



GLAMUR

Global and local food assessment: a Multidimensional performance-based approach



Grant Agreement no: 311778

Project acronym: GLAMUR

Project title: Global and Local food chain Assessment: a Multidimensional performance-based approach

Call identifier: FP7-KBBE-2012-6-singlestage

Activity code: KBBE.2012.2.5-03: A comparative analysis of global versus local food supply chains



Report on the 1st Expert meeting of GLAMUR(Deliverable 2.2)

J. Kirwan, D. Maye, D. Keech and D. Bundhoo. Countryside and Community Research Institute, University of Gloucestershire.



Due date of deliverable:	March 2014
Actual submission date:	March 2014
Start date of project:	1 February 2013
Duration:	36 months

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme	
Dissemination Level	
PU	Public



GLAMUR is a EU FP7 project that aims at integrating advancement in scientific knowledge about the impact of food chains to practice, to increase food chains sustainability through public policies and private strategies.

This general objective will be pursued through the following specific objectives:

- To develop and validate a performance criteria matrix for assessment and comparison of food chains operating at a range of geographical scales through analysis of how food chain impacts are communicated in different spheres of society.
- To build a database of quantifiable indicators of impact and a set of 20 case studies aimed at understanding how impacts are generated within specific food chains.
- To advance knowledge on methodological problems and trade-offs arising when measuring and comparing the impact of food chains within and between sectors.
- To assess how performance is perceived by stakeholders in different national contexts through participatory assessment and multi-criteria analysis of the different typologies of food chains.
- To assess the actual and potential role of public and private policies addressing food chains and to turn assessment into policy recommendations.
- To build a network that turns the advancement of scientific knowledge into decision making tools for domestic and public consumers, producers, citizens, scientists, policy makers, civil society organizations.

To be quoted as:

J. Kirwan, D. Maye, D. Keech and D. Bundhoo (2014) Report on the 1st Expert meeting of GLAMUR (Deliverable 2.2). Countryside and Community Research Institute, University of Gloucestershire, UK. March.



GLAMUR

Global and local food assessment: a Multi-dimensional performance-based approach



Report on the 1st Expert meeting.

Deliverable 2.2

J. Kirwan, D. Maye, D. Keech and D. Bundhoo (2014) Countryside and Community Research Institute, University of Gloucestershire, UK.



Summary

Summary	4
Introduction to the report on the 1 st Expert Meeting.....	5
1. Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: <u>synthesis report discussion</u>	6
2. Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: <u>Delphi report discussion</u>	9
3. <u>FAO Methods Presentations</u>	13
4. <u>External Experts Panel Discussion</u>	15
5. <u>Concluding comments</u>	23
Annex 1. Expert Meeting Agenda, Rome. 27 th February 2014. FAO: Iran Room....	255



Introduction to the report on the 1st Expert Meeting

Experts present at the meeting:

Professor Murat Boyaci	Ege University
Mr Gert Engelen	Vredeseilanden
Professor Krzysztof Gorlach	Jagiellonian University
Ms Maryam Rahmanian	Cenesta
Mr Henk Renting	RUAF Foundation (Chair)
Dr Sara Rodrigues	Porto University
Mr Luca Ruini	Barilla
Professor Sergio Schneider	University of Rio Grande do Sul
Ms Rosita Zilli	EuroCoop

The project Expert Forum (EF) includes international experts, observers and actors who have no direct responsibility within the GLAMUR project. Its members cover different scientific and socio-economic areas and present different, complementary and even critical positions in relation to the project. They also represent different constituencies, and so offer additional opportunities to disseminate project results.

The main role of the EF is to enlarge the vision of the project and to validate and enhance the quality of the research, through scientific scrutiny. The intention is for there to be a two way process of mutual information and suggestions exchange. More specifically, the role of the EF is to:

- provide *direct feedback* on the GLAMUR (interim) results;
- contribute *relevant information* about project related practices, studies, publications, experiences, conferences etc. (through concrete directed consultation);
- open up many *dissemination channels* (develop mailing lists, use of their networks to distribute leaflets, Policy Brief etc.); and
- contribute to a strengthening of *networking activities* between stakeholders at an international level.

The EF does this through their engagement at three different meetings, in a conference format, throughout the GLAMUR project, the first of which took place in Rome at the FAO on 27th February 2014. The main purpose of this meeting was for the work package leader (CCRI) to present the draft comparative report (Deliverable 2.3) and for the experts to critically reflect upon the developed concepts, methodologies and draft conceptual framework.

This report provides a written record of the day's activities and is structured according to the four main sessions of the day.



The meeting started with a short introductory talk by Eugenia Serova, Director for the FAO's Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division, who explained how the GLAMUR work fits with the FAO agenda and its new strategic objective that examines the efficiency of food systems on all levels, extending beyond the primary sector to consider wider food chain functions. She welcomed the work of GLAMUR and looked forward to fruitful collaborations during and beyond the meeting. **Prof Gianluca Brunori**, scientific lead and co-ordinator for the GLAMUR project, then provided a general introduction to the project, including its aim, objectives, conceptualization in relation to multi-dimensional notions of food chain performance, and overall work-package structure.

The first of the four main sessions, which forms the focus on this report, then followed, which involved the WP2 leaders (CCRI team) presenting the key elements of the draft comparative report. This was followed by a presentation from the designated discussant for this session, Professor Krzysztof Gorglach, before it was opened up to the wider audience. The second session involved the WP2 leaders (CCRI) presenting the findings of a Delphi survey they had conducted as part of WP2. Henk Renting, as discussant for this session, then presented his response to the report of the Delphi survey, before the session was opened up to the audience for wider discussion and comment. The third session involved staff from the FAO presenting three different methodological approaches to the assessment of food supply chains. The fourth session then involved all nine experts sitting as a panel and reflecting on the progress made within GLAMUR so far. This session was chaired by Henk Renting. In addition, there was also a 'poster session' during the morning coffee break, during which all participants (both partners and experts) were able to review posters that had been prepared for each of the 12 countries examined within WP2. These posters included the essence of each of the national reports prepared as part of WP2, including the individual national-level matrices and key food chain performance attributes.

1. Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: synthesis report discussion

Overview

Dr James Kirwan and Dr Damian Maye of the University of Gloucestershire's Countryside and Community Research Institute presented the draft comparative/synthesis report, carried out as part of Work-package 2 (scoping and framing) of Glamur. This section of the Expert Meeting report records the subsequent discussion of the draft. This first session was chaired by Henk Oostindie of Wageningen University. It started with some introductory comments by Professor Krzysztof Gorglach of Jagiellonian University, who was the discussant for the session. His opening comments were then followed by comments and questions emerging from the audience.



Professor Krzysztof Gorlach (KG) noted that the report was still in draft form.

He then structured his comments into eight distinct points, as follows:

1. The relationship between different theoretical concepts is unclear e.g. between 'frame' (which is a term emerging from social discourse studies) and 'discourse'.
2. More thought needs to be given to the rationale behind the four spheres – how were they identified?
3. A number of national clusters were suggested. They are not distinctive categories, nor – it was stressed repeatedly – are they part of a typology. Therefore, the question is: what reasoning lies behind them? The cluster of Serbia, Latvia, Senegal, and Peru seems particularly unclear. Are the clustered discourses based around attributes? If this is the case, it seems possible to produce more composite matrices associated with/structured by the national clusters.
4. Cutting down the attributes from 207 to just 24 seems alien to the project. Additional information on the rationalization of the attributes is required.
5. Attempts to evaluate the importance or visibility of particular attributes in particular discourses are currently not detailed enough.
6. Global-local distinctions are difficult to define. It is therefore necessary to be clearer about what these terms mean within the Glamur context.
7. In relation to commodities, there is just one dominant discourse; in other discourses one commodity is highlighted. However, wine is not mentioned within the commodity discourse at all despite the fact that at least three countries are major producers.
8. Language must be considered. While the common language of the project is English, this may mask linguistic nuances. For example in Polish, food safety and food security are described by the same term.

The audience was then invited to contribute to the discussion of the draft composite report.

Mr Engelen asked for further insights into why the term 'attribute' was chosen, given that it has such a complex context. In relation to the clusters, he also wondered about the choices made, especially as there are differences *within* and not just *between* countries.

Mr Renting underscored the importance of national settings. While he understood the need to produce one overall matrix, there was surely a danger of losing the diversity within national contexts. It would be useful to see summaries from each country.



Another member of the audience indicated the absence of taste and quality as attributes. Could there be a way to discriminate between social perceptions and those which are more evidence-based, and how can the attributes be used with a degree of rigour?

Another audience member noted an absence of labour as part of the discussion. Furthermore, she noted that the project includes two non-European countries, but also cannot reflect the full diversity of all European countries. How can such diversity be better captured?

Mr Ruini supported the approach outlined by CCRI colleagues, especially its ability to summarize complexity.

Prof Giampetro emphasised that the reports outlined during the morning represented the starting point of the research project. The purpose of WP2 was to get a first idea of supply chain performance. He suggested that it would be acceptable to start working and then learn how to interpret better and change the research emphasis. He also praised CCRI colleagues for their work to date on the comparative report.

In response to the feedback, **Dr Kirwan** of the CCRI urged that colleagues should consider the time available for the production of the composite report. Its principal purpose is to develop the multi-criteria performance matrix, and to raise potential indicators. This doesn't mean the issues being raised during the discussion won't be addressed. It is anticipated that national partners will also write articles for publication in scientific journals. Dr Kirwan thanked Prof Gorlach for his comments, which would be particularly helpful when developing subsequent academic papers, as well as finalising the report.

Dr Kirwan continued, in response to Prof Gorlach's comment about framing, that part B of the original tender was designed to extend the scope beyond the normal bounds of market and scientific knowledge in order to be more inclusive.

Dr Maye added, on the matter of national clusters, that frames are a way to help clarify and simplify performance discussions. In this project, frames are a mental structure or a way to communicate dominant discourses in relation to food chains. They do not constitute a typology. It is possible to recognize dominant frames, sub-frames and alternative frames in most of the national reports.

Dr Kirwan indicated that partners will provide a two-page summary about how the national report relates to the comparative report, especially in terms of the matrix. With regard to perceptions and the validity of views, he clarified that the matrix mainly reflects perceptions. We are not trying to prove, for example, that local food is healthier than non-local, but we can draw on evidence which debates this discourse. It is possible to think about representation and perception in relation to distinctions between quantitative and qualitative methods and data.

Attribute ranking was carried out with national experts. There was some debate about whether attributes should be ranked. It was suggested that it would be helpful to add



more details on how ranking happened in the national reports. The overall view during the discussion was that ranking attributes in the comparative report was not useful and would risk losing important national detail.

In terms of the coding process for the composite report, **Drs Kirwan and Maye** explained the systematic and iterative nature of the process. It was accepted that this was a subjective process and conceivable that other research scientists may come up with slightly different outcomes. However, the procedure was systematic and transparent and therefore replicable. The final comparative report will further clarify methodological steps used for the attribute analysis.

Prof Brunori clarified the position on spheres: the frame of the project is post-normal science, which posits that there is no scientific truth that runs from science to society. On the contrary, there is a flow of meanings from one field to another and vice-versa. Glamur is set within this post-normal context and therefore concerned with interactions.

