



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

PAGRI/IAP

Politica Agricola Internazionale

Volume **1/2014**

Paolo De Castro

*Chairman of the Scientific Committee
Presidente del Comitato Scientifico*

Francesco Marangon

*Editor-in-Chief
Direttore Scientifico*

INTERNATIONAL

www.politicaagricolainternazionale.it

agricultural

POLICY

THE APTITUDE TO PROMOTE VALUE CREATION IN GI AREAS THROUGH THE ADOPTION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

JEL classification: Q13, Q18

Marcello De Rosa*, Felice Adinolfi**, Luca Bartoli*, Silvia Chiappini*

Abstract. *The search for financial opportunities to promote value creation has been a key topic in the literature concerning geographical indications. In this framework, a relevant set of opportunities is provided by the rural development policy (Rdp) of the European Union. However, access to Rdp is not easy: therefore, value creation through consumption of Rdp is the result of an individual and collective entrepreneurial process within a GI area. This paper intends to look into different adoption strategies of*

Rdp to promote value creation in a GI food supply chain. Our results confirm, on the one hand, a higher aptitude to create value through Rdp on behalf of farms working inside GI circuits; on the other hand, empirical analysis evidences a limited set of consumed measures by the farms. This reflects a lost opportunities in terms of value creation.

Keywords: *value creation, rural development policies, geographical indication*

1. Introduction

The recent approaches of rural development policies provide a new version of agricultural competitiveness: the consequences of the modernization paradigm filter the way of supporting competitiveness of agriculture in rural areas: in the European agricultural model different types of agriculture should be selectively supported, and ‘farm persistency needs to be enhanced in a well-targeted rather than generic way (van der Ploeg, 2010). Accordingly, sustainable rural development should be rooted on high-added-value and high-quality agricultural products. To this end, Rdp pays higher attention on endogenous rural development, through a territorial approach, which provides for either a diversified set of tools for rural development or various opportunities for farms in rural areas. However, the access to Rdp is conditioned by the respect of commitments on behalf of farmers: therefore, in a principal-agent perspective, a new contractual approach is arranged between the policy makers (principal) and the users/consumers of policies (the agent). Against this framework, farmers play an active role: they must choose among various strategic options to develop their farm with a long-term perspective.

The topic of our paper is the “consumption” (what means in this particular context: the

* University of Cassino and Southern Latium

** Authors affiliations University of Bologna

capability to obtain funds) of rural development policies for value creation. More precisely, the paper aims to test value creation through the access to Rdp by farms working within an area with a geographical indication (GI). To this end the paper presents a methodological approach to infer the aptitude to value creation through Rdp on behalf of buffalo farms localized in a GI area. After a brief theoretical background, an empirical analysis is presented: we investigate buffalo farms working in the production area of “Mozzarella di Bufala” PDO, a very famous Italian cheese.

1.2. Consumption of rural policies and value creation: theoretical background

The research of financial opportunities to promote value creation is a key topic in the literature concerning geographical indications. Barjolle (2006) stresses the importance of the capability to gain access to financial support in order to promote value creation of quality products and to promote integrated rural development. In a multidimensional view of entrepreneurship (Yamada, 2003) access to Rdp could be assimilated to an entrepreneurial activity aiming at expanding the rural business (Pyysiainen *et al.*, 2006; Gray, 2002). Like for other entrepreneurial activities, three essential dimensions of entrepreneurship need to be underlined (McElwee, 2005):

- the first one concerns risk-taking: access to rural development policies is costly and implies transaction costs¹; as a matter of fact, the risks of failure of the application rise the total costs of accessing to Rdp measures;
- the second entrepreneurial aspect is related to growth orientation: the demand for Rdp is motivated by the idea of promoting farm’s growth in the broad sense. That stimulates the farmers towards external funds to support their strategies.
- finally, innovativeness: access to Rdp support innovative processes of boundary shift (van der Ploeg *et al.*, 2002), aiming at producing new quality products, diversifying farming activity, developing new niche products, etc².

The analysis of farm’s innovation and value creation through the access to Rdp can be read from a double Austrian School perspective: the first one is a classical Shumpeterian vision (Shumpeter, 1911), strictly jointed to the farmer’s willingness to introduce changes in the farm. The second one is related to the concept of entrepreneurial alertness developed in the neo-Austrian perspective (Kirzner, 1973): the aptitude to discover the opportunities offered by the second pillar of the CAP is the exit of the entrepreneurial alertness to financially support his decision of investments. According to the literature on rural entrepreneurship, the identification and the exploitation of opportunities (entrepreneurial alertness) are recognized as key competencies in entrepreneurship (Man *et al.*, 2002). Therefore, the entrepreneur is engaged in active, dynamic and competitive economic striving, in a continuing pursuit of opportunity (McElwee, Bosworth, 2010).

