone Seminar) (annex n. 14; see also annex n. 15 "the virtuous circle"): an agro-food typical product resulting from a collective and territorialised tradition. OLP is hence strictly linked to a physical *terroir*, which is revealed by a local specific know-how which in turn derives from a local social system. From the hinging of OLP to the different dimensions of the territory follows that:

OLP ARCHETYPE CHARACTERISTICS		EFFECTS ON RD AND ON THE TERRITORY
OLP typicity comes from local natural resources	↗	Sustainable exploitation of natural resources
OLP production factors are not reproducible nor transposable	↗	Localisation of economic activities
OLP know-how is site-specific and it is based on a organised local community	↗	Localisation of know-how transmission and support to the reproduction of local social system
The name of OLP is the name of the place	↗	Promotion of the global image of the territory, and feedback effects on the OLP
OLP supports the territorial identity of the producers and of the local population	↗	Territory is the space framework which guarantees the product identity

In the real world there is not only one «model» of OLP, but there is a set of differentiated situations: correspondence of real OLPs to the «archetypal» model is not the rule. Moreover, OLPs are not steady but they cover complex trajectories and are subject to evolutions depending also on the transformations at a local system scale and on firms strategies; in the same territory very often there are a number of OLPs which are interrelated. As a consequence, evidence points out that OLPs by itself have not positive effects on rural development concerning the sustainable exploitation and remuneration of local (natural and non natural) resources, the localisation of economic activities and know-how transmission process, the support to the reproduction of local social system. The positive effects of OLPs on rural development depend on the strategies local and non local actors activate.

### **The two dimensions of the link between OLPs and «rural»**

Many RD Reports (Part II : Literature Review Italy [Univ. of Florence], Portugal, Spain and Switzerland) recall the positive effects of the presence of OLPs on rural economy and society ("OLPs virtuous circle"), but all the RD Reports underlined a general lack of scientific works which deepen this kind of link. Besides, much of the positive impact depends on the

characteristics of the local system, more or less far from the Archetype. Two strictly tied dimensions can be identified when analysing the relationship between OLPs and rural development:

- A. the impact of OLPs on rural *economy*;
- B. the impact of OLPs on rural *development*.

### **A. The impact of OLPs on rural economy**

Fostering the development of OLPs in rural areas may help to keep agricultural and, more generally, economic and social activities in rural areas. The reproduction of resources linked to OLP within the rural area give the basis to the activities of supply-chain firms and to other firms and institutions not directly involved in the production process of the typical product.

- a) Give support to rural economy inside the OLPs supply chains: OLPs can improve the competitiveness of the local firms, especially small-medium sized (Part II : Literature Review Spain), and can have positive effects on the firms belonging to the specific supply chain within the area of production, and by this way, on rural economy (Part II : Literature Review Belgium, France, Italy [Univ. of Parma], Portugal, Spain and Switzerland). Actually, this kind of effects, and also production and marketing strategies of the firms, are mainly considered within WP2.
- b) Give support to rural economy outside the OLPs supply chains: more close to WP3 interests are the effects that OLPs may have on other economic activities within the production area. As a matter of fact, as recalled in many RD Reports (Part II : Literature Review France, Italy [Univ. of Florence], Portugal and Switzerland), OLPs can foster other economic activities - such as hospitality (hotels, agri-tourisms, restaurants), handicraft activities, services - and a higher level of integration between economic sectors in the rural economy, and also within the same agricultural firm. The integration of economic activities within the rural area is by many authors considered as a pre-condition for rural development. These effects are reached in particular when the product is sold in the area, and when firms of the supply chain are not "single-product", and they have an interest in developing others economic activities. On these aspect an important contribution has been given by Alessandra Pesce (annex n. 5), who has taken in exam the role of OLPs within LEADER initiatives. Actually there are some studies focusing their attention on some promotional initiatives trying to connect the OLP to other activities in the area of production, so this dimension is quite well covered by scientific work and often present in the RD Reports.

### **B. The impact of OLPs on rural development**

The second dimension identified refers to the impact of OLPs on rural development / dynamics. Development results from the strategies of private, collective and public actors, coupled to a structural dynamic (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-ESR Toulouse]). Which are the economic and social structures able to let the specific rural resources OLPs are based on to be reproduced along time? Which are the institutional and governance structures? Which are the connections between OLPs and rural economy, society and culture? How can an OLP help activating endogenous rural development strategies?