Luca Colombo of FIRAB added that taste was emerging from Italian documentary analysis, but was not emerging as strongly as other attributes.

Dr Vorley of IIED supported the idea of country clusters, which offer new opportunities. This project is not concerned with an EU - developing nation division. For example, there is a chance to further develop ideas around global as more safe, secure, responsible and traceable, and the local being less so, and more informal. However the dominant policy push supports local as an antidote to the global. He suggested extending the cluster analysis further in order to avoid a north-south split and provide a wider number of countries. There is a need, as proposed in the country clustering, to move away from the Global North doing something and the Global South suffering or benefitting from it.

2. Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: Delphi report discussion

Overview

Dr James Kirwan and Dr Damian Maye of the University of Gloucestershire's Countryside and Community Research Institute presented findings of a Delphi survey carried out as a part of Work Package 2 (scoping and framing) of Glamur. The notes set out below record the discussion of the report introduced by Henk Renting of RUAFA, followed by comments and questions emerging from the audience. The second session was chaired by Professor Mario Giampetro of the Autonomous University of Barcelona.



Discussion of the results by Henk Renting (HR)

Henk Renting began by thanking Kirwan and Maye for their extensive and helpful introduction to the Delphi survey. He opened his discussion by asking what can be learned from the presentation of the Delphi results. In particular, remarks were needed on three issues:

- Delphi methodology
- The possibilities and limitations of the Delphi, as well as how the Delphi survey fits into the overall WP2 work-package; and
- The interpretation of the results, and how the Delphi can generate relevant research results for the next parts of the GLAMUR project.

HR stressed the importance of including the Delphi in the project, because WP2 seeks to identify not just the actual performance of food supply chains but, vitally, perceptions of performance. This means that the project is concerned with differences in opinion, conceptions and ideas. In this respect, the Delphi has proved to be a good tool for scoping, framing and triangulation of views from across the four spheres. He remarked too that the Delphi is helpful for national teams in the task of positioning attributes in the multi-criteria performance matrix.

Nevertheless, HR recognized limits in the uses of the Delphi, for example, that the number of responses and rounds was limited. In addition, the different views expressed between country experts and spheres complicates interpretation and makes consensus formation a difficult task. This means that the Delphi results and the ranking of attributes should be interpreted with consideration to the different backgrounds and perspectives of the respondents.

HR felt that the results of the Delphi largely confirm the outcomes of the comparative analysis of national reports. For example, they underscore the multi-dimensional nature of food supply chain characteristics and performance characteristics, especially around the key points which characterize local and global chains. The results clearly show that there is an agreement on the criteria which characterizes local and global. There is also agreement that a debate exists around supply chain characteristics and performance, and therefore also sometimes conflict and struggles between the different supply chain models and perceptions are evident. HR found it striking that people articulate, on the one hand, asymmetric power relations and on the other hand, the growing importance of consumers is foreseen or hoped for by the experts. The question arises, therefore, of how those things can be reconciled; this is particularly the case if experts foresee asymmetric power relations as an obstacle for the functioning of food supply chains. He posed the question: how does this relate to expectations of the growing role of consumer engagement? He argued that it was also necessary to look behind the responses to the question of how local and global chains are positioned in response to those alternatives.

Another question arising from the Delphi survey for HR is how different supply chain mechanisms relate to the matter of consumer engagement. HR identified different



mechanisms to articulate consumer engagement: e.g. IT management, trust in local supply chains, or the importance of consumer organisations to implement forms of consumer engagement. He posed the question of what the implications of these different mechanisms are for articulating consumer engagement and how this affects the process of choosing case studies (WP3). Similarly, HR suggested that the mechanisms through which impacts and performances are produced are not always the same between global and local chains, and are context-dependent. If the Delphi results show high scores for affordability in both global and local supply chains, it may not be the case that affordability means the same thing in each context. How might these contexts and specific meanings be captured in performance indicators?

On the matter of measuring ethical and other non-economic attributes, HR indicated the strong dominance of economic perspectives emerging from the Delphi, and a strongly shared opinion among the respondents that this should move towards a more holistic, systemic type of evaluation. HR highlighted responses to the statement 'price will no longer be the overriding concern of consumers'. The Delphi results show a very high value given by the respondents to the importance that this change to a more holistic evaluation should occur, although the score given for the likelihood of this happening is one of the lowest. There is no other statement where the difference between importance and likelihood is so wide. In other words there is skepticism that this change will be made.

In addition to the importance of looking at different attributes, another important consideration for HR was the question of what role lay and expert discourses play in the project. There is a strong emphasis in the project on how indicators can be operationalized, not just in a scientific way, but also in a way that allows them to be used by different stakeholders (e.g. farmers and consumers). For example, in the case of food miles, there is much debate in scientific terms about whether food miles are very meaningful. Food miles nevertheless represent a very strong sustainability indicator for consumers. Therefore, despite scientific debate, it cannot be denied that food miles have a strong meaning for certain people and perceptions.

HR drew further attention to the stark differences in the ranking of attributes of trade relations and consumer engagement. HR found it fascinating that global and local chains represent different potentials and different trajectories for system transformation. He felt that this was an important dynamic within the Glamur. In other words, the project is not just identifying the differences between global and local chains, but exploring the potential of both chains for system transformation. Currently neither local nor global chains are contributing adequately towards sustainable consumption or production. The Delphi results therefore highlight the importance of the complementarity of, and interaction between, local and global food chains. Furthermore, it stimulates questions about how global/local chains can become more complementary and hybridised. Delphi (and the wp2 comparative analysis more generally) has highlighted the interactions and relations between the two scales. HR concluded by commenting that it is also important to consider this interaction and hybridization in the case study methodology and the choice of cases.