To grasp value creation processes Prahalad (1993) suggests that either a performance gap (based on restructuring processes) or an opportunity gap (based on revitalization processes) have

¹ According to the regulation 1305/201 (article 2): “transaction cost” means an additional cost linked to fulfilling a commitment, but not directly attributable to its implementation or not included in the costs or income foregone that are compensated directly; and which can be calculated on a standard cost basis.

² “Innovation involves much more than technology; more and more it relates to strategy, marketing, organization, management and design. Farmers looking for alternatives to industrial agriculture don’t necessarily apply “new” technology. Their novelties emerge as the outcome of different ways of thinking and different ways of doing things” Knickel *et al.* (2009, 94).

to be taken into account. The actual offer of Rdp addresses farm strategies towards the two strategies described above, with special provisions for the second, by encouraging processes of farm boundary shift (van der Ploeg *et al.*, 2002; Pacciani *et al.*, 2001). Moreover, Porter and Kramer's concept of shared value (Porter, Kramer, 2011) fits well in the new rural paradigm of multifunctional agriculture (OECD, 2006) where a societal value overlaps with the economic value provided for farms³.

The case of "value creation through Rdp access" is provided by farms producing a Geographical Indication (GI). Adding value through the protection and labelling a product as "geographical indication" is a key strategy in this framework (Fay, 2011) and should raise economic benefits for farmers producing the GI. As a consequence, farm strategies are sustained by specific investments aiming at value creation, which should distinguish farms producing the GI product from farms not producing it.

One relevant factor in the use of a GI is the collective dimension of the governance. This dimension is evident in the definition of the strategies to develop GI products and to support the persistency of localized food systems based on typical products. According to Barjolle and Sylvander (2002), the effectiveness of the collective strategy depends on the capability of each local actor to "appropriate the collective process". Moreover, collective action raises economic power along the food chain, thus fostering higher capabilities to increase the farmers' economic performance (Jeanneaux Blasquiet-Revol, 2012). On the other hand, the protection process of a GI is a starting point that should be supported along the time by the local producers. To this end, farmers working inside a GI area could benefit from a set of measures of political economy to adopt either supply chain strategies or integrated territorial strategies (Belletti *et al.*, 2002). This strategic behaviour should be the result of shared strategies linking both geographical and organizational proximities (Torre, Wallet, 2012; Rallet, Torre, 2004).

2. Rural development policies for value creation: an analytical framework

As Schmitz (2005) points out, a relevant task for policy makers lies in the identification and support of more profitable activities aiming at increasing the added value at farmers' stage in the agrifood value chain. Recent rural development policies surely accomplish this objective by providing farmers with a set of opportunities (EC, 2008). As a matter of fact, the supply of Rdp makes funds available to sustain value creation along the agrifood chain through measures either for farm structural adjustment or for increasing the quality of agricultural products and, finally, for diversifying on-farm activities.

In the actual programming period (2007-2013) the measures available for farmers are included in the four axes of the regional development rural plan⁴ presented in the appendix 1.

Supply of Rdp makes funds available to sustain value creation through measures either for farm structural adjustment (ex. 121) or for increasing the quality of agricultural products (ex. 132) and, finally, to diversify farming activity (ex. 311). Moreover, specific measures can be


³ *The concept of shared value can be defined as policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates. Shared value creation focuses on identifying and expanding the connections between societal and economic progress (p.6).*


⁴ See the European network for rural development (ENRD).

“consumed” to raise added value of agricultural products (for example, 123). Our paper is set against this background and makes reference to the basic concept of Porter’s value creation (Porter, 1991; 1985). As explained in the theoretical background, he defines value creation as a process of adding value to a product through processes of qualification, valorization and addition of subsidiary services. Moreover, in the Porter and Kramer’s (2011) scheme, value creation is strictly linked to societal wellbeing. Similarly, consumption of policies for multifunctional agriculture adds value at farm and social levels. Therefore, by adapting Porter’s perspective, we consider in this paper as “value creation” a process of access to Rdp with the object of raising the value of agricultural products at farmers’ level. By discriminating between farms working within a GI and those outside GI area, we put forward an approach for giving account of value creation through consumption of Rdp. Following Prahalad’s (1993, p.41) analysis, value creation is realized by filling up two gaps:

1. “Performance gap, i.e improving performance across a wide variety of dimensions such as quality, cost, cycle time, productivity and profitability;
2. *Opportunity gap, profitably deploying resources to create new markets, new businesses and a sense of broad strategic direction”.*

Measures for farm competitiveness (first axis) and farm diversification (third axis) will be analyzed: more precisely, the first axis will be the main focus in order to consider measures for value creation of the first type (performance gap); the second type of value creation (opportunity gap) will be analyzed through measures of both the first and the third axis. Furthermore, with the purpose of fully taking into consideration Porter’s scheme, thus taking into account support services, measures for farms advising, training and information (111+114) will equally be considered. Figure 1a and 1b evidence a possible pattern of analysis: figure 1a illustrates value creation through access to whatever axis of Rdp; in figure 1b, possible measures of each axis are associated to each step of value creation.





3. Materials and method

In order to look into the farm’s aptitude for accessing RDP funds related to “value creation strategy by GI”, our empirical analysis will follow a two-stage methodology. The first stage features in the context of impact analysis of a GI and refers to objective methods and, more precisely, to synchronic evaluation (Paus and Reviron, 2010). To this end, we analyse the consumption of Rdp measures, that is to say the farms’ capability to obtain funds, paying special attention to measures aimed at promoting value creation. By comparing buffalo farms working under the GI protection and outside GI protection, we will test the access to Rdp for value creation and we will try to infer the capability of creating value by gaining access to Rdp. Therefore, the database containing the total application to Rdp on behalf of buffalo farms has been processed. Moreover, according to Prahalad’s scheme, a second stage concerns the distinction between value creation, aimed at filling a performance gap and value creation aimed at filling an opportunity gap. To this end, a qualitative analysis of the application forms and direct interviews with a sample of farmers and with key respondents have been carried out. This has permitted to check the type of investments realized by farmers: our analysis focuses on the first and the third axes, including measures of investments through which an authentic entrepreneurial activity is achieved.

The area under study is the Amaseno Valley, in the region Latium (Italy)⁵. The database, mainly from the region Latium, comes from both secondary and primary sources and it concerns the amount of farms funded within the Rdp between 2007-2013. It provides useful feedback on measures funded subdivided into axis and actions of intervention.

4. Results

4.1. Buffalo sector in the Amaseno Valley

In the Amaseno Valley, 323 farms work in the buffalo sector; 70% of them works inside the PDO circuit, while the remaining percentage acts outside of it. For thirty years, the farms in the Amaseno Valley have been undergoing a considerable process of restructuring, with a reduction in the number of farms, counterbalanced by the increase in the number of heads (table 1).

Tab. 1 - Evolution of buffalo farms in Amaseno Valley

Region	Var.% 2010-1982		Var.% 2010-1990		Var.% 2010-2000	
	farms	heads	farms	heads	farms	heads
Italy	13,9	607,2	14,1	321,0	8,4	98,0
Latium	-12,7	765,3	-23,6	318,9	-8,5	87,6
Amaseno Valley	-42,7	366,8	-46,4	137,0	-18,4	43,0

Source: data processed from ISTAT

With respect to Italy, in Amaseno Valley buffalo breeding represents currently 13,3% of Italian farms and 5,8% of heads (table 2); in relation to the region Latium, the percentage raises respectively to 54,6% and 33,4%, in sensible reduction with respect to 2000. As a consequence buffalo breeding is characterised by small dimension of the farm; however in the last years a restructuring process is evident, with the average herd rising from 37 to 65.

Tab. 2 - Regional and national incidence of buffalo farms and average dimension

	2000		2010	
	farms	heads	farms	heads
% / Italy	17,6	8,1	13,3	5,8
% / Latium	61,2	43,8	54,6	33,4
	Heads/farm		Heads/farm	
Italy	81,0		148,0	
Latium	51,8		106,2	
Amaseno Valley	37,0		65,0	

Source: own elaboration on ISTAT data

⁵ Municipalities taken into account are: Maenza, Priverno, Prossedi, Roccasecca dei Volsci (province of Latina); Amaseno, Castro dei Volsci, Giuliano di Roma, Vallecorsa, Villa Santo Stefano (province of Frosinone).

