

FOOD IMPROV'IDERS

Provide producers with fit-for-purpose knowledge to develop new sustainable food chain models improving their revenue and enhancing consumers' satisfaction

Intellectual Output 2 **Dedicated pedagogical contents on Short** **Food Chains (UP)**



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

<https://foodimproviders.eu>

This document forms part of the deliverables from the FOOD IMPROV'IDERS project which has received funding from the European Union's ERASMUS+ program under grant agreement 2020-1-FR01-KA204-080640.

The project is aiming to develop the skills and knowledge of EU producers in short food chains circuits to facilitate their insertion in existing network and/or the creation of new one to rebalance their role in the food chain.

More information on the project can be found at www.foodimproviders.eu.

Authors:

Cristina Mora
Audrey Cavalieri

Contributors:

Giovanni Sogari
Davide Menozzi
Hilva Gjoni
Françoise Gorga
Elena López Colmenero
Alfonso Ribas Alvarez
Mojca Jevsnik
Urška Jamnikar Ciglencečki
Adam Hegyi
Galina Ivanova



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Table of contents

1. Project Summary	5
2. Introduction	5
3. Deliverable 1.5 - Raw learning contents and internal assessment.....	6
4.1. Introduction	6
4.2 Raw learning material contents index	6
4.3 Internal assessment of the raw pedagogical material	10
4. Deliverable 1.6 - Stakeholders' Feedback Main findings.....	11
5.1 Introduction	11
5.2 Collection of raw material.....	12
5.3 Internal and stakeholders' feedbacks.....	13
5.4 Conclusion.....	27
5. Deliverable 1.7 - Improved raw training contents.....	28
6.1 Introduction	28
6.2 Improved pedagogical material and translation.....	28
6.3 Conclusion.....	29
6. Deliverables 2.3 and 2.4	29
7. Conclusion	31

1. Project Summary

FOOD IMPROV'IDERS is an Erasmus+ project that aims to provide EU food producers with tailored training content in line with their needs and lifestyle to improve their skills and knowledge in short food chains circuits. To reach the beneficiaries, the project will offer the training content both online and in presential courses.

The FOOD IMPROV'IDERS project gathers 6 partners from 6 different EU Member States (France, Bulgaria, Italy, Hungary, Slovenia, Spain) having complementary profiles in order to provide the necessary expertise for the implementation of all project tasks.

Part. #	Partner name	Partner short name	Country
1	Association Nationale des Industries Alimentaires	ANIA	France
2	Eszterházy Károly University	EKU	Hungary
3	University of Ljubljana	UL	Slovenia
4	University of Parma	UP	Italy
5	Foundation Juana de Vega	FJDV	Spain
6	Europroject	EP	Bulgaria

2. Introduction

University of Parma was in charge of the Intellectual Output 2 - Dedicated pedagogical contents on Short Food Chains.

The work for this IO started after the definition of specifications and methodology which were the aim of IO 1.

First the partners together defined common standards and of the topics that had to be analyzed in the modules the creation of the pedagogical material started and led to the first draft of the contents and the following internal assessment (*Deliverable 1.5*). Once the raw material was approved by all the partners the pedagogical material was tested with stakeholders to collect feedback and understand if the material produced was suitable and coherent (*Deliverable 1.6*). This phase of tests lead to the improvement of the pedagogical material performed based on the issues highlighted by the feedback received. After the improvement each partner translated the pedagogical material in its national language (*Deliverable 1.7*).

Once the pedagogical material was ready and approved it was uploaded by each partner on the dedicated E-Learning platform (*Deliverables 2.3. and 2.4*).

3. Deliverable 1.5 - Raw learning contents and internal assessment

4.1. Introduction

In this document will be analyzed the work done by the partners to assess the quality and completeness of the raw version of the pedagogical material.

4.2 Raw learning material contents index

Following the guidelines of the Deliverable 1.4 “Pedagogical requirements and quality standards” and based on the target demand the partners started to draft the index of the course including the different modules and sub-modules.

In June 2021 a shared table on Microsoft Excel was created with a first draft of the different topics and the firsts draft of the sub-modules for each topic (*Table 1*).

In this table the partners decided who was going to be the main contributor/author in charge for each topic (who lead the module and submodules) and the co-author (proofread and enrich).

Author and co-author cooperated sharing the word document with the Pedagogical Content and other materials (by e-mails and dedicated Teams meeting).

After this first version of the module the partners reached the definitive version and the definitive attribution of author and co-authors as showed in *Table 2*.