Henk Renting's discussion of the Delphi process and results having concluded, Mario Giampetro then invited comments from the audience.

David Barling of City University asked, with regard to rankings, if the results show an overlap between power relationships and power asymmetries. James Kirwan confirmed this. The attribute of trade relationships relates more closely to how foods are traded rather than ethical issues linked to, for example, how much farmers are paid. Dilshaad Bundhoo added that trade relationships often refer to trade policies.

Luca Ruini of Barilla suggested that industry moves towards using local supply chains and sourcing more local products could be interpreted as a strategy for labour generation. This can be seen in efforts by European public authorities, including those in Portugal for example, to promote the consumption of domestically produced goods and services to support the national economy during times of austerity.

Maryam Rhamanian of Censta observed that Glamur is concerned with methods, understanding complexity and getting stakeholder knowledge into scientific debate. Thus the project has the potential to make an important contribution to challenging the narrow framings of food chain performance. She wondered what would happen if the results from the project are ignored, e.g. by economists. In other words, how can Glamur open up space for debate within science and other spheres to change practice?

Mario Giampetro responded by saying that Glamur introduces a number of different analytical techniques. Glamur has thus far been little concerned with systemic trends which indicate fragility and uncertainty in the food chain, because WP2 attempts to reflect the current perception of the roles and functions of food chains and of the food sector more generally. The next work-packages complement such discussions by including different views and introducing different analyses.

Rosita Zilli of EuroCoop suggested that the Delphi results underline the continuing importance of price, and that in future price will also include different parameters beyond the purely economic sphere. She asked if this meant that consumers will be ready to pay more for foods which embed aspects of sustainability. This conclusion might contrast with what is known about the gap between consumer intentions and actual behaviour. The results also reflect opinions that consumers will become more important within the supply chain and that large scale retailers will continue to enjoy dominant positions. Does this indicate that consumers are happy with large scale retailers?

James Kirwan responded by clarifying that the Delphi results refer to the general issue of importance, i.e. that consumers are likely to continue to buy cheaper foods, rather than more expensive foods which embed externalities. **Damian Maye** added that Delphi respondents emphasize the importance of embedding externalities in food prices, yet speculate that a narrow measure of price will prevail. This general assessment and forecast raises important governance questions about who is responsible for embedding externalities in food prices. James Kirwan added that consumers don't make a conscious choice to shop in large retailers but, in the main, they do.



Henk Renting's opinion was that this kind of skepticism among experts provides the project with opportunities to devise non-economic elements, in order that Glamur's findings might be used to adjust the system. **Mario Giampetro** added that the Delphi analyses extrapolate the current food chain picture and expectations of what is likely to happen in the near future but warns that, in reality, future contexts may demand different responses to those predicted by the Delphi experts. **Damian Maye** concurred by adding that the highlighted role of consumers indicates that Glamur must integrate consumers into WP3 research, and not just farmers/primary producers.

David Barling suggested that the hybridising of local and global chains was already evident from the preparations for Work-package 3. A challenge within the project is to identify the positive aspects of hybridisation and consider how to reflect them, not least because in Work-package 6 reasonable and workable policy recommendations will be needed. Henk Renting felt that there is a lot of positive potential in this respect. Case studies should highlight patterns of interaction and it will be important to avoid isolated case studies in global and local scales.

3. FAO Methods Presentations

In this third session, three members of the FAO presented an outline of food chain assessment methods/methodologies that they have been working with. These were:

- SAFA: Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture Systems
- Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership
- World Agriculture Watch (WAW)

Nadia Scialabba – Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture systems (SAFA)

NS began by congratulating Glamur partners on the inclusion of an ethics dimension within the dimensions of supply chain performance. This perspective is long overdue.

Moving on to SAFA, NS described how around 106 countries have established national sustainable development strategies, and over 120 sustainable development frameworks are applied by companies. The rapid expansion of such tools raises questions about their comparability. Most have an environmental focus.

The claims made about local food also raise many questions, dependent on your objectives. For example, sustainable local procurement relates to familiar environmental issues but also fair pricing, regional economy, self-sufficiency and culture. More holistic supply chain assessments integrate cost-benefits, hotspots, ethics etc.

SAFA is a holistic SD framework; it is not a standard or label. SAFA allows for equivalence and inclusiveness because it is flexible – it can be used when working with consumers as



well as with producers/enterprises. Four dimensions are captured within SAFA, namely governance, economy, nature and people. SAFA then uses 21 themes, which are universal sustainability goals. Additionally, there are 58 sub-themes which relate specifically to the supply chain (i.e. not to national policy). Finally, there are 116 indicators for different food commodity enterprises, which are both target-based and practice-based.

The SAFA framework builds on CSR, drawing out the triple bottom line, however it reaches beyond LCA and is focused on rights. SAFA is applied in various ways e.g. by the IFOAM standards, SHARP and SMART tools. SAFA is available freely on the web as a self-assessment tool. FAO provides the top and bottom performance benchmarks, but everything else in-between depends on the user's interpretation.

Feedback from stakeholders about the usefulness of SAFA is positive. It helps to structure data, but is fairly generic, lacks specificity and needs adaptation to specific regions or chains. FAO has adapted an application of SAFA as an app dedicated to smallholder farmers with cellphones. It has been tested with 1,000 farmers in Latin America.