One way to analyse the effects of OLPs on rural dynamics is to look at actors' dynamics around OLPs, and in particular the *rationale* of the different valorisation strategies. The typical product represents a potential resource for the rural system, as much as it stimulates aggregation and strategies leading to the creation of value through the product itself. Around the OLP local actors can build strategies for creating economic value on the basis of local specificities and resources. Sometimes OLPs can be considered as "cultural markers" for local populations and institutions. As emerges also by some WP3 RD Report, the OLP acquires a "patrimonial status" (Part II : Literature Review Belgium, France [INRA-LRDE Corte], Italy [Univ. of Florence] and Switzerland) for the local community. This way of considering OLPs helps understanding the *rationale* of many promotional activities implemented on typical products, and the different interests shown by actors within and outside the production area.

### **1.2.3. Main issues: multifunctionality (co-ordinator: Gilles Allaire)**

Multifunctionality refers to the fact that an economic activity may have multiple outputs and thus may contribute to several societal objectives at once, by way of the market and by producing positive externalities. The concept of multifunctionality conveys the idea that agriculture, from a social point of view, cannot be seen as producing only generic agrofood products (or fibre) (annex n. 12). The multifunctionality of agriculture is not a recent phenomena. However, the conception of multifunctionality and the value of different externalities of agriculture activities accorded to it by public institutions, citizens or professionals has varied over time. The recent introduction of the multifunctionality of agriculture in policy debates can be seen in relation to the general context of a restructuring of agricultural economy. But, in this context, it can relate to very different positions. This note develops three points to clarify the issue: (1) the definition of multifunctionality and its implications for economic analysis, (2) the multifunctional character of Origin Labeled Products (OLPs), (3) some implications for policy.

## **1) the definition of multifunctionality and its implications on economic analysis**

Multifunctionality has taken over the debate on agricultural policy reform at the multinational level. But approaches to multifunctionality vary according to national positions in this debate and OECD has undertaken a work program to produce a common working definition. According to a recent OECD report (2001), *"the key elements of multifunctionality are: i) the existence of multiple commodity and non-commodity outputs that are jointly produced by agriculture; and ii) the fact that some of the non-commodity outputs exhibit the characteristics of externalities or public goods, with the result that markets for these goods do not exist or function poorly."* The same report notes that *"there are essentially two approaches to the analysis of multifunctionality. One is to interpret multifunctionality as a characteristic of an economic activity. Some of the outputs are valued in existing markets, whereas others may elude the market mechanism. (...) This view can be termed the "positive" concept of multifunctionality. (...) The second way of interpreting multifunctionality is in terms of multiple roles assigned to agriculture. In this view, agriculture as an activity is entrusted with fulfilling certain functions in society. Consequently, multifunctionality is not merely a characteristic of the production process, it takes on a value in itself. Maintaining a multifunctional activity or making an activity "more" multifunctional, can become a policy objective. This view can be termed the "normative" concept of multifunctionality."* Dealing with the positive interpretation, the report examines the degrees of jointness and the market failures for different outputs associated with agricultural activities. But positive and normative approaches of multifunctionality are not separable as far as collective action and public policies are concerned.

To undertake action for a "more" multifunctional agriculture, we must list the desired outputs (normative definition), and analyse (positively) the actual forms of provision of these goods and subsequent plans of action, which have normative implications. The introduction of multifunctionality by OECD Agriculture Ministers at their meeting of March 5-6, 1998, conveyed this sense of the concept in recognising *"that beyond its primary function of supplying food and fibre, agricultural activity can also shape the landscape, provide environmental benefits such as land conservation, the sustainable management of renewable natural resources and the preservation of biodiversity, and contribute to the socio-economic viability of many rural areas"* (cited in OECD, 2001).

One difficulty of the use of the concept of multifunctionality in policy debate is that the jointness and market failure invoked in the definition are not absolute characteristics of a given activity, but depend instead on the technologies, social structures of production and market institutions that frame it (annexes nn. 8, 11, 12, 16, 20). Thus the classic definition refers to ambivalent situations. If the jointness is regarded as absolute for certain outputs than can be considered as national public goods, multifunctionality can be an argument invoked to protect a national agriculture from the destructuring effects of liberalisation (OLPs are not implicated in this perspective). On the contrary, a deficit of (positive) multifunctionality can be attributed to the model of production and policies developed in the previous decades. If there is a failure of agriculture in securing the many functions which are or should be considered part of it, we should seek an explanation in the structural characteristics of the model of agricultural development during the years of growth (since WWII). This failure is doubtless a failure of the first Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), in which case multifunctionality refers to an alternative concept of agriculture, such as the one inspiring the "European agricultural model" which Agenda 2000 aims to promote. Thus the potential impact of multifunctionality is not restricted to only one type of policy instrument or debate. Policies, market institutions (particularly in the sense of the capacity of the market to differentiate qualities) and professional and collective competencies will be affected by the issue (annex n. 12).

In the perspective of a possible action on the set of functions that are articulated in multifunctionality, two public strategies are usually considered. The creation of (public) markets for functions corresponding to external effects is one of them, which therefore considers this effects to be goods which can be separated from the production of agricultural products (markets in environmental services). The second is to favour a qualitative differentiation between technologies and agricultural products considering different contexts. But, no single model of action exists and taking new dimensions of agriculture into account can produce contradictions.