4.2. The consumption of Rdp

As regards the consumption of rural development policies, table 3 shows that three out of nine municipalities of the Valley have not consumed policies. The percentage of access to Rdp among GI and non-GI farms reflects the percentage of GI/non GI farm distribution: if 70% of farms work within GI circuits, 66% adopt Rdp. The highest access percentage and concentration of funds has been found in the municipality of Amaseno, where the most relevant part of buffalo breeding is concentrated. However, against the 50% of farms concentrating in this municipality, the share of funds obtained here reaches the 88%. As a consequence, there is a sort of asymmetric distribution of investments in the Valley, as shown by the average amount of funds obtained.

Tab. 3 - Consumption of Rdp in Amaseno Valley

Municipalities	Consumption of policy	Average investment (€)	
		GI	Not GI
Maenza	No		
Priverno	No		
Prossedi	Yes	55.727	
Roccasecca dei Volsci	Yes	35.750	
Amaseno	Yes	68.605	161.595
Castro dei Volsci	Yes	1.500	
Giuliano di Roma	No		
Vallecorsa	Yes		1.500
Villa Santo Stefano	Yes	1.500	1.500

Source: data processed database of Latium region

On the whole, 31 farms have been funded. As a matter of fact, a restricted number of measures have been funded, being limited to 4 relevant types of investment:

1. the first one is the integrated package for the first settlement of the young entrepreneurs;
2. the second one concerns funds to stimulate farm's structural adjustment;
3. a third type of measures makes reference to the use of farm advisory services, to encourage cross compliance;
4. finally, measures for farm diversification are used, even if on a limited base.

The measure for farm adjustment (121) funds essentially interventions either for the optimization of agricultural processes, for the improvement of farm efficiency and for the upgrading of product quality. Few differences have been found between GI and not GI circuits: in one case investments to improve animal welfare have been adopted by a GI buffalo farm; in another case, investments for farm structural adjustment are linked to strategies of farm diversification (121+311). This happens even in cases of generational renewal, where the purchase of equipment is preferred to any other structural investment aiming at improving added value of agricultural products. No specific measures have been found devoted to the value creation (for example, 132). Measures aiming at supporting agricultural processes (114) have been consumed, within the framework of cross compliance.

The second step of our analysis is the articulation of farms on the basis of value creation, divided up into GI and not GI farms. The results are presented in a synthetic way in figure 3.

The figure shows higher aptitude towards value creation by GI farms: as a matter of fact, the opportunity gap (through which higher added value is created) is filled up by 56,5% of farms, while 25% of farms fill it outside the GI circuit.




Table 4 gives more detailed information by distributing the farms according to the type of value creation and to the adhesion to the GI.

- A first interesting result concerns young entrepreneurs starting agricultural activity: the large majority of them (7 out of 8) work inside the GI circuits, that is, act along a quality strategy based on typical products of their territory. In 4 out of 5 cases, the entry strategy aims at filling a performance gap, which is to rationalize the agricultural process, while the remaining 3 create value through revitalizing the farm (opportunity gap).
- Other cases of consumption of integrated measures stimulate value creation through the opportunity gap: in this context, 71% of funded farms work inside GI circuit; just 3 out of 14 show similar strategies of farm development.
- 2 farms, equally distributed between GI and not GI circuits, have obtained funds from single measures of investment, within either the first or the third axis.
- Finally, non-dedicated measures for value creation have been exploited by farms (for example, 132).

Tab. 4 - Value creation through Rdp in the Amaseno Valley

Type of measure	Type of filled gap	Performance gap		Opportunity gap	
		GI	Not GI	GI	Not GI
Multiple measures of investment (integrated farm package or else)	For generational renewal or first settlement (112+114 (or 111)+121)	4	1	3	–
	I axis (ex. 114+121) I + III axis (ex. 121+311)	1	–	10	3
Single measures of investment	I or III axis (121 or 311)	–	–	1	1
Specific measures for value creation	Ex. 132	–	–	–	–
Single support measures	Training courses*	3	1	5	1
	Farm advisory system	4	3	–	–

* farms having attended training course among the 31 funded farms.
Source: data processed from ISTAT

5. Not to conclude

This paper has tried to put forward a methodological proposal to investigate processes of value creation through the access to Rdp. In order to adopt a rigorous approach, Porter’s scheme of value creation has been borrowed. Moreover, by distinguishing between farms in GI circuits and farms outside, we have classified this special type of consumption on the basis of the farm’s strategy to fill a performance gap or an opportunity gap. Even though further empirical analyses are needed, the preliminary results seem supporting and encouraging us to continue along this path.