Carolyn Opio, Natural Resource Dept FAO - Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance partnership (LEAP)

LEAP aims to contribute to the improvement of the environmental performance of the livestock sector. Livestock supply chains are complex because they involve natural processes which are difficult to control, and there are multiple products which often have long supply chains. LEAP responds to the lack of an internationally agreed sector-specific methodology and guidance to measure environmental performance.

LEAP is largely based on LCA and looks especially at GHG emissions from livestock supply chains. Particular focus-points are biodiversity, water and nutrient cycles. So far FAO has developed guidelines for poultry, small ruminants and feed supply.

LEAP's strengths are that it has been widely accepted because the LCA is well known and used. LEAP provides a useful way to identify the most effective ways to reduce environmental burdens and has the capacity to prevent shifting environmental problems from one phase of the life cycle to another – in other words, it identifies trade-offs.

However, LEAF's weaknesses include that it is hard to capture the diversity of the livestock sector and it lacks consensus on methods such as carbon accounting for soil.

CO concluded by suggesting that science is not mature enough to include progression towards other environmental impacts within LEAF and that there is a difficulty in identifying key drivers of environmental impacts such as biodiversity and land use change. There are data collection challenges too.



Marie-Aude Even, FAO, World Agricultural Watch (WAW) initiative

WAW explores the heated debates around family farms and co-operative farms and focuses on different farm transformations in particular fields, such as subsistence to field scale farming, where both types compete for resources and markets.

WAW asks questions about the future for family farms in the agricultural and nutritional transformations, the impacts of the transitions on the rural poor, drivers and policy reforms and the nature of markets linked to subsistence and to agro-industrial transformation. The WAW programme has established a range of observatories and partners who share and harmonise data.

WAW has typified three kinds of farm, examines their assets, their household business strategies, their performances, the strength of territorial influence and the influence of their outcomes. The typology of farms is distinguished by the type of labor, market orientation, and the legal status/management type.

Four case studies have been carried out in Madagascar, France, Vietnam and Nicaragua to look at labour, income, type of market linked to family, patrimonial or corporate farms.

Weaknesses of WAW include getting hold and using national census data, how to deal with multiple scales, and understanding policy relevance in relation to performance.

After the three FAO presentations, a brief discussion followed which considered the value of the methods presented and the usefulness and synergy with the GLAMUR project. There was consensus from audience members that on-going FAO work had links with GLAMUR at a general level, although GLAMUR was more food chain focused. Some critical comments regarding SAFA were noted by some audience members but there was general consensus that this framework presented the strongest links with GLAMUR (see also expert panel discussion notes below), in that it provides a not too dissimilar attempt to examine performance beyond the economic dimension (in this case framed as four pillars), developing practice-based and target-based indicators.

4. External Experts Panel Discussion

Experts present on the panel:

Professor Murat Boyaci	Ege University
Mr Gert Engelen	Vredeseilanden
Professor Krzysztof Gorlach	Jagiellonian University
Ms Maryam Rahmanian	Cenesta
Mr Henk Renting	RUAF Foundation (Chair)
Dr Sara Rodrigues	Porto University
Mr Luca Ruini	Barilla
Professor Sergio Schneider	University of Rio Grande do Sul
Ms Rosita Zilli	EuroCoop



This fourth discussion session involved the nine experts sitting as a panel. It was chaired by Henk Renting of the RUA Foundation.

Section 1 – Introductions

Henk Renting started the session by asking each expert on the panel to introduce themselves, and then make a contribution to the discussion session, having reflected on the presented work and the day's proceedings.

Henk Renting began by introducing RUA as an international foundation that works on matters of urban agriculture and sustainability, mainly in the global south, but increasingly also in the north. Previously he worked within the Rural Sociology Group at Wageningen University in the Netherlands.

Rosita Zilli introduced herself as the Deputy Secretary General of EuroCoop, a federation of European co-operative retailers, based in Brussels. Ms Zilli suggested that the Glamur project will feed into an important current EU agenda, namely the way in which sustainable food systems are communicated. She recommends that links should be made between Glamur and the EU programme of forthcoming communications. Euro-coop participates in many different fora and Ms Zilli felt that the Glamur project seems to be making a particularly useful additional contribution, due to its focus on multi-dimensionality. She also felt the partners would benefit from studying the findings of the EC's sustainable production and consumption roundtable, which is a forum to which EuroCoop has contributed.

Ms Zilli ended by suggesting that consumer co-ops represent a particular kind of highly successful retailing model, due to their consumer ownership structure. Co-ops have a long history of reconciling local and global issues because they are legally bound to support local communities and, indeed, are often formed by communities. She is happy to be involved in Glamur and looks forward to further collaboration.

Henk Renting underlined Ms Zilli's comments about the uniqueness of consumer co-ops and urged the Glamur team to consider whether co-ops could be one of the consumer models looked at more detail, given the results of the Delphi survey.

Maryam Rahmanian from Cenesta spoke next. Cenesta is an Iranian NGO with an interest in sustainable development. At Cenesta Ms Rahmanian manages a national programme of participatory and evolutionary plant breeding. She indicated also the establishment in 2008 within FAO of the expert panel on food security and nutrition, of which Ms Rahmanian is vice-chair.

The next three speakers then introduced themselves in succession. Firstly **Dr Sara Rodrigues** from the Faculty of Nutrition and Food Sciences at Porto University in Portugal; secondly, Professor **Murat Boyaci** from the Faculty of Agriculture at Ege University; and thirdly, **Gert Engelen**, the Director of the Belgian NGO Vredeseilanden, which works to promote food security in 20 countries. This brings the NGO into partnership with a range



of supply chain actors including retailers, distributors, banks and so on, in order to negotiate long-term supply commitments and fair prices.