Multifunctionality is not, by itself, a normative concept. The normative framework of multifunctionality that is generally recognised derives from "sustainable development". Multifunctionality as a normative approach to changing agricultural practices depends on the (social) construction and diffusion of sustainable development principles. It must be emphasised that multifunctionality, by nature, is not a technical standard of production or a product quality. The effectiveness of it must be evaluated as much by considering local impacts of agricultural practices as by considering the overarching goals for agriculture that have emerged from the consensus of society. However, a logical link emerges between the two levels. Global goals or objectives can only be reached through local action and change. Conversely, local actors are entitled to claim that their actions have a global impact, for example that the rules of production governing their activity have a positive global outcome. Different production systems may be set up as "models". There are plenty of candidates, such as organic agriculture. We can also anticipate that advocates of the OLP model would want to join the list of multifunctional systems.

## **2) the multifunctional character of OLPs**

The issue of the multifunctional characteristic of OLPs does not concern global sectoral agricultural policy, because they represent a small share of agricultural production in the European Union. But policies to enhance multifunctionality can consider action in favour of OLPs if the production of this type of product has positive impacts on the environment (in comparison with other types of agricultural products), on the sustainable development of less favoured areas, or on other

general public values (such as cultural diversity), meaning that OLP systems of production provide local and global public goods. The results of the DOLPHINS project, and the discussion held by WP3 researchers, point out that OLP systems generally are such public goods providers, but that it is not a systematic characteristic. Provision of local environmental goods and amenities depends on several aspects of the economic organisation of the production and of the marketing and on the room of this activity in the local economy. Public cultural values of OLP systems have some relationship with their collective reputations.

One important point to be considered here is that if OLPs contribute to multifunctionality in providing local and global public goods, the provision of these goods is paid for by the consumers of these products (annex n. 8). If the premium (the payment for a specific quality) is sufficient to sustain an OLP system, existence of this system providing positive externalities is beneficial. In this perspective, issues that must be considered concern market institutions. One is the legal protection of OLPs, which concerns what we have called market institutions to differentiate qualities (for example, OLPs are covered by the TRIPS agreement, see WP1). The second issue concerns the actor's strategy of valorisation and its policy implications, which involves public regulation of quality signs and rural development policies (see next issue).

The multifunctionality of OLPs can be represented by a decomposition of their value into four categories (annex n. 16):

- Generic food or nutritional value, corresponding to the basic price of a generic substitute as food,
- Hedonistic (private) value, corresponding to the quality the consumer pays a premium for,
- Local public value (amenities),
- Global public value, environmental and cultural (meaning existence value).

The premium paid by the consumer corresponds to both the material characteristics linked with origin and the rules of production (generally an organoleptic quality), and to immaterial qualities (mainly referring to cultural value or the ambience of consumption). From the perspective of the consumer, it is difficult to distinguish between these different aspects (see WP4). The origin is considered to give the product typical sensorial qualities but they are not recognisable by all consumers. However, an indication of origin is generally regarded by consumers as a reassurance concerning a bundle of qualities (freshness...) and linked with global value (credence good). The ambiguity of the notion of origin leads us to link the premium paid by consumers to the "public" values associated with the product. But, in another sense, this ambiguity could be a weakness of the product identification. Potentially there are two strategies of communication, one referring to particular traits of the product (targeting the connoisseurs), the other to general attributes of origin that express public concerns (generally related to sustainable development). Are these two strategies compatible and reinforcing? This is not a given if the cultural value is a "club" (elite) good or concerns only a small community. To consider the global value of OLPS, it is necessary to delineate a wider concept of OLPs than one resting solely on the idea of a "unique" product.

On the side of the production, the origin specific quality is linked with the typicality (specificity) of the local resources, the method (rules) of production and the skills of the producer. These components have a more or less collective dimension (notably given by delimitation of the zone of production and rules that apply within it). But this quality can vary due to the capacities of the producer, so there is some trade-off between individual and collective reputation and thus a variability of the collective strategies of producers. But the public values (local and global) are strictly a collective outcome of a localised system of production. In enacting collective production rules, actors can enhance the production of public goods. And so we can distinguish between strategies that are more product oriented and strategies that are more oriented towards the territory of production.

From these remarks, we can see that the strategies of actors can give more or less importance to "typical" (cultural) quality or "multifunctional" (sustainable development) quality, as well as to their offering on the local versus the global market. On the local market, meaning in the area of production, the public value of the product is realized essentially through amenities as the "quality" and typicality of the landscape. OLPs can benefit from their relationship with associated products and services, for example their association with tourist areas (see next issue). Strategies of valorization of this kind may or may not use the PDO regulatory procedure. On the global market, it seems that to escape being merely a niche market product, a valorization strategy can be founded on a larger image of the territory of origin than the typical, intrinsic characteristics of the product. In this case, the PGI procedure may be more adapted (annex n. 2).