Table 1 - Draft of the pedagogical content

THEMES	MODULE	SUB MODULE 1	SUB MODULE 2	SUB MODULE 3	SUB MODULE 4	SUB MODULE 5	SUB MODULE 6	Legal aspect and financial advices
INTRODUCTION	Project presentation	Objective of the project, partners, other info	Best practices guide on short food chains models development and implementation	Questionnaires and events results	the platform	
Providing Theoretical knowledge on alternative food chain	Theoretical knowledge on alternative food chain	Sustainability & Rural development	Short chain actors	Cooperation and trust in short food chains	Contribution to the preservation of the culture/tradition/heritage of the territory (link to PDO products)	Consumer and short food chain market analysis		National and European legislation on short food value chain
Improving producers' entrepreneurial and managerial mindset	Managerial advice	Introduction - what is the multifunctional farm	Human capital management	Time and budget management	Control planning (cost classification)	Business Plan	Equipment	Fund sourcing (EU, National, local)

Table 1 - Draft of the pedagogical content

<p>Ensuring high standards for food traceability and safety</p>	<p>Food safety</p>	<p>When is food safe at Farm level - Introduction General EU food law</p>	<p>How to ensure safety in a multifunctional farm</p>	<p>Animal and plant identification</p>	<p>One health concept - animal and plant health</p>	<p>Wrong behaviour - Risks and fake news; Take home message</p>	<p>European legislation ; National and regional legislation</p>	
	<p>Basic elements of food processing, food quality</p>	<p>food quality and consumer trust</p>	<p>food processing</p>	<p>new technologies, plant innovation (industry 4.0 digitalization)</p>	<p>sustainable and user friendly food plants (<u>economic, environmental, food waste, social point of view</u>)</p>	<p>packaging, labelling, traceability, block chain</p>	<p>case studies (crowdfunding, sharing)</p>	<p>National and European legislation</p>
<p>Improving producers' competencies in product valorisation, marketing and labelling and client relation</p>	<p>Local-Short Chain Food Marketing</p>	<p>introduction & Value chain</p>	<p>Instruments (swot, business canvas, questionnaire focus group)</p>	<p>Competitor analysis</p>	<p>Customer satisfaction - Branding - Loyalty</p>	<p>Innovation and Design Thinking</p>	<p>Digital marketing</p>	
	<p>Labeling scheme</p>	<p>Introduction (and how to obtain)</p>	<p>Ingredients and allergens</p>	<p>nutritional</p>	<p>PDO/PGI/LABEL ROUGE/others</p>	<p>Organic</p>	<p>Sustainable labeling (comprising Km 0)</p>	<p>National and European legislation</p>

Table 1 - Draft of the pedagogical content

Highlighting best practices in alternative food chains (by sectors) and replication opportunities,	Success stories	National cases

Table 2 - Modules and authors

Module	Authors
Project presentation	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Audrey Cavalieri</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Adam Hegyi, Barbara Varga-Pallagi</p>
Theoretical knowledge on alternative food chain	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Davide Menozzi</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD</p>
Managerial advice	<p>Foundation Juana de Vega (FDJV): Anxo Calvo Silvosa and Ángel Fernández Castro</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD</p> <p>Association Nationale Des Industries Alimentaires (ANIA): Françoise Gorga</p>
Food safety	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Hilva Gjoni</p> <p>University of Ljubljana (UL): Urška Jamnikar Ciglencčki, Mojca Jevsnik, Malan Strbenc, Spela Strnad, Tanja Knific</p>
Basic elements of food processing, food quality	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Audrey Cavalieri, Giulia Zanti, Anja Losso</p>

Table 2 - Modules and authors

Marketing	Association Nationale Des Industries Alimentaires (ANIA): Françoise Gorga
Lagelling scheme	University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Giovanni Sogari, Audrey Cavalieri Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD

Once the partners defined a common layout for the modules, in order to ensure a coherent structure of the different modules, the writing process began.

When each partner had the first version of the assigned topic ready the pedagogical material was collected on a shared folder on Google Drive (<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1cxOlfN5eipOpc1fHSnswathcKgHfc6J>) and reviewed by the consortium of the project.

The internal comments/review on the Modules were made between the end of October/first week of November 2021.

The internal assessment of the raw version of the pedagogical material activity was discussed in April 2022 and actually started in May-June 2022.

The comments received were both general remarks or were specifically related with individual modules/sub-modules. These concerned different aspects such as the way a topic was presented, the quantity of practical examples given, the coherence of the additional resources with the topic covered.