Mr Engelen reflected that during the course of his work with Vredeseilanden, and in collaboration with other civil society groups, he saw a lot of tension between local and global food systems. Some actors in local systems are anxious about expanding beyond local chains. He often encounters a rather 'black-and-white' view of local and global chain characteristics, and therefore finds it interesting that Glamur is concerned with performances at both scales.

Mr Engelen was followed by **Mr Luca Ruini**, who is responsible for the food chain CSR work within Barilla Pasta, as well as aspects of food and nutrition.

Next, **Professor Sergio Schneider** introduced himself. He is a sociologist from the University of Rio Grande do Sul, in Brazil, working on topics including rural development, public policy linked to family farming and the food chain and organic production. Prof Schneider also advises the Brazilian government and the FAO's Latin American division.

Last to introduce himself was **Professor Krzysztof Gorlach**, also a sociologist, from Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland. His work focuses on changes within the agricultural system in Poland, especially after 1989. With colleagues he has also pursued research on the local cultural traditions linked to agriculture and how they shape changes in the countryside. Prof Gorlach is also an advisor on agricultural extension to the Polish government.



Section 2 – Comments from the panel relating to Glamur

Professor Ginaluca Brunori outlined the purpose of the expert panel, which is namely to be part of the project community from the beginning so that project partners can:

- Gain direct feedback from them on their work;
- Acquire relevant information on practices (three experts were involved in the kick-off meeting in Wageningen in February 2013, for example);
- Open up dissemination channels through the networks of the experts; and
- Aim to strengthen networking at the international level with a view to developing new projects and consortia.

There is no fixed guideline for how the partners and the experts should interact and partners are open to proposals. Some expert contributors have already enjoyed active roles within the project. For example Henk Renting and Prof Gortlach have provided critiques of presented project papers. Prof Brunori invited experts to tell project partners what they are doing and how our work within Glamur might prove helpful. He concluded by inviting frank comments on views of Glamur, reflections on potential weaknesses and ways to avoid mistakes when striving to meet Glamur objectives. Such responses will be of very high value to the project partners and help them to refine common research questions in future work phases. Experts will be invited to join the *ning* – the Glamur social network.

Prof Schneider outlined three main responses:

- (i) Sometimes within Glamur, the categories of local and global appear to be used as contradictions. From his view-point, we are at point of transition from one system of food provision to another. How the result will turn out is uncertain. In the transition process, the ways in which local and global are manifested are not clear, but the project appears to place them in contradictory or oppositional stances to one another. This is not born out by Prof Schneider's work with farmers, who have for some time played a role in both systems, e.g. local farmers may produce soya for global channels and vegetables for local schools. It will be useful within the project to consider how this transition process is being played out when undertaking case studies.
- (ii) He notes an absence in the comparative report (WP2): although policy and public spheres are referred to, Prof Schneider sees little about the explicit role of the state in the construction of institutions and regulations, both in global and local food chains. The state is notable for its inability to act as a brake on breaches in sustainability or to mitigate power imbalances within the global food system, where there is a lack of regulation. At the local level, by contrast, the state is usually a problem or barrier for local initiatives. So where is the state and public policy, and the tools available through public policy? More thought needs to be given to this matter within Glamur.



- (iii) Methodologically, the quickscan cases seem too optimistic and look at successful examples of practice. There is much to be learnt from cases that don't work and have failed. Often successful initiatives have a history of past failure.

Gert Engelen added his own comments to the issue raised above in relation to the distinction between global and local chains.

- (i) He felt that distinctions could be made beyond global-local distinctions by focusing on functions or properties of markets, rural and city markets, modern markets, markets for bulk products, niche premium markets, community supported schemes etc. It is the performances of these markets and chains which are important, and Mr Engelen wondered whether the global-local distinction was actually more polarising than it is helpful.
- (ii) His second point reflected his high expectations that there should be clear results of performance that will be used by actors in the field. However, on listening to the scientific language used today, the project partners should not underestimate the need to translate scientific terminology into language more familiar to the project's target-groups.
- (iii) Mr Engelen asked what are the factors that create change and transition in the food chain and, in looking at supply chain performances, how does positive transformation happen?

Prof Brunori responded on the matter of global-local distinctions by clarifying that it is a key part of the project and it was an aspect specifically requested in the European Commission's call. Yet from the start of the partners' work together, it was recognised that the reality is not simple, and that such scale distinctions cause problems. Even so, it is the case that in public debates (e.g. Italy), local is associated with sustainability, solidarity and rural development. Thus local has a value in the public debate. Scientific partners must be aware that although the reality is more complex, it is necessary to explore the details and contexts of the movement behind local food. What is the change that local groups are trying to operate? If they are the same as non-local actors, then how can the existence of a strong pro-local movement be explained? It is a task of the Glamur project to raise debates and contradictions, and to have in mind that there are different coalitions of discourses. Furthermore, global chains are also changing. How can all these transitions be made in coalition? It is not the goal of the project to seek a clear definition of local in order that this may be used on food labels, for example, rather the project seeks to explore how policies can affect the discussion.

Professor Mario Giampetro of the Autonomous University of Barcelona shared Prof Brunori's view of transition. From the methodological perspective, Glamur is looking at narratives around flows of energy, or the export of local foods. In other words the research is trying to explore the contradictions and coalitions. Partners are not concerned with a reduction of definitions, but a framework for narrative contexts.



Henk Renting acknowledged these responses from the Glamur team but encouraged further discussion on the matter in relation to the case study research.

In relation to questions about the role of the state, raised by Prof Schneider, **Dr David Barling** of City University, London reminded panellists that WP2 did explore a wide range of policy documents but more specific suggestions for policy interventions will follow in WP6. WP2 serves to situate the rest of the project within perceptions of chain performance within a number of spheres and dimensions. The inclusion of developing country markets also helps partners to look at the role of EU policy beyond EU boundaries, and case studies will flush out further policy issues. A policy road map will follow and policy experts and officials will help advise on this.