#### **1.2.4. Main issues: strategies (co-ordinators: Giovanni Belletti, Andrea Marescotti)**

Focussing on strategies means to analyse which actors are involved in OLPs protection and valorisation actions, how they behave, what are the effects of these valorisation strategies on rural development, and which is the role played by OLPs in rural development strategies. The analysis of the link between OLPs and rural development should focus on the mechanisms by which the economic and social resources at the basis of the typical product are reproduced (or not...), including the institutional and governance structures which are in charge to manage this process. If development means that private strategies are sufficiently compatible as to guarantee that a collective benefit is taken by the collective resource, then the point is how different individual and/or private valorisation strategies can give a contribution or may represent a hindrance to a positive global effect on rural development, sectorial integration, social cohesion.

OLPs give to local actors the opportunity to escape from the effects of the homologation model of agriculture and processing, aiming at creating a competitive advantage over mass-products and also in mass-distribution systems and by this way at remunerating specific local resources employed in the production process, preserving them from the dissolution.

Local actors very often identify OLPs also as a tool to join other aims, which are not strictly and directly linked to the provision of the good. In fact OLPs are capable to generate positive external effects in the rural areas (landscape, environment, image and reputation of the area, cultural identity, and so on), in line with the recent attention on multifunctionality of agriculture (see previous issue on multifunctionality). These external effects are interesting for various actors' groups, who try to implement strategies for capturing them, or for local public administrations interested in improving economic and social life in rural areas.

The opportunities offered by OLPs attract different actors. These actors can be highly heterogeneous: they can be directly involved in the activities of production and distribution of the product (within the supply chain) or not, they may have an individual or collective nature, and if they are collective they can be Public Administration Institutions (local administrations) and intermediate institutions (firms organisations, etc). In many cases they are external to the traditional area of production: for example the agents of the chain that are not local (as processing and distribution firms), scientific institutions, public institutions, consumption associations. Each actor has his own outlook on the typical product, which depends on his own interests (economic, social, political, scientific, etc.). The diversity of the actors leads to a diversity of objectives that are locally pursued through the valorisation of the product.

### **Construction and validation**

OLP valorisation strategies are processes aiming at creating new ways to articulate the link between the OLP local heritage and the general transformations at a global level, with the aim of giving coherence to OLP local (traditional) farming and processing systems with general consumers search for quality. Case studies analysis points out the central role of local actors in re-building this link. Local actors direct their actions on the basis of their interests, which can be convergent or lead to conflicts also at a local scale. The typology and the intensity of the effects on rural development arise from this game of co-operation and competition between local actors.

Two dimensions should be underlined concerning the role of local actors: an internal dimension (*construction-agreement*) and an external dimension (*validation-justification*) (annex n. 11).

*Internal dimension:* local actors re-build the links between OLPs and territories they come from, they recover and re-interpretate historical roots of the products and the link with local resources. Qualitative, collective and temporal dimensions are central in this definition (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-LRDE, Corte]). The OLPs-based strategies are hence a result of an agreement between local actors with regard to three dimensions:

- qualitative dimension: local differentiation and search for external acknowledgement (market and institutional);
- temporal dimension: recover the heritage and project it in the future;
- collective dimension: cohesion of local community and voluntary solidarity. We should also take into consideration the many individual initiatives around OLPs.

*External dimension:* local actors should articulate new relationships between OLP and external entities (markets, consumers, mass distribution chains, etc.). The role of OLPs in the local/rural development is strictly linked to the global context (socio-economical context and political context) (annex n. 12):

- at the institutional and protection level: the institutional tools for the valorisation of OLPs are elaborated at national and European level (EU Regulations), but also at world level (WTO negotiations)
- at the market evolution level: development of OLPs is a part of more general evolution of agro-food system development model. This evolution is characterised by a market differentiation (of a private, public and collective type) more and more centred on immaterial attributes of the products and by the transformation of the governance structures.

### **The effects of strategies on rural development**

Cultural heritage linked to an OLP is an asset that local (and non local) actors aim at employ in their strategies. Giving the diversity of actors' objectives, from an OLP-centered strategy can result very differentiated effects on different aspects of rural development. The effects of typical products valorisation strategies on rural development can be seen as the result of actors' behaviour and strategies around the typical product on the structure of local economy and society within rural spaces. Starting from a set of local resources, actors' behaviours (individual and collective action) build along time the OLP and activate actions aiming at giving value to the resources used in the production process by using a determined set of tools and methods. Individual and collective actions produce the effect of attaching value (or disvalue) to some local resources used to build the typical product, as well as other resources both local and non local, inducing an evolution within local economy and society which may eventually lead to a deeper structural transformation.