The empirical test has confirmed higher aptitudes towards value creation (through Rdp) by farms inside the GI circuit. As a matter of fact, GI farms show higher proclivity to fill the opportunity gap, by creating value through paths of processing and qualification of their products. Therefore, the adhesion to a GI fosters higher levels of involvement for buffalo farms and, due to stronger connection with the institutional framework and higher opportunities to obtain funds provided by Rdp.

On the other hand, further elements of reflection, which should be investigated in future research stem from our analysis. A first element points to the asymmetric distribution of the funds in the Valley: almost 90% of funds are concentrated in 1 municipality, where 50% of buffalo farms are located. That means that in this area, geographical proximity engenders organizational proximity and the possibility to benefit from a relational institutional context supportive of the processes of value creation through policy.

Moreover, few farms are able to pursue these strategies and, most important, they do not fully exploit the opportunity available from the regional plans for rural development. The complete absence of demand for specific measures of value creation raises serious doubts about the farms’ real capability of activating paths of boundary shift. However, it could be of help, and it will be the object of future researches, to understand the motivation for concentrating the demand for Rdp on a restricted set of determined measures. In our opinion, the question has to be addressed from a double perspective, which involves both the demand and the supply side. In the first case, the choice of filling an opportunity gap sets up an innovation with a functional repositioning

of the farm. This strategy is resource-demanding and requires, on the one hand, an evaluation of the farm's socioeconomic characteristics; on the other, it requires the farmer to be "familiar" with innovation processes (Gow *et al.*, 2002). However, it is not only a demand problem, but a bias could also be generated on the "supply" side. McElwee (2006) is very convincing on this point when he underlines the scarcity of advice to support farmers' strategies. This explanation is confirmed by socio-psychology models applied to understand farmers' conservation behaviour (Beedell, Rehman, 2000). Therefore, we agree with McElwee's definition of "constrained entrepreneurship", which impedes a full and conscious consumption of Rdp. In this framework it is not surprising that *support is more likely to be sought from family and friend networks before public sector agencies. Poor and inconsistent advice prevents many farmers from attempting to expand their business* (McElwee, 2005). As Knickel *et al.* (2009) point out: *there is a gap between the need for change and farmers' willingness to adjust, and the insufficient capacities of innovation agencies and advisory services to effectively support changes.*

Hence, processes of value creation within GI areas could be constrained and limited by an institutional context, where support services do not act as a stimulus but as a bond against higher levels of competitiveness of farms working within GI circuits. The evaluation of this aspect could be the object of future researches, in order to clarify if it impedes a wider diffusion of practices and strategies coherent with the multifunctional paradigm of agriculture and, according to Porter and Kramer's perspective, to distribute higher societal value.

REFERENCES

- Barjolle D. (2006). "Indications géographiques et appellations d'origine contrôlée: un outil de propriété intellectuelle au service du développement rural?". In: Actes du colloque international alimentation et territoires (ALTER), Baeza, Espagne.
- Barjolle D., Sylvander B. (2002). "Some factors of success for origin labelled products in agro-food supply chains in Europe: market, internal resources and institutions", *Économies et Sociétés*, XXV: 9-10.
- Beedell J., Rehman T. (2000). "Using social-psychology models to understand farmers' conservation behaviour", *Journal of rural studies*, XVI: 117-127.
- Belletti G., Marescotti A., Scaramuzzi S. (2002). Paths of rural development based on typical products: a comparison between alternative strategies, 5th IFSA Symposium: Farming and rural system, research and extension, local identities and globalization, Florence, Italy, April 8-11.
- EC (2008). The EU rural development policy: facing the challenges, Brussels.
- Fay F. (2011). Adding value to agricultural products, presented at the African Union – European Union joint workshop: Creating value through geographical labelling and indications: the power of origin.
- Gow H., Olivier D., Gow N. (2002). Cooperating to compete in high velocity global markets: the strategic role of flexible supply chain architecture. *Journal on chain and network science*, II: 19-32.
- Jeanneaux P., Blasquie-Revol H. (2012). Localized agro-food systems in France and dairy farms performances, in proceedings of the IFSA: Producing and reproducing farming systems New modes of organization for sustainable food systems of tomorrow, Aarhus 1-4 July.
- Kirzner I. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Man T.W.Y., Lau T., Chan K.F. (2002). "The competitiveness of small and medium enterprises. A conceptualization with focus on entrepreneurial competences", *Journal of Business Venturing*, XVII:123-142.
- McElwee G. (2005). A literature review of entrepreneurship in agriculture, ESoF, University of Lincoln.
- McElwee G. (2006). "The enterprising farmer: a review of entrepreneurship in agriculture", *Royal agricultural society of England journal*, CLXVII: 66-75.