Dr Damian Maye of CCRI added that the WP2 comparative matrix included the attribute of governance. This contains two distinct aspects, one of which relates to governance structures, while the second draws out state roles and issues of democracy.

Mr Ruini then presented his comments, in three points:

- (i) He underlined Barilla's role as a local producer of pasta, indicating at the same time Barilla's French branded bread products sold in Italy, Italian branded goods in Italy and international brands marketed in Sweden. Barilla might be seen (in Italy) as a producer of a local product (pasta) within a global supply chain. The connection with the global chain is not just marketing, but also for sourcing, because the quantity of national wheat at the right quality is inadequate. In this respect, Mr Ruini found the global-local distinction helpful, precisely because it includes perceptions and values.
- (ii) He also found it helpful throughout the day to be presented with key summary points from each country. Some country's trade policies are very liberal, like Spain, and some such as France, Switzerland and Italy have food as central parts of the culture. Such issues relate to the quality of products. However, if a food company hopes to grow, it must be able to ensure supply and that may mean expanding the range of its supply chain.
- (iii) Mr Ruini felt, finally, that recent crises in food security have kick-started a local sourcing revival. He asked why food should be imported if it can be sourced at home. As an illustration Mr Ruini indicated the example of French firms that stopped importing palm oil in favour of local oil, due to supply and price volatility in Malaysia. Glamur needs to capture the complexity of the transition mentioned above by Prof Schneider. Mr Ruini foresees no local or global dominance. The world is in a period of transition and there will be both scales and an uncertain outcome. The project needs to explain why the transition is working and how each scale contributes to supply chain transformation.

Professor Brunori welcomed Mr Ruini's comments. He suggested that the project is seeking to identify the principles and drivers which generate one performance or another. If there is an intention to re-localise, this doesn't necessarily mean you discriminate in favour of



local chains, so much as generating a principle of food chain evolution. By way of example, Prof Brunori indicated that PDO labels attempt to displace global inputs with local ones. Thus there is a shift from a debate between local vs. global to a debate about intentions. If companies are large, local chains can be associated with a risk of not being able to secure raw materials. This is about a strategic approach to company size. But also quality constitutes another strategy. British wheat does not have the right qualities to make bread, so UK bread is largely made from foreign wheat. In other words, it is impossible to set clear definitions for the characteristics of global or local chains, instead, the discussion is about dynamics and intentions.

Professor Talis Tisenkopfs of the Baltic Studies Centre supported Mr Ruini's idea of local and global co-evolution, which may help project partners think in terms of thematic groups – such as policy - that stimulate co-evolution.

In response, **Henk Renting** added that the case studies should be used for generating data that will help answer some of these issues. This is a key point because the current project methodology obscures some of the issues within the attribute descriptions.

Dr Rodrigues then asked what would be done with the case study data that has been collected. Why were the case studies chosen? She felt that local and global chains remain in need of some clearer definition.

Professor Boyaci suggested that farmers remain the most important actors in the chain and asked for thought to be given to their role, their opinions and how they affect food chain performance. There is a need to learn from their ideas and expectations.

Ms Rahmanian then presented her responses, in three points:

- (i) Motivations behind the local movement – debates about food sovereignty seem relevant to the Glamur project. Food sovereignty is one narrative within the localization debate and captures rights and labour issues. In considering what the rural spaces of the future may look like, project partners need to refer to the multi-criteria performance matrix and compare attributes to the main arguments within the food sovereignty agenda. This can be a step in data triangulation.
- (ii) Actors and people – where are the people in the matrix? The matrix is anonymous, soulless and objective, while it is people who drive the way the chain changes through the pursuit of their interests. Somehow the project needs to identify the interests of people and make them clear. This could be a difficult task and begs the question of what the interests are behind the decisions made?
- (iii) There is a need to broaden out the view of knowledge and go beyond the quantitative findings, and post-normal science. This is an implicit objective of the project and needs to be made explicit and enrich the debate.



On the latter point **Professor Giampetro** responded that the matrix can be organized in relation to farmers, consumers, cows or any number of actors. Alternatively, the matrix could show who wins or loses in relation to certain issues. This flexibility then allows questions to be asked about why certain performances persist. Prof Giampetro's colleague **Dr Gonzalo Gamboa** added that discourses within the attributes depend on who the interested actors are and the performance matrices can help draw these out. Work-package 5 will carry out a participatory check on the issues. In that respect, the Glamur project is designed not just to offer research findings to supply chain actors, but also to see if the approaches within Glamur work, through the assessment of the case studies.

Professor Brunori explained that in Work-package 4, four types of assessment will be put into operation, and one of them is the participatory checklist. How case studies will anticipate the data needs of WP4 was still being discussed within the project partnership. Relevant attributes will be chosen through the participatory processes for all the case studies. The project partners are moving towards setting out some cases for comparison. He noted, however, in response to Professor Schneider's early suggestions, that finding data for success stories is hard enough, let alone data for failures.

Professor Erik Mathijs of the Catholic University of Leuven underlined that Glamur is a project written in response to a call from the EU. In this respect, the project is a response to demand. Members of the expert group may find it useful to look at the original call, to get a better understanding of the original contexts. At the time the project proposal was being prepared, partners knew about much of the evidence-based data, and that local-global divisions are to some degree an illusion, so it was necessary to balance that knowledge with the need to address the consumer-driven call, which is essentially about expanding the consumer market for sustainable food.