In the valorisation strategies there is a distinction between the socio-economic valorisation and the patrimonial and socio-cultural one. As a consequence, another kind of effects to be considered is more connected to the *socio-cultural dimension*, and refers to support and relaunch folklore, history, local community's sense of belonging. Usually it has an internal dimension only, but this can support rural development paths.

The evaluation of OLP-based strategies on RD should be based on a «grid». In general, the standard criteria (as higher prices of OLP, increase in OLP sales, increase in employment, etc.) are not the only way if the aim is the evaluation of effects on RD. Diffusion of these economic effects inside the rural area, endogenousness of the strategy and participation of local actors, integration in the strategy of different resources of the rural area, sustainability and reproduction of social system can be the most important criteria in strategies evaluation.

The “8 model” (annex n. 14) stresses the need of a balance between what the territory brings to the product and what the producers return to the territory. Together with the effort of remunerating (so re-producing) local resources, we should also consider the re-production of the (local and global) social system. The sustainability of OLPs protection and valorisation strategies depends on both the remuneration of local resources and the typology of the social system.

There is not empirical evidence on effects of OLP-based strategies on RD evaluation criteria. But researches made in different EU countries give us some critical points that should be considered in this evaluation:

- inclusion/exclusion, conflicts and cooperation
- focus of the actors involved in the strategy
- the degree of integration with local resources
- the role of local public administrations and institutions
- the role of external actors

*Inclusion/exclusion, conflicts and cooperation.* In the elaboration and implementation of a OLP-based strategy very often arise conflicts. As a matter of fact, actors involved in the OLP tend to make use of «OLP local heritage» for their own interests. In some cases OLP strategies are individual, and in others there is an «exclusion effect», i.e. one or a small number of actors make an appropriation of OLP positive effects. The initiative in some cases is taken by non producers, and often there is a “fracture” between agricultural firms (and their organisations) and the initiators, who may be cultural and regional associations more concerned with culture and identity than on income and added value, or other economic agents interested in the exploitation of the reputation of the products or other externalities produced with it. OLP valorisation strategy generate winners and losers. Evaluation of the strategy should identify different actors and interests involved, and the effects of the strategy at a local scale, which can be also negative effects.

*Focus of the actors.* Considering the actors' focus we can distinguish mainly to kind of strategies: a supply-chain strategy and an extended territorial strategy.

- *Supply chain strategy:* the valorisation of the typical product is interpreted by the local actors as a tool to allow a satisfactory remuneration of the specific assets directly used in the production process of the typical product. The actors are normally firms involved in the supply chain or their associations, but also local public institutions and other actors who may show the interest in strengthening and fostering an important part of the local economy; anyway the production system plays a central role in activating and fulfilling this strategy;
- *Extended focus strategy:* the typical product doesn't have an importance in itself, but it is important as it can attract a supply (existing or potential) of a diversified range of goods and services localised in the rural area. In this strategy the firms involved in the typical product chain are only a part (sometimes a marginal one) of the actors that activate it, and are flanked by firms belonging to other economic sectors, by the public policy maker, by intermediate institutions representing widespread interests (cultural, social, etc.).

*Integration.* The territory of origin may be used by actors in OLP-based strategy as a quality sign, or the single components and resources of the territory may be encapsulated in the typical product as attributes.

- *Sign.* In the first case the territory is used by local actors as a sign of origin, stressing the informative meaning of the geographical name on the quality of the product in order to differentiate it from other competing products.
- *Attribute.* In the second case the local actors explicitly use the elements of the territory to increase the value of the typical product and/or of the basket of local goods tied to it: the valorisation strategy aims at linking the product to a set of local resources that are specific of the territory and used as quality “attributes” of the product or of the basket. These specific resources can be tied to the chain of the typical product itself (production technique, varieties, races.), but also to other sectors (handicraft, tourist services, etc.) and more in general to the territory (landscape and environment, local culture and artistic and cultural resources, etc.).

*Public institutions.* The role of the public institutions in supporting OLPs within rural development policies is another important aspect. Public institutions may play an important role in decision-making and negotiation processes, and in the effectiveness of OLPs valorisation strategies, but in some cases the interests of public institutions may diverge from farmers'. More generally, “the policy dimension does matter” (Part II : Literature Review Belgium): this means that for the analysis of the link between OLPs and rural development attention should be paid also on the general structure and organisation of policy levels (UE, national, federal, regional, etc.: “governance capacities approach”) and by this way to the role of (origin) labels within public bodies strategies (“politisation of the labelling”).