- McElwee G., Bosworth G. (2010). "Exploring the strategic skills of farmers across a typology of farm diversification approaches", *Journal of farm management*, XIII: 819-838.
- OECD (2006). *The new rural paradigm*, Paris, OECD.
- Pacciani A., Belletti G., Marescotti A., Scaramuzzi S. (2001). The role of typical products in fostering rural development and the effects of Regulation (EEC) 2081/92, 73rd EAAE seminar, Ancona, Italy, June 28-30.
- Paus M., Réviron S. (2010). "Mesure de l'impact territorial d'initiatives agroalimentaires. Enseignements de deux cas suisses", *Économie rurale*, CCCXV: 28-45.
- Porter M.E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*, Free Press, New York, 1985.
- Porter M.E. (1991). "Towards a dynamic theory of strategy", *Strategic management journal*, XII: 95-117.
- Porter M.E., Kramer M.R. (2011). "Creating Shared Value," *Harvard Business Review*, LXXXIX: 62-77.
- Prahalad C.K. (1993). "The role of core competencies in the corporation", *Research/technology management*, XXXVI:40-47.
- Rallet A., Torre A. (2004). "Proximité et localisation", *Économie rurale*, CCLXXXIV:25-41.
- Schmitz H. (2005). Value chain analysis for policy makers and practitioners, ILO, Geneva, 2005.
- Shumpeter J. (1911). *Théorie de l'évolution économique* (Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung), première édition.
- Torre A., Waller F. (2012). *Proximité et territoires*. Paris. Economica
- van der Ploeg J.D. (2010). Rural Development and territorial cohesion in the new CAP, document prepared for the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development.
- van der Ploeg J.D., Long A., Banks J. (2002). *Living Countrysides: Rural Development Processes in Europe: the State of the Art*. Doetinchem. Elsevier, EBI.

APPENDIX 1 – MEASURES PROVIDED BY THE RDP

Axis 1: measure for competitiveness of agricultural and forestry sector: the menu of measures is the following.

Promoting knowledge and improving human potential	111	Vocational training and information actions
	112	Setting up of young farmers
	113	Early retirement
	114	Use of advisory services
	115	Setting up of management, relief and advisory services
Restructuring and developing physical potential and promoting innovation	121	Modernisation of agricultural holdings
	122	Improvement of the economic value of forests
	123	Adding value to agricultural and forestry products
	124	Cooperation for the development of new products, processes and technologies in the agriculture and food sector and in the forestry sector
	125	Infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and forestry
	126	Restoring agricultural production potential
Quality of agricultural production and products	131	Meeting standards based on Community legislation
	132	Participation of farmers in food quality schemes
	133	Information and promotion activities
Transitional measures	141	Semi-subsistence farming
	142	Producer groups
	143	Providing farm advisory and extension services
	144	Holdings undergoing restructuring due to a reform of a common market organization

Axis 2: measures to protect environment and the countryside

Sustainable use of agricultural land	211	Natural handicap payments to farmers in mountain areas
	212	Payments to farmers in areas with handicaps, other than mountain areas
	213	Natura 2000 payments and payments linked to Directive 2000/60/EC
	214	Agri-environment payments
	215	Animal welfare payments
	216	Non-productive investments
Sustainable use of forestry land	221	First afforestation of agricultural land
	222	First establishment of agro-forestry systems on agricultural land
	223	First afforestation of non-agricultural land
	224	Natura 2000 payments
	225	Forest-environment payments
	226	Restoring forestry potential and introducing prevention actions
	227	Non-productive investments

Axis 3: measures to improve quality of life and to promote economic diversification in rural areas

Diversify the rural economy	311	Diversification into non-agricultural activities
	312	Support for business creation and development
	313	Encouragement of tourism activities
Improve the quality of life in rural areas	321	Basic services for the economy and rural population
	322	Village renewal and development
	323	Conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage
	331	Training and information
	341	Skills-acquisition and animation measure with a view to preparing and implementing a local development strategy

Axis 4: LEADER

Implementing local development strategies	411	Competitiveness
	412	Environment/land management
	413	Quality of life/diversification
	421	Implementing cooperation projects
	431	Running the local action group, skills acquisition, animation

Source: ENRD