A more detailed analysis of all the comments received for each module and sub-modules is present in the Deliverable 1.6 “Stakeholders’ feedback main finding”.

4.3 Internal assessment of the raw pedagogical material

Once all the raw versions of the different modules were collected in the shared folder on Google Drive the consortium decided which partner, different from the author, had to perform the internal feedback as showed in *Table 3*.

Table 3 - Partner in charge of feedback

Module	Partner in charge of feedback
Food safety	ANIA
Food processing	FJDV
Project presentation	EKU
Theoretical knowledge	UP
Managerial advice	UP
Marketing	FJDV
Labelling	UL

The feedback had to be done based on:

- Quality of the scientific educational content
- Quality of the adaptation of the learning contents for online media
- Quality of the translation for each modules
- Quality of the adaptation to national situation for ad-hoc modules

Following this indications each partner gave its feedback on one of the modules. This process took place in December 2021.

The comments received were both general remarks or were specifically related with individual modules. These concerned different aspects such as the way a topic was presented, the quantity of practical examples given, the coherence of the additional resources with the topic covered.

These internal feedbacks were used to improve the pedagogical material and obtain the improved raw training material.

The improvements were made between January and February 2022.

The internal feedbacks together with the ones later received by the stakeholders are analyzed in depth in the document Deliverable 1.6 “Stakeholders’ feedback main findings”

4. Deliverable 1.6 - Stakeholders’ Feedback Main findings

5.1 Introduction

After the selection and development of the pedagogical content the feedback phase started. Partners tested the modules with stakeholders in order to have feedbacks and to understand if the material produced was suitable to reach the aim of the project.

The Deliverable describes the steps that characterized this phase: the collection of the raw material from each partner, the reception of the internal and stakeholders' feedbacks, the production of the improved raw training content.

5.2 Collection of raw material

Each partner of the consortium was in charge of the writing of one or more modules:

Table 1 - Modules and authors

Module	Authors
Project presentation	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Audrey Cavalieri</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Adam Hegyi, Barbara Varga-Pallagi</p>
Theoretical knowledge on alternative food chain	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Davide Menozzi</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD</p>
Managerial advice	<p>Foundation Juana de Vega (FDJV): Anxo Calvo Silvosa and Ángel Fernández Castro</p> <p>Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD</p> <p>Association Nationale Des Industries Alimentaires (ANIA): Françoise Gorga</p>
Food safety	<p>University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Hilva Gjoni</p> <p>University of Ljubljana (UL): Urška Jamnikar Ciglencički, Mojca Jevšnik, Malan Strbenc, Spela Strnad, Tanja Knific</p>

Table 1 - Modules and authors

Basic elements of food processing, food quality	University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Audrey Cavalieri, Giulia Zanti, Anja Losso
Marketing	Association Nationale Des Industries Alimentaires (ANIA): Françoise Gorga
Labelling scheme	University of Parma (UP): Cristina Mora, Giovanni Sogari, Audrey Cavalieri Eszterházy Károly University (EKU): Csaba Patkós PhD, Judit Vincze PhD

In the period between June and December 2021 the material for each module was collected and the first version of every module was created.

5.3 Internal and stakeholders' feedbacks

Once the material was collected the modules had to be reviewed by both the consortium of the project and producers, that are the target.

Firstly the feedbacks of the partners of the project were collected and some changes were made. Then to each partner was given a module to present to producers and people who work in the agri-food sector in order to collect their comments about the material that was produced and to understand what kind of changes had to be done.

Table 2 - Partner in charge of feedback

Module	Partner in charge of feedback
Food safety	ANIA
Food processing	FJDV
Project presentation	EKU
Theoretical knowledge	UP
Managerial advice	UP
Marketing	FJDV
Labelling	UL

The comments that were collected can be divided in three main categories: general remarks, remarks on individual submodules and “controversial issues”. Below we are going to present the feedbacks that led to the module’s revision. The “controversial issues” will be discussed in the conclusions of this document, hoping they could become on site discussion subjects with producers and stakeholders.

Module: Project presentation

EKU was the partner in charge of the stakeholders’ feedback and the author of the module were UP and ECU.

UP received the feedbacks on December 9th 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on February 15th 2022.

Module: Theoretical knowledge

UP was the partner in charge of the stakeholders’ feedback and the author of the module was ECU.

ECU received the feedbacks on December 13th 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on January 14th 2022.

