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Why are we here?

• The end of a project, sure!!

• **A long and innovative** path: from SoFar to SoFaB

• An innovative way of re-linking the creation of economic and social values, to introduce new principles, attitudes in time of crises

• An attempt for thinking how social innovation and transition can affect our routines in planning in the perspective of prosperity and social justice

• Is it interesting? How to move forward?

• I would try to compare it with the italian situation to see similarities and useful lessons
Social farming in Italy at a glance

2002:
- The concept emerges after a debate on lack of social services in rural areas

2003:
- A survey in Tuscany collects about 60 projects already existing run by farmers, social cooperatives and agricultural cooperatives

2004/05:
- Networking activities run by Universities and local administrations in Tuscany and Latium increase the attention on the SF concept
- Some local public health authorities start to recognize SF practices

2006/09:
- SoFar project promotes networking in Italy and Europe by the way of national and EU platforms
- In Italy first surveys start to account an increasing number of practices
- In 2009 Tuscany region approved the first regional law on SF

2010-14:
- The topic starts to enter in diverse areas and environments and starts to be debated by farmer unions and in the third sector
- At local level an increasing number of practices emerges (today about 2000 initiatives are estimated), Other regions approve their regional laws
- In the 2007/13 RDP some measures on SF are introduced mainly for investments in diversification
- In 2014 the National parliament approves a national law on SF (to be discussed by Senatum)
# SF and type of services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service</th>
<th>Users and activities</th>
<th>Regulatory system</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-therapy</td>
<td>autism, mental or psychiatric people) devoted services at farm level (ie Hippoterapy or horticultural therapy)</td>
<td>Market/ quasi Market</td>
<td>Effectiveness, flexibility and adaptation to peculiar and individual needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil services</td>
<td>Daily services for elders, child, families in periurban and rural areas people in needs for housing</td>
<td>Public/private compensation or economic recognition</td>
<td>Scope economy and better use of on farm resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and social inclusion</td>
<td>Diverse users (autism, psychiatric, mental, people with addition, ex offenders, long run inoccupied</td>
<td>Market promotion of ethic products and indirect recognition of farmers (reputation and visibility on the market)</td>
<td>Active participation in real agricultural processes and activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New tools for providing services and social justice
Organizational frame and outcomes

**Outcomes**
- More services in rural and periurban areas for users and families
- Networking, social capital and better resilience
- New concepts and attitudes (social justice, civic economy)
- Social and economic sustainability

**Co-planning recognizing**
- State
- Regions
- Provinces
- Municipalities
- Health services
- Unions
- Third sector
  - Volunteers & Social Coop A
  - Social Coop B
  - Farmers

**Co-projecting providing**
- Health services
- Education
- Vocational training
- Job inclusion
- Social inclusion
- Social services
- People with disabilities, People affected with addition, Prisoners, Youngsters, Elders

**Acting**
- Co-therapy
- Education
- Rehabilitation
- Vocational training
- Job inclusion
- Social inclusion
- Social services
- People with disabilities, People affected with addition, Prisoners, Youngsters, Elders

**Using**
- Conflictual vs cooperative