



New forms of local collective governance linked to the agricultural landscape:

- Identifying the scope and possibilities of hybrid institutions.

**Erik Fahlbeck and Gunnar Lindberg
Department of Economics
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala**



OUTLINE

- Research question
- Background/Literature
- Method
- Results
- Conclusions



RESEARCH QUESTION

- Identifying the scope and possibilities of hybrid institutions.

Hybrid institutions = Interaction between [State, local government, local interests (groups) and farmers].

- Hypothesis':
 - Reduce costs of implementation and production of public goods?
 - Improve uptake, evaluation, feedback and development of policy?
 - Increase the geographical and rural development dimensions of agricultural policy?
 - Improve the links between provision of public goods and development of enterprises/farms?

“Which hybrid institutions can do what ?”

BACKGROUND - POLICY

- Increased focus on rural development and public goods within the CAP.
- New ways of implementing policy and new collaboration between various actors is essential if the territorial and rural development aspects are to be successful. (e.g. Schucksmith et al. 2005, Clark 2006)
- Vertical collaboration and horizontal collaboration. (Marsden et al. 2002, Raco et al. 2006)
- “Transaction cost benefits” if policy is implemented through hybrid systems of governance. (Wätzold and Schwerdtner 2005, Birner and Wittmer 2004)
- Communication (vertically and horizontally) help reduce information asymmetries and improve implementation and provision quality. (Cabugueira 2001, Segerson and Miceli 1998, Martimort et al. 2005, Van Huylenbroeck and Whitby 1999).

BACKGROUND - FARMERS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

- Historically Sweden has tried to link agri –environmental and rural development support to new production and entrepreneurship. However, regional institutions have not traditionally been involved and policy has been driven top-down.
- “New associationalism”: Farmers exist in a more complex web of institutions, networks, consumers, markets, new products. (Marsden et al. 2002, Clark 2005)
- Environmental and rural development groups might practically:
 - Rally support for policies; implement decisions; enforce contracts; perform actual tasks (sub-contracts); teach technical knowledge; act as a hub between farmers, institutions and markets. (Krishna 2003)
- Hybrid institutions might improve the development of new “products” that internalise and build on the positive externalities of public goods.

METHOD

- Using a “survey/ case-study/ stakeholder-discussion” approach we wanted to answer the research questions by looking at:
 - (i) the actual potential for hybrid governance in Sweden.
 - (ii) the conditions for establishment of local co-management of agricultural land, resources and policy implementation.
 - (iii) the possibilities of these initiatives to actually deliver benefits in implementation, rural development and farm development.

Survey: 278 responses from local action groups of environmental or rural development type.

Case study: 2 groups purposely chosen, one from each type.

Stakeholder discussion: Results, transferability, related practical and research issues. Representatives from organizations, farmer association, government and the university

RESULTS - SURVEY

- **Rural development groups**

- 35 percent reported agri-environmental/public good/amenity activities. Geographical areas covered by these activities are limited to the local surroundings.
- 20 percent report cooperation with other organizations, 10 percent report cooperation with farmers.
- 33 percent report participation in or funding by governmental programs such as CAP, Leader etc.

- **Environmental groups**

- 95 percent reported agri-environmental/public good/amenity activities.
- 20 percent cooperate with farmers and 16 percent with other organizations.
- 50 percent receive funding from programs.

RESULTS - CASE STUDY

- **Rural development group**

- Supports local entrepreneurs and sustains a standard of local infrastructure and attractive surroundings.
- Public goods from agriculture is recognised as a mean to support e.g. hotels, restaurants and recreation services.
- Continuous preservation of cultural landscape and large scale open landscape project developed in close cooperation with local authorities, extension consultants and farmers.
- Purchase of an animal herd for own use and to help farmers with grazing.

- **Environmental group**

- Activities range from smaller preservation projects to large and more strategic landscape projects
- Active construction of a network with farmers, authorities and other organizations.
- Not in the same way focusing on supporting entrepreneurship and not as much hands on work.

RESULTS - LINKING CASES TO ABILITIES

- Improvements in uptake and reduced costs for implementation of policies.
- Networks involve farmers and local actors and created a link between agricultural policy, rural development and farm development
- Rural development group show abilities in: practical and technical knowledge; animals; own supportive activities.
- Environmental group show abilities in: information dissemination and creation of networks.

RESULTS - STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSION

Participants:

- Emphasised that a bottom-up approach, linked to productivity and new markets, might do a better job than top-down policy in implementing sustainable agri-environmental and rural development policy.
- Believed informal cooperation between farmers and between farmers and groups to be more common than generally observed.
- Believed that agri-environmental policy must be placed/treated more clearly in a rural development perspective.

CONCLUSIONS - POLICY ISSUES

- There exist numerous initiatives that illustrates the potential for a development of various forms of hybrid governance.
- Both groups use their knowledge, interest and time to e.g. help farmers apply for environmental support, offered grazing animals and helped with fencing. I.e. groups may reduce some of the transaction costs involved in policy and development of new farm activities.
- Authorities benefited from less mistakes and a better fulfilment of the policy goals.
- Whether a hybrid governance structure can improve the evaluation, feedback and development of policy is still an unanswered question.
- Hybrid governance seem to improve sustainable rural development and strengthen the geographical dimension of the CAP

CONCLUSIONS - LOCAL COOPERATION

- Farmers increased their incomes from environmental schemes and cooperate with groups and other farmers to develop farm activities.
- Farmer cooperation is developed as farmers are brought together to cooperate in agri-environmental policy.
- Local groups might stimulate development of new products and farm activities. The rural development group seems more promising in this respect. Plans exist to develop local brands and develop supply chains between the local farmers and other firms (hotels, restaurants, tourism, public services etc.)

RESEARCH QUESTION - CHECK

Hybrid governance:

- 😊 Seem to reduce costs of implementation and production of public goods.
- 😐 Seem to improve uptake but may or may not improve evaluation, feedback and development of policy.
- 😊 Seem to increase the geographical and rural development dimensions of agricultural policy.
- 😊 Seem to improve the links between provision of public goods and development of enterprises/farms.

- Rural development groups seem to offer greater potential to stimulate entrepreneurship, farmer cooperation and farm development.

FURTHER RESEARCH AND QUESTIONS

Thank you for your attention!