General remarks

- The text is very understandable.
- Every concept is clearly explained and even the non-expert readers can easily understand the topics being addressed.
- If technical terms are used they are also explained.
- Focus and external resources are very helpful to analyze in depth the topic of the module.
- Maybe could be useful add a case study of a successful business belonging to the short food chain.
- Add some images and pictures can be helpful for the reader.
- Make the bibliography homogeneous.

- Add exercises.
- Module is well written in a straightforward manner with appropriate amount of theoretical background for all the topics presented.
- Since the focus is on alternative food chains, I would maybe expand more the submodules on this subject (2+3+5). Conversely, submodule 1 could be summarized, because it is more general and theoretical, especially the description of rural areas.
- To present in greater detail some of the SFC (mentioned as an example in submodule 2) would be useful. There are direct links and some information only for the Italian initiatives.
- In general, the interviewee would provide more “operational” tools and examples of existing projects to stress concrete strategies and their outcomes.

Remarks on individual submodules

Module 1

- The very specific theoretical frame (e.g. definition criteria of rural areas for OECD) might be too sectorial and might be more useful for research purposes rather than for stakeholders working in the field of agriculture.
- In the same way, why are the national criteria in FIN and DK presented? If they are relevant, maybe it would be nice to understand the choice of including these two EU countries.
- The interviewee would already state in this section the importance of rural areas in terms of cultural and aesthetic services. They are stressed in the sustainability paragraph, but I would mention these values from the very beginning, when the Eu Charter is mentioned.
- “Third category of human-ecological and social functions”: for me it is not so clear which categories are referred to. Maybe it would be useful to introduce and describe also the other two categories?
- For the “various development options” and Fig. 1 the reference is missing.
- In the features’ list of rural development: Dynamism has been stated twice.

Module 2

- Some features presented here are also listed and further explained afterwards in submodule 5: wouldn’t it be clearer to collect all the definition of SFSC at the very beginning?

Module 4

- The links of the documents and video cited are missing.
- Case studies section: is it maybe worth to deepen some projects within the LEADER framework? To have concrete examples of existing cooperation and partnership could be inspiring.
- Focus: beside the political vision and the EU statement for rural areas, the interviewee thinks it

would be useful to provide the attendees a description and a list of the financial measures they may apply for/projects they could activate, along with the services offered by some public bodies in the application procedures, if applicable (in case, to be defined at national level, as well).

Module 5

- Some points described in the introduction are maybe referred to the actors in the SFC submodule.
- Same comment for submodule 2: Some aspects highlighted in this module have already been introduced in previous ones: would it maybe make sense to present a general introduction and complete description of SFSC at the very beginning?
- GHG emissions are listed under the benefit provided by SFSC, since they are supposed to be lower when comparing short with long chains. On the contrary, a previous module contains several bibliographic references on researches stating the opposite. It would be interesting to provide several references also for the statement presented in this module, in order to have a complete view of the topic and references for both hypotheses.
- Detailed data presented only for Community Supported Agriculture, but not for the other typologies of short chains.

Module: Managerial advice

UNIPR was the partner in charge of the stakeholders' feedback and the author of the module was the FJDV.

FJDV received the feedbacks on December 9th 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on January 11th 2022.

General remarks

- The request is to make available to employees a training course suited to the needs of the farm. And the material proposed is good to reach this aim.
- The interviewee explained how difficult it is for those who reach 10 employees to take care of human resources. With this, you require time to deal with those who work within the company and show the discomfort in the lack of clarity of the laws that are in force regarding this type of activity.
- In this particular case, you rely on more than 27 professional figures to try to give the customer greater protection and trust for the presentation and production of your products, what should, according to you, be entrusted, in reality, to a legislative system made ad hoc for farms.
- In order to fully understand the module the reader should have a previous knowledge in

economics.

- Keeping in mind that some readers may not have studied economics some technical terms and concepts should be explained.
- Might be helpful put a paragraph dedicated to quality certifications (PGI, PDO) and the establishment of a corporate brand.
- The interviewee won't delete any topic.
- This module could help small farms by opening a small window to the economic world. The entrepreneur, after reading the text, will have increased his knowledge in the economic field and will be able to try to implement some solutions for his company.
- Case study and examples are very useful.
- It will be very interesting to take the online course but, given the large amount of work, I will be willing to devote a maximum of four hours per week divided into two days.
- The text is easy to understand, the concepts, even the most complex ones, are immediate and accessible.
- Each technical term encountered received the right explanation.
- The interviewee won't add any content to the module
- The interviewee won't delete any content to the module
- The module can be an excellent starting resource for many new companies without technical knowledge about the topics that are addressed.
- Can be helpful add some examples and case studies.
- The interviewee would be interested in the online course.
- An online course compatible with work commitments, could be an excellent tool for improving your company's management. The ideal would be a 90-minute appointment a week.