External actors and local-global relationships: we often refer to OLPs valorisation strategies as example of endogenous development, but frequently resources, competencies, know-how come from the outside the rural area, from the city or the industrial and service sectors, and the economic exploitation of typical products is driven by external firms and institutions. A more comprehensive interpretation framework is needed to understand the role of non rural actors in building strategies and in capturing added value.

### 1.2.5. Main issues: evaluation (co-ordinator: Erwin Stucki)

Generally speaking, the Review and Discussion reports have underlined a lack of general models and theoretical studies aiming at describing and interpreting the link between OLPs and rural development. This has much to do with the fact that there is no one single concept of what is meant by "rural development"

Within the frame of WP3, we agreed on defining rural development (RD) as a social process, aiming at improving the life standard of people in rural areas. The process has to be endogenous, integrated and sustainable, which means that it has to integrate social, economical and environmental dimensions in an holistic, systemic approach. RD is place and goal oriented, which implies territorial and governance dimensions. Rural development is a public good.

In the frame of Dolphins, evaluation has to consider three main questions :

1. What impacts have OLPs on rural development ?
2. What impacts rural development has on OLPs ?
3. Are rural development policies based on fostering OLPs effective, efficient and sufficient ?

The aim is to evaluate the overall territorial impact of OLPs in the context of sustainable rural development. The evaluation of the linkages between OLPs and RD has to be based on a multicriteria analysis. These linkages have to be analyzed on the basis of criterias and indicators covering various aspects.

- OLPs have to be considered as economic activities susceptible to improve the economical situation of rural areas. Criterias and indicators to take into account are: added value in relation to (local) space (direct, indirect, induced effects) as the basis for additional income, employment, rents, taxes and benefits.
- OLPs have to be evaluated according to their environmental impacts. Criterias and indicators to take into account are: environmental assessment on biodiversity, soil, water, landscape, natural hazards, etc.
- OLPs have to be considered as social processes. Criterias and indicators to take into account are: networking and co-operation among actors involved in different branches of activity in the area, local identity.
- OLPs have to be analysed from the technological and skills involved: technology use, marketing approach, project management, entrepreneurship.
- OLPs have to be evaluated in a dynamic perspective and in relation to the local situation. This requires a good understanding of the past, the present and the probable future situation of the rural area concerned:
- OLPs contribute to the long-term competitiveness of regions by reducing the disadvantages of rural areas and strengthening their potentials in a sustainable way. Competitiveness in this sense means the overall performance of a region not only in economic terms but also in environmental, social and cultural terms, the ability to market products and services better and to attract new businesses

Benchmarking is an appropriate tool to evaluate the links between rural development and OLPs. (Partner 8, Switzerland, IER/ETHZ). The research in progress by Paus (*Evaluation de l'impact territorial d'une filière A.O.C.: contribution à la mise en place d'une méthodologie*. Mémoire de DEA, INA-PG, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Université Paris VII, non publié) is an important contribution to the methodology of evaluation of OLPs impacts on rural development.

Finally it is important to consider that unexpected results (bad and good ones) might appear in the long term. These effects might be more important than the short term effects. This reminds us that the scope of time has also to be taken into account, besides the choice of criteria and indicators.

#### Empirical evidence

The Review and Discussion Reports made by participants show a number of existing case studies. The case studies are mainly based on economical methods (added value, financial flows). These economical impacts of OLPs on rural development vary from extremely positive to more questionable effects. The positive results are dependent on the degree of the interactions with the local economy at the various steps along the chain: from the origin of the basic product to the processed good, ready for the consumer.

A number of studies extends the economical analysis to environmental and to social elements (Partner 8, Switzerland, IER/ETHZ). They show the importance of OLPs in fostering the interactions among actors of different branches of the economy, with local administration and with local development agencies. These interactions are of crucial importance for rural development.

While most of the evaluation focus on more or less successfully single case studies, there is a lack of comparative studies at a larger scale. Partner 5 (Italy UNIPR; see also annex n. 13) and Partner 2 (France-ESR Toulouse; see also annex n. 9) have undertaken studies at a national and regional level. These researches are based on the following principles:

- contextual analysis : state of the overall development situation at local level (NUTS 5)
- importance of OLPs in each type of local development situation

The cluster analysis is used to set the typology of the different areas involved.

First results related to Emilia Romagna and Veneto show that OLPs are most developed in the economically more "advanced" regions. OLPs based strategies seem to be insufficient to improve significantly the economical situation of lagging behind rural areas (annex n. 13). The research lounded by Partner 2 (annex n. 9) is dedicated to the territorial impacts of official quality labels (OQL) in the region Midi-Pyrénées. First results show that the OQL are mainly present in areas with poor agricultural conditions (MBS/ha). Furthermore, OQL are more widely spread in areas with comparatively younger, recently installed farmers. These first findings seem to be in line with the goals of agricultural and rural policy in France.

The problem of fostering rural development by means of OLPs-based strategies raises the question of appropriate effective and efficient alternative strategies. This again, depends greatly on the evaluation which is made of them. This type of evaluation requires a deep knowledge on the local and regional context of the areas to be considered. Review and Discussion Reports did not mention the existence of such studies.

The evaluation of OLPs in the frame of rural development requires to give an appropriate answer to the following five (W) questions: What evaluate ? Why ? When ? For whom ? and finally, Who evaluates ?

### 1.2.6. Special focus on the role of PDO and PGI

The central question may be synthesised as follow: is the legal system of protection and normalisation of product denomination a condition to improve effects of OLP on rural economy and development?

The use of a PDO or a PGI is often considered as a means to enhance rural economy and rural development, increase added value and market power, remunerate locked-in resources, obtain spill-over effects on the local economy and activate or reinforce rural development. Up to now there is no much evidence on the effects the institutionalisation process of OLPs may have on rural economy and rural development. Generally speaking it is not the institutionalisation of the resource "origin" (the collective elaboration and the public recognition of a platform which specifies the condition of exploitation of the resource "name of the place") in itself to set the conditions of development, but how this process is constructed and the effectiveness of the valorisation strategies built upon it (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-ESR Toulouse] and Italy [Univ. of Florence]).

PDO-PGI may help to build networks among local firms and between firms and local community . Actually actors who promote the initiative are not only producers, but also public local and non local institutions, research institutions, touristic organisations, consumer associations. The choice to ask for a PDO or a PGI may change the direction and intensity of the effects on the rural economy and rural development.

The effects of PDO-PGI on link between OLP and rural development vary according to the contents of the Code of Rules (Cahier des Charges). The way by which the Code of Rules is written may have different effects on OLP development and on the value of local resources (external effects). How do the definition of production areas, techniques, and characteristic of the final product affect the value of local resources in the supply chain and outside it (externalities)? (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-LRDE Corte], Italy [Univ. of Florence], Portugal and Switzerland).

PDO-PGI recognition may help firms to "update" to the *modern logic* of quality assurance, certification, traceability, specialisation. At the same time this process may lead to *exclude* a big part of local firms and/or increase their production and marketing costs, or, alternatively, exclude them from the use of a traditional product name. As a matter of fact some evidences underline the difficulties faced by small-medium and/or artisanal firms in implementing PDO-PGI regulations as stated by Council Regulation 2081/92, in particular in marginal areas and when the quantities produced are small, and this in opposition to the expressed goals in EU OLPs policy (Part II : Literature Review France [INRA-LRDE Corte], Portugal and Spain). Small producers in peripheral regions often lack local markets, are short of the resources and skills required to enter more distant markets, and have little flexibility in production.

PDOs products can stimulate rural development in marginal rural areas, or, at the opposite, only in dynamic rural areas PDO-PGI products are diffused and really used by the firms? Some RD reports (Part II : Literature Review Italy [Univ. of Parma]) pointed out that in some regions PDOs are located mainly in more developed areas. OLPs could be the result and not the cause of the development of certain areas. Answering this question requires to map the diffusion of PDO-PGI in Europe and to analyse the presence of typical products in rural areas characterised by a different level of development.

Turning to "trajectories" of PDO-PGI, the institutionalisation may help external powerful actors (mass distribution, processing firms, traders) to extract resources and added value from the area of origin, menacing rather than fostering local development.

Even where there is an opportunity to obtain a PDO or a PGI, often local actors are not interested in applying for any legal protection (Part II : Literature Review Belgium, France [INRA-LRDE, Corte] and Italy [Univ. of Florence]); this is mainly the case of those products which have short marketing channels and rely on local consumers and tourists (Part II : Literature Review France, Italy [Univ. of Florence], Portugal and Switzerland), or more generally where estimated premium price is not sufficient to cover estimated certification costs plus "transformation" costs (the costs required to firm in order to adapt to the content of Product Specifications).

PDO-PGI is not necessarily the best solution to enhance the diffusion of OLP effects on rural economy: there are other tools for building networks between different local economic activities starting from the OLP, and that can create diversification opportunities in rural areas (tourism, non-food craft products, environmental and recreational services ...) based on search for scope economies. An interesting cases are the "product routes"; more in general, analysis and evaluation of LEADER initiatives can give empirical evidences and give evaluation elements for more "territorial-based" strategies.

