



# **Some reform proposals of Italian Regions improving efficiency and effectiveness of Farm Advisory System**

## **Workshop “Farm Advisory System in the European Union: proposals for improvement”**

# Status of Italian extension services system



The Italian Regions manage their ***agricultural extension services system*** on their territory independently.

Due to common problems, they have formed an ***inter-regional network for agricultural extension services***.

So they deal with all the features relating to services (research, training, advice and information), including the FAS, in according to a ***coordinated way***.



In Italy the FAS was activated in all regions, although with some delay due to procedural difficulties, such as the appeals of professional bodies, the lacking of a national framework. That has delayed the activation of the measure 114 on “Use of farm advisory services”.

The regions have met with the Italian Ministry of Agriculture on 10 November 2010 and they highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the measure 114 with some proposals.

1) The regions have implemented the measure 114 with ***different constraints*** required by European Commission (for example the number of advice granted to single farm during the programming period 2007-2013)

***Italian Proposal:*** “The frequency of uptake of the measure on the use of farm advisory services should be left open” (as also suggested by *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council*)

***(to be resolved in the current programming)***



## ***2) Deregulation of the contents of advice:***

### ***Italian Proposals:***

- a) “a farmer is not obliged to take up advice on each cross-compliance requirement in order to be entitled to receive support for the use of a farm advisory service” (as also suggested by the Report). Viceversa, there would be obvious problems of cost and organization of FAS operating bodies

***(to be resolved in the current programming)***

b) further deregulation of the advisory contents even with respect to **global performance** of the farm (**to be resolved in the current programming**)

3) On the latter issue, the European Commission should plan a further quality step by widening the advisory services' scope to **sustainable development topics (to be resolved post 2013)**

4) **Increasing the number of times for advice contribution up to at least two times** is already possible. RDPs, which foresee less than two times, have to be re-planned up to, at least, two times a programming. It has to be ensured that “Farm advisory services should assess the specific situation of the farmer and not only present general information” (as also suggested by the *Report* )



Any case, Italian Regions would propose an increase of the amount financed each time up to 3.000 euro

**5) Finally, the most important “*proposal of the system*”:**

The Italian Regions propose to plan all actions promoting development of human capital in a ***single cross action (hypothetical Axis 0)***, including all actions aimed at improving human capital that are currently in Axes 2 and 3 (measures 111, 114, 115, 124, 132, 133, 214, 331, 341). In this axis should be given a minimum percentage of total financial resources of rural planning (***to be resolved post 2013***). In this way, the preliminary investigation would be focused on the farmer beneficiary rather than on the farm, it would be easier by the procedural aspect.



## The monitoring activity of Italian FAS

The Italian agricultural extension services system is a quality system, which has got a different structure and organization among Italian Regions.

So it is very difficult to realize an accurate and complete monitoring activity, especially with regards to contents and methodologies.



At present, we are collecting the data to monitoring the implementation of the measures, which finances the Italian FAS (111, 114 and 115). They are the followings:

- financial resources;
- criteria for selection of farms or presence of priority;
- inclusion in packets or integrated projects;
- number of the FAS advisers;
- number of beneficiaries;
- total amount accepted.



So, in relation to the contents of the Axis 0, it is necessary to include this information into the following whole classification of services, that we are going to propose

# EXTENSION SERVICES CLASSIFICATION

## *First level services (target: farms and local territories)*



<p>a Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a1. Technical magazines</li> <li>a2. Fairs and exhibitions</li> <li>a3. Conferences and seminars</li> <li>a4. Other</li> </ul>	<p>b. Basic and local services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b1. Cultural activities</li> <li>b2. Basic farm advice</li> <li>b3. Technical advice</li> <li>b4. Marketing advice</li> <li>b5. Customer advice</li> <li>b6. Other</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>c. Advanced level support services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c.1 Network of environmental monitoring</li> <li>c.2 Specialized supports</li> <li>c.3 Marketing promotion</li> <li>c.4 Networks, data base and multimedia</li> <li>c.5 Other</li> </ul>	<p>d. Product specialized services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d1. Test</li> <li>d2. Technical advice</li> <li>d3. Marketing advice</li> <li>d4. Farm advice</li> <li>d5. Other</li> </ul>	<p>e Managerial services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e1. Accounting</li> <li>e2. Managerial and financial advices</li> <li>e3. Support to implement policy</li> <li>e4. Other</li> </ul>
---	---	---

## *Second level services (target: technical organizations)*

- Planning and management advices
- Analysis of innovation demand
- Other



# Thank you for your attention

[ascione@inea.it](mailto:ascione@inea.it)  
[vagnozzi@inea.it](mailto:vagnozzi@inea.it)