Module: Food safety

ANIA was the partner in charge of the stakeholders' feedback and the author of the module was the UP and UL.

UL received the feedbacks on December 21th 2021.



The improved raw training content was completed on December 22th 2021.

The feedback for this module was done by an expert in the subject addressed.

Some concepts were revised (for example zoonosis) and the reasonability of the food producer was specified.

Other comments were made between the co-authors of the project in order to obtain the best version of the final module.

The version shared between the co- authors was approved by ANIA.

Module: Food processing

FJDV was the partner in charge of stakeholders' feedback and the UP was the author of the module.

UP received the feedback the 13th December 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on February 2nd 2022.

General remarks

- The learning objective is not an objective, it's more an introduction to the subject. It's necessary to reformulate as a learning objective.
- The level of the module is not homogeneous, some parts are basic (storage and packaging) and others are clearly advanced (emerging technologies).
- The farmers are not researches so references in the middle of the text could make it more difficult to understand.
- The course is longer than 4 hours.
- Emerging technologies are difficult to understand. It could be useful to explain basic technologies in food processing in a short way (Food preservation methods: fermentation, drying, salting, cooling, canned, frozen, addition of sugar, acidification...) before emerging technologies.
- "Honey": interesting but seems to be out of place.
- The case study about eggs is not related with the module.
- The interviewee recommends reducing and explaining better the submodule about quality.
- To make it more attractive to producers, more graphical elements could be added. (as in

“Honey” part).

- Summarise the content before uploading it to the platform.
- The interviewee finds the inclusion of references very interesting, but to simplify and help the understanding of the text they could be placed as hyperlinks or in a pop-up window. (in the on-line version).
- Some of the sources are a bit old (sources from 1996 in module 1)
- Suggestion: including objectives per submodule.
- Bibliographic references make reading difficult.
- Figure 3 on page 6: difficult to understand. Need to be explained better.
- The interviewee does not understand the structure of module 2. Honey quality and processing between food processing and emerging technologies?

Remarks on individual submodules

Submodule 1

- There are many models to explain quality, some complex models are mentioned but not explained (TFG model). Complex models could be difficult to understand in a basic level.

Submodule 2

- Is very important, but it is definitively advanced level. It's necessary to explain the concepts in an easy-to-understand way. Same for submodule 4.
- The first part about food processing is basic level, clear and well structured. Then, there are 3 pages about honey. It's unclear to us why these pages focus exclusively on honey. Is it an example?
- Emerging technologies are definitively advanced level. We can include them but they have to be explained in other words. Examples of application of these technologies in food processing could help to understand the technology.
- Lack of pictures and images.

Submodule 3

- Basic level, clear and well structured. Lack of pictures and images.



Submodule 4

- Basic level, clear and well structured. The examples related to food production help to understand. Lack of pictures and images.
- Submodule 5
- In this module, references are included throughout the whole section (in previous sub-modules, references are at the beginning of the module: "the material used in this section..."). The sub-module is written as a scientific article, not as a training content for farmers.
- Lack of pictures and images

Submodule 6

- Very interesting and too short. A real example could help.
- Lack of pictures and images.

Submodule 7

- Submodule 7, case study 1: I don't understand the relation between the module (food processing and storage) with a case study about "environmental and economic sustainability: the case of eggs". From page 49 to page 70 the contents and their organization are very difficult to understand.
- The submodule is organized as a scientific review so it will be difficult for a farmer to understand and gain any knowledge from this submodule. In addition, the structure of this submodule is different from the others: there is an introduction to the submodule and an objective, whereas in the other submodules there is not.
- Lack of pictures and images.

Module: Marketing

FJDV was the partner in charge of the stakeholders' feedback and the author of the module was ANIA.

ANIA received the feedbacks on January 18th 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on February 8th 2022.

