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• UNISECO WP5 - Governance and Policy Assessment

• Overarching objective: to analyse market and policy instruments (MPIs), with governance mechanisms, supporting AgroEcological transition
Categories of MPis

- Income and market support
- Agri-Env Payments
- Diversification
- Payments for investments
- Regulatory restrictions
- Land use policies
- Regional policies
- Tax policies
- Certification schemes
- Food policies
- Knowledge promotion
- Networking
Objectives and steps

• Identified and described the **broad range of MPIs** in place in each Case Study

• **Shortlist** 10-15 key MPIs in each Case Study based on stakeholders’ experience and knowledge

• **Assessed and ranked** the shortlisted MPIs with local actors and experts

• **Discussed** key opportunities and challenges to adoption of the assessed MPIs, including governance changes

• Delivered **policy recommendations** based on the key policy and governance lessons learnt
Mixed-methods approach:
• Multi-criteria Analysis (MCA) + Qualitative analysis

Data collection:
• Semi-structured interviews/workshops with 127 local stakeholders from 15 Case Studies

Ex-ante approach:
• Focused on AE transition
• Including a mix of existing and new MPIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisors</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Policy makers</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Other actors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-Criteria Analysis

• Selection from a **candidate list of criteria** with MAPs, PAG and CS partners (experts)

• **Two types** of assessment criteria:
  - **Relevance**: urgency and priority
  - **Performance**: effectiveness, undesired side-effects, targeting, efficiency, feasibility

• Criteria **weights**: range 0-100

• MPIs **scores** for each criteria
  - From 0 (very weak) to 5 (very strong)

• Level of **confidence**
  - Scale 1-4 based on the interviewee knowledge of each MPIs
Assessment scores

- Knowledge promotion
- Payments for investments
- Food policies
- Agri-Env Payments
- Networking and regional instruments
- Certification schemes
- Income and market support
- Other measures

Performance  Relevance
Key MPIs and transition phases

Knowledge creation
- Agri-Env payments
- AKIS

Knowledge diffusion
- Certification schemes
- Food policy

Capacity building
- Regional policies
- Networking instruments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Policy recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising <strong>awareness</strong> on agroecological practices</td>
<td>➢ Facilitating access to advisory services for small farms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Empowering **entrepreneurship**               | ➢ Information, skills and training aimed at food-system re-design  
|                                               | ➢ Covering market/legal issues                              |
| Strengthening **partnerships** and collective projects | ➢ Targeted interventions for intermediate institutions (e.g., Bio-districts)  
|                                               | ➢ Empowerment of RDP Cooperation measures (e.g., pilot food chain projects) |
### Added value and market access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Policy recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing <strong>sustainability</strong> in consumer markets</td>
<td>➢ Introduction of new voluntary certification schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating <strong>awareness</strong> among consumers and citizens</td>
<td>➢ Promotion of educational campaigns in schools and awareness campaigns through local media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving <strong>public procurement</strong> initiatives</td>
<td>➢ New and more ambitious standards in the catering contracts for public schools (e.g., local food, reducing food waste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Policy recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Simplification** on the requirement for policy support | ➢ Reducing bureaucracy  
➢ Providing free access to advisory services to small farms |
| Improving **targeting** of policy support | ➢ Better designing the support for AE practices (e.g. targeting to core practices / farm typologies) |
| **Prioritization** among different initiatives | ➢ Prioritizing support for advisory services |
| **Policy coordination**                  | ➢ Integrating support for investments, practices adoption and cooperation measures |
| Experimenting **innovative** instruments | ➢ Result-based payments  
➢ Eco-schemes targeted to AE practices |
Final remarks

➢ Limitations of the approach:

• MPIs targeted to context-specific strategies and on specific dilemma (15 CS across Europe)

• Interviewed stakeholders with different expertise and knowledge of present and future policies

➢ New perspectives on MPIs:

• Interesting insights on the tailored mix of instruments necessary to address different transition challenges (trade-offs and synergies)

• Additional funding and new measures are not the main priorities, the key challenge is improving the implementation and governance of existing MPIs
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