### 1.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW RESEARCH

RD Reports show, more or less explicitly, a certain agreement on the dimensions above mentioned, but at the same time underline various open questions and need for further research. Actually here is not systematic and comparative analysis at european scale aimed at analysing and evaluating the role of OLPs for rural development. An in-depth analysis of different kinds of OLPs is needed to better understand:

- the different actors categories involved in OLPs protection and valorisation processes, their objectives and roles;
- the typology of strategies and tools actors use on a practical field: which kind of initiatives are taken for supporting the link between OLPs and rural development (wine routes, collective marks, e-commerce, advertising, modern distribution channels, rural tourism, etc.)?
- the different functions that OLPs may have in fulfilling local and global needs, according to the concept of multifunctionality: environment, landscape, culture, health, employment in disadvantaged areas, etc.
- the effects OLPs have on rural development, and viceversa: which are the most appropriate methodologies, criteria and parameters to use when evaluating the economic, social, cultural, environmental impact of OLPs on rural economy and development?
- the role of PDO-PGI in fostering rural development: who are the actors which take part to the activation of the request for a PDO-PGI? Are PDO-PGI products located in marginal areas? What kind of firm uses PDO-PGI denominations? Do the way the Code of Rules is written affect the production of (local-global) externalities? Who take benefits from the initiative? Are they the local actors?
- Which are the public policies, with particular reference to the Common Agricultural and Rural Policies, that mainly affect the link between OLPs and rural development? Is there a "governance" problem to solve in order to make these tools have positive effects on rural development by means of OLPs support?

### 1.4. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Review and Discussion Reports from WP3 participants, together with the other documents produced and discussion held during the plenary meetings and the seminar of Barcelona, allowed to identify some policy recommendations in order to improve the links between OLPs and rural development.

Owing to the diversity of OLPs (annexes nn. 14, 15), it is important to underline that the impact OLPs may have on rural development greatly change from one situation to another. As a consequence supporting OLPs valorisation strategies may not always be the best solution to activate positive rural development dynamics.

Two kinds of important policy recommendation can be considered: the first refers to the multifunctional dimension of OLPs, and the second to the importance of using PDO-PGI for fostering rural development.

#### **Multifunctionality:**

Though not yet demonstrated, the multifunctional nature of many OLPs has important consequences for public policy analysis.

*The informative contents of the sign.* Quality policies concern the ability of quality signs to transfer the various attributes of origin and to support several types of market strategies without blurring the significance of these attributes. To achieve this, the protection of the name that refers to product quality must articulate with the signalling of qualities of the territory of production, which in turn depends on territorial policies.

*Policy tools.* Rural development policies can contribute to multifunctionality in promoting the OLP system (in the general sense of promoting territorial goods) by backing individual conversion and collective organization in its critical phases. The Italian agricultural law (2001) which defines new policy tools at local level (the Agro-food district and the Rural district") or the French agricultural law (1999) which makes it possible for farmers to engage in "territorial contracts" for which they are rewarded are examples of legal frameworks permitting such local programs.

*WTO Negotiations.* Considering the WTO negotiations, the reference to multifunctionality is not the basis for OLP recognition. The protection of OLP names in globalized markets is an issue of international intellectual property rights protection. But if multifunctionality is considered to be associated with sustainable development, then the development of OLP systems can be considered a valid objective of rural development policies.

**PDO-PGI for rural development:**

PDO-PGI are usually considered to have positive effects on rural development, but there is no much evidence at present. Lack of evidences on the effects of PDO-PGI on rural economy and development should take us to be careful in supporting the request of PDO-PGI in every case. Not necessarily PDO-PGI are the right tool to foster rural development.

The few studies available point out that the role of PDO-PGI in supporting OLPs-based rural development strategies shows opportunities but also limits (annex n. 19).

Some studies show that the "formal logics" brought on by PDO-PGI certification often "select" firms, and may exclude small-artisanal firms, non professional firms and more marginal areas from benefitting of the PDO-PGI. Besides, other studies shows that the more developed is the production area from an economic and social point of view, the higher is the presence of PDO-PGI, and the higher is the utilisation ratio of the denomination.

These observations, when confirmed by further research results (see point 1.4), ask for more flexible and accessible tools, especially for marginal and disadvantaged rural areas and small and artisanal firms. Should a simplified version of EEC regulation 2081/92 be taken into consideration for allowing a higher diffusion of PDO-PGI between firms?

Anyway, Designations of Origin and Geographical Indications cannot support rural development processes if not integrated with other local valorisation initiatives and other public interventions: structural problems (at agricultural, processing and distribution level), co-ordination problems, lack of research and training activities, may impede a full success of PDO-PGIs.

## Part II

# Literature review WP 3

### Link between Origin Labelled Products and rural development

Belgium	(FUL - SEED, Arlon)
France	(INRA - ESR/ETIC, Toulouse)
Germany	(TUM-PFM, Freising)
Italy	(Università di Verona, DES) (Università di Firenze, DSE)
Portugal	(DRAEDM-DPA, São Torcato ; INIA-EAN-DEESA, Oeiras)
Spain	(DGA-SIA, Unidad di Economía, Zaragoza)
Switzerland	(SRVA, Lausanne)