General remarks

- The length is correct



- Module objectives are missing
- The module is easy and quick to read.
- Well-structured and easy to read.
- Easy-to-understand language
- Clear structure but modules and submodules but quite different from initial draft (pedagogical content for meeting DRAFT.xls)
- Beginner-intermediate level.
- The person who reads it does not have to be an expert to understand it.
- Intermediate level. Too high for some primary producers. For people with certain level of formation in perfect and useful.
- Too theoretical. A lot of definitions but few examples and case studies.
- Very interesting the difference between medium and short enterprise.
- Considering a SME or a primary producer point of view: What can I do myself if I have a small rural business with no budget to hire a marketing specialist? The module should help to answer this general question a little bit.
- Well-structured and coherent development of the content, starting from the origin of the marketing concept.
- Lack of images of graphic elements
- Some links include in case studies doesn't work properly (bizilur) or don't have English version (<https://www.kaemena-blockland.de/>, <https://www.biostadt.bremen.de>)
- More examples are missing, as in the first chapter. There are many good and well-known examples from around the world that could help students to understand and deepen on the concepts and tools.
- The module could be improved by adding a chapter with detailed steps (and examples of each step) on how to develop a marketing plan for a SME in a simple and clear way.
- Marketing is a key module for producers that wanted to improve their competences. I found contents too general.

- Chapters 1 and 4 have same title. We suggest to change one of them to avoid misunderstandings

Remarks on individual submodules

Submodule 5

- The part on "marketing in SMEs" is extremely important. SMEs have to know how to take advantage of the fact that they are different from larger companies.

Submodule 6

- Confusing and not necessary until B2B. B2B interesting for SME but too theoretical,. Examples are needed. We found structure a bit confusing: we guess if "characteristics of the professional demand" and "Criteria for purchasing decision in industrial environment" are in fact subchapters of "B2B marketing"

Submodule 7

- Is named "focus", but according D.1.4, Focus will "supplementary material on the subject of the sub-module in a box".
- The interviewee especially liked specifically "digital marketing"

Focus 1: lack of examples and a list of free resources to carry on a competitor analysis. A SME should focus on 3-4 competitors, not more.

Focus 2: Very important point. I miss the explanation on KPIs (Key Performant Indicators) and a real example on how to choose the most suitable KPIs for my company

Focus 3: again, practical examples of each step are needed to understand the idea.

Focus 4: There is a lot of free on-line resources and examples to marketing studies. A list with some examples could enrich this part: <https://www.edelman.com/>
The interviewee especially liked the Focus 4 section (Instruments for marketing studies), with some tools identified and of immediate use. Perhaps other types of tools could be included in some other section...

Focus 5: perfect! Only add something about "Brand territory".
The bibliography and references are not in the correct format.

Module: Labelling

UL was the partner in charge of the stakeholders' feedback and the author of the module is UP.

UP received the feedback on November 30th 2021.

The improved raw training content was completed on January 14th 2021.

General remarks

- Module is generally well written in a straightforward manner with appropriate amount of background (in Introduction).
- Appropriate scientific literature and legislation is cited
- Submodule 1 and 2 don't have case study.
- The interviewee feels there is not equal amount of details among submodules: submodule 4 is explained in great detail compared to submodules 2 and 3. It seems there should be more in 2 and 3
- Referring to sources is not the same throughout the text, the interviewee recommends using footnotes. Whole Ural addresses are cumbersome, they belong to textboxes or hidden in hyperlink
- Case studies are not presented in every submodule
- Submodule 4 and 5: In the process of quality schemes is everything traceably written. But you can add some text in connection with plant seeds.

Remarks on individual submodules

Submodule 1

- Labeling policies: mandatory and voluntarily. The interviewee suppose s voluntarily information is not only what farmer/manufacturer/retailer thinks consumer may need but is also a direct benefit to the producer (better sales, price, eligibility to stay in specific market, compliance to other regulations?)
- Mandatory information, bold text: pre-packed should be non-prepacked?
- Figure- example of full vs minimum label would be helpful.
- Is the seller obliged to show full information on food on request of the customer if he is using minimum labels?
- Could present at least one example of voluntary information.

- Member States should retain the right, depending on local practical conditions and circumstances, to lay down rules in respect of the provision of information concerning foods. There are many cases where food labels mislead consumers, which I find very unfair. In food labelling would be needed more control by the competent authorities. You could add more text that talks about control.

Submodule 2

- Start of the text is a bit misplaced, some introduction is needed (focus comes later)
- Nutrition declaration: any requirements on the analysis method, how often should be checked, repeated?
- Really too few info on additives labeling. At least examples needed.
- Case study, examples, problems with small print, esp. when labeling in multiple languages?
- How often are ingredients, nutrition declaration, additives and food supplements checked, repeated and controlled by the competent authorities.
- Mandatory information (ingredients, nutrition declaration, additives and food supplements) are printed with too small letters and there is usually a lot of abbreviations. Has anyone thought of solving this problem?