Henk Renting well understood this constraint, but still felt the need to accommodate interesting issues, such as how to engage people in sustainable supply chains, for example through the use of ICT or participation in consumer co-ops. Case studies might possibly be screened in this way. Therefore, although the criteria for selecting cases have been established, project partners need to justify why cases are interesting and how they contribute to the objectives of the project.

Henk Oostindie of Wageningen University suggested that the FAO schemes introduced earlier in the day were very interesting. He felt, however, that they were not so closely related to Glamur's food chain focus. SAFA was perhaps the closest to Glamur and offered some learning opportunities. Henk Renting agreed that SAFA offered the most interesting and ambitious opportunities for Glamur partners. SAFA challenges Glamur because it shows there are other methods.



5. Concluding comments

A range of interesting comments emerged from the three discussion sessions. Some of the key ones include:

- Important to **acknowledge national settings** as these will hugely impact the nature of food supply chains both now and in the future. While there is clearly a need to produce a composite matrix, care must be taken not to lose the diversity of the individual national contexts. This makes it important to include two page reports from each of the 12 national reports that relate their specific contexts to the comparative MCPM. These should then be included as an annex to the comparative report.
- The results of the Delphi underscore **the multi-dimensional nature of food supply chain characteristics**. The results clearly show that there is an agreement on the criteria which characterize local and global. There is also agreement that a debate exists around supply chain characteristics and performance. It is striking that people articulate asymmetric power relations on the one hand, and on the other hand the growing importance of consumers is foreseen or hoped for. How can this be reconciled?
- How different supply chain mechanisms relate to **the matter of consumer engagement** (for example, IT management, trust in local supply chains, or the importance of consumer organisations to implement forms consumer engagement). What are the implications of these different mechanisms and how might this affect the choice of case studies?
- Important to question **what roles lay and expert discourses play** in the project. For example, in the case of food miles there is much debate in scientific circles about whether food miles are very meaningful. Food miles nevertheless represent a very strong sustainability indicator for consumers.
- It is apparent that global and local food chains represent different potentials and trajectories for **system transformation**. This is an important dynamic within GLAMUR. The project is not just identifying the differences between global and local chains, but exploring the potential of both chains for system transformation. Nevertheless, while the comparative report and the Delphi report have identified distinctions between global and local chains, this work to date has also highlighted the importance of interaction and complementarity between the different scales.
- The GLAMUR project is feeding into an important part of the EU agenda, namely **the way in which food systems are communicated**. It is also important due to its focus on multi-dimensionality.



- There was considerable debate about **the distinctions between local and global**. There was a strong feeling that a hard and fast distinction can be unhelpful and that we are in a process of transition in which the ways in which global and local are manifest are as yet unclear.
- Another take on the debate was that **there may be no local or global dominance in the future**. That the world is in a process of transition and that the outcome is uncertain (i.e. post-normal epistemologies are needed). GLAMUR can make a contribution by explaining what is involved in this transition and how each of the scales can make a contribution to supply chain transformation.
- A further perspective was that distinctions could be made beyond the global-local by focusing on **the functions or properties of markets**: rural and city markets, modern markets, markets for bulk products, niche premium markets, community supported schemes etc.
- It is important that the findings of GLAMUR can be understood and utilized by actors in the field/on the ground. As such, project partners should ensure that the **scientific language used within the project is translated** into a language that is more familiar to the target groups.
- It was raised that the matrix is devoid of *people*. The matrix was described as being anonymous, soulless and objective, while **it is people who drive the way the food chain changes** through the pursuit of their interests. Somehow the project needs to identify the interests of people and make these clear. This could be a difficult task and begs the question as to what the interests are behind the decisions being made in relation to food supply chains.
- In relation to the FAO presentations, the only comment made by the partners when discussing the three presentations afterwards, was that although they were all very interesting, they were not so closely related to GLAMUR's food chain focus. **SAFA** was perhaps the closest to GLAMUR and offered some learning opportunities. In this respect, SAFA challenges GLAMUR because it shows there are other methods of assessment already in existence.



Annex 1. Expert Meeting Agenda, Rome. 27th February 2014. FAO: Iran Room

What is global food? And when is food local? How to measure food chain sustainability performance?			
Session I (chair: Henk Oostindie)			
9.30	9.45	Welcome to FAO	Eugenia Serova, FAO
9.45	10.00	GLAMUR in a nutshell: what's at stake in the global/local antinomy and how the Glamur research project will address the issue	Gianluca Brunori
10.00	10.30	Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance	James Kirwan and Damian Maye
10.30	11.00	Poster session (with coffee): presentation of national reports	
Session II (chair: Mario Giampietro)			
11.00	11.30	Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: synthesis report	James Kirwan and Damian Maye
11.30	12.15	Synthesis report discussion	Facilitated by Krizstof Gorlach
12.15	12.45	Stakeholders' communication and perception of food chains and their sustainability performance: Delphi expert panels report	James Kirwan and Damian Maye
12.45	13.30	Delphi report discussion	Facilitated by Henk Renting
13.30	14.30	Lunch break	
Session III (chair: Erik Mathijs)			
14.30	14.45	Glamur: assessment of food chain performance	Dominique Barjolle
14.45	15.15	SAFA: Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture Systems Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP) Partnership World Agriculture Watch (WAW)	Nadia Scialabba Carolyn Opio Marie Aude Even
15.15	15.30	Challenges in quantitative assessments of food chain sustainability performance	Erik Mathijs
15.30	15.45	Coffee break	
15.45	16.45	Parallel groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLAMUR external experts evaluation session • FAO experts with GLAMUR team • PhD students 	
17.00	18.00	Wrap up and final interactive remarks	