Submodule 3

- More examples (like salt content in the focus box)
- The interviewee misses any “vegan” claims in the whole Module, perhaps this belong to this Submodule. Are there any regulations, it surely can be misleading to the customer.
- Figure “New EU food labeling rules” is really informative, only too small to read clearly in the word file. Accompany text maybe?
- Focus: voluntarily information: please insert some key points and examples how to achieve this not only link to “more information”
- Focus: origin labeling: many examples needed!
- Above the line “On the web site of the European Commission you can find more in-depth information:” is blank space in the box, maybe some figure missing

Submodule 4



- At the beginning of the submodule, the following terms about products or labels should be defined and discussed before further use: organic, ecological, eco, bio, green as well as fair-trade. Explain which of these terms are interchangeable, which may only be used if certain criteria (at EU or national level) are met, and when the term may not be used so as not to mislead the consumer. Also, some information on what happens and who can be contacted if the consumer finds some food labels misleading.
- in PGI example: can all meat come from elsewhere?
- Boxes for spirit drinks and aromatized wines- in the second box there should be aromatized wine in the title, not spirit drinks
- TSG: “Mandatory for all products” I do not understand mandatory, should it be “applicable”?
- Please refer to the list of TSG terms here (it comes in 3 pages, but should be at least a link here too)
- Labelling alone does not do anything, it merely enables consumers to make informed choices. The eco labelling standards were not written by scientists alone (but mainly by politicians and stakeholders), but since we are scientists, we should avoid endorsing views that are not supported by science. As mentioned in the module, labelling is an attempt to correct market failures. So there could be a discussion about why this failure is not being solved at the national or EU level, and why it is important that although these problems are not being solved at this level, these same bodies are committed to "solve" this failure through labelling. In short, a discussion on the pitfalls of liberalized/free trade and consumer trust is needed.
- The purpose of this submodule is to introduce and to some extent promote the concept of labelling. This is fine, but scientific rigor should still be observed. The interviewee finds that some statements (e.g. about genetically modified organisms or the benefits of organic food) lack scientific perspective and instead make only general (political and market friendly) statements, which the interviewee finds unacceptable. For example, foods from intensive farming or genetically modified foods can be just as safe as organic foods, and even organic foods are not safe per se (organic foods can contain pathogens just as much as non-organic foods, etc.). We also need to be careful that claims are not misleading and do not frighten the public. We should take great care to ensure that readers of this content do not think that non-organic food is not safe, because great efforts are being made in the EU to ensure that we have safe, high-quality food in Europe.
- Even if politicians and the market want you to believe that the increase in organic/sustainable production is a result of demand - it most certainly is not. The organic market would not be growing as much if it were not for other incentives - like subsidies for organic production and big investments in marketing by the EU and each individual country, as well as a lot of money for research and education in the field - and none of that is driven by demand, although the push by consumers is beneficial. I am not saying these incentives are wrong, quite the opposite,

but to claim that these changes are solely due to consumer demand is wrong. Information on subsidies, marketing efforts, research and knowledge transfer funds (which includes Food Improv'iders project) should be included in this module.

- The interviewee thinks that this submodule has too much information. In particular, it seems to me to be frequently repeated regulations on quality schemes for wine sector. There are other sectors that could be presented in more detail – especially dairy sector, which is very widespread.
- The interviewee finds it difficult to say anything about the content of this module because I do not deal with it professionally. I met quality schemes more closely at the workplace when ordering food for a public institution. As they have to provide at least 20 % of food from quality schemes under the new legislation, we have been paying more attention to this over the last month. This ensures better nutrition for the children, which he thinks is great, because it's not always just the price that matters. It seems right to me that products that have a certain characteristic are somehow "protected" by an appropriate label. He thinks this makes the food safer to use as it has to meet certain requirements. In addition, food producers are also supposed to be under constant control, which should further help to avoid any misrepresentation. Perhaps you can add some information on quality schemes in public institutions.
- Food product certification is a complex and relatively expensive process. The applications and registration of quality schemes depends on the inspection body conducting the certification process. There are state authorities (e.g. universities) and private companies. Certification systems are tailored for large and influential companies. The quality schemes of imported food products cannot be equivalent to quality schemes of our product. In the background are financial interests.
- Food product certification is a complex and relatively expensive process. Some information can be added on how food certification procedures are monitored.

Submodule 5

- “There are many possible benefits of eco-labelling on food (Boström – Klintman, 2008):” – the second bullet, this is very weird, the interviewee supposes theoretical and in my opinion beyond the scope of giving info to the stakeholders... Put it into further reading or something like that.
- Principles of organic farming: how does 8 main principles connect/reflect to the second list (“Organic food can only be”:)
- You present examples of Type I ecolabelling, but not also type II and III
- Some case study would be nice

- EU ecolabel – how often is this really used for food?
- Some case studies can be added
- Submodule 6
- This paragraph. “Consumers conceptualize numerical product information faster than non-numerical one, such as text or graphs and when a benchmark is put to a label, it makes it more effective. Colour is also relevant as labels, containing red, green, and orange colours can cause more impact in consumers’ mind. (Biel and others 2005)” seems applicable to other labelling as well?
- Zero km: exact definition for “0”. It is logical if the food is produced in local community but it would still collect a couple of kilometres from the field, orchard and pasture to the farmhouse and market or restaurant...
- Animal welfare: give examples on eggs labelling.
- More words needed on the new 5 levels of animal welfare. Is there some proposed timeline for implementation?
- Carbon footprint: legal background for this?
- Zero kilometer food – it is difficult to provide e.g. it would be better to say short supply chain inside X km. You could describe what animal welfare means.
- Sustainable labelling - it is necessary to ask if these labels hold for all the steps in the life cycle of a product.
- Zero km: exact definition for “0”. It is logical if the food is produced in local community but it would still collect a couple of kilometers from the field, orchard and pasture to the farmhouse and market or restaurant...

Exercises

- Quiz is nice, but covers only one submodule. The interviewee suggests each submodule presents 4 questions here.
- Quiz is good idea but it could have more questions (for example 10).

5.4 Conclusion

After the reception of the feedbacks each partner revised the module and produced the

improved raw material.

The controversial issues regard two themes:

1. Organic Agriculture: The development of OA is due to an increasing interest from the consumers or is due to an important public support ?
2. GMO: The juxtaposition between GMO innovation in agriculture and traditional practices that characterize zero kilometer agriculture, whether it is biological or not.

The final version was uploaded on the Google drive restricted to the project's partners.

Then began the translation process.

Every module is being translated in the national language by each country. Furthermore every additional material present in the module is being adapted to the national language. Due to this process some aspects in the modules could be slightly changed and adapted in order to fit the national situation.

5. Deliverable 1.7 - Improved raw training contents

6.1 Introduction

In this document will be analyzed the work done by the partners to improve the pedagogical material following the issues highlighted by the internal feedbacks and the following translation in each national language of the material.

6.2 Improved pedagogical material and translation

Once each author received the feedback from both the internal partner and the external stakeholders the revision of the module started.

Each partner had to modify its module in order to solve the issues raised by the feedbacks received.

The main changes made in each module were:

- Addition of case studies/practical examples to better understand some specific topics
- Addition of images
- Harmonization of the style used for the bibliography

The final version of each module was received between January and February 2022 and uploaded on the shared Google Drive (<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1cxOlfn5eipOcpc1fHSnswathcKgHfc6J>).

Once all the modules written in English were collected and approved by the consortium of the project the translation process started.

Each partner had to translate every module in its national language.

During the translation some small changes in the modules were done by each partner in order to better suit the national reality of each country.

Some of the changes made during the translation process:

- Addition of specific case studies and practical examples suitable for the specific country.
- Addition of articles, focuses and external links in the national language.

Overall the pedagogical content of the modules remained the same after the translation, the changes were mainly related to the additional sections that could be added according to the Guidelines related to the structure of the modules.

The translation process was conducted between September and October 2022

6.3 Conclusion

The translation process was conducted between September and October 2022.

The material was then uploaded on the e-learning platform with a different schedule for each partner.

Once the uploading process was done the pedagogical material was available on the online platform for the start of the first training sessions.

6. Deliverables 2.3 and 2.4

Deliverables 2.3 and 2.4 belongs to WP2 and they are dedicated to the E-learning platform.

In order to achieve the objective of these two deliverables the partners led by EKU uploaded and adapted the translated pedagogical material produced on the e-learning platform.

During this part of the work it was possible to highlight some issues that could have made difficult for the future users to easily utilize the platform such as the presence of some essential sections of the menu that were not translated in the national language of each partner but were present only in Hungarian.

Considering this issue the partners helped in the translation in the national languages of these sections in order to make the e-learning platform user friendly and easily accessible.

7. Conclusion

Considering the work described in this document we can state that the objectives of Intellectual Output 2 which, briefly, were the development, assessment, test and final optimization of the pedagogical material were overall achieved by the partners.

The achievement of these objectives was more difficult than expected due to the pandemic which prevented in presence meetings between partners and thus significantly slowed down the collection of the needed material in some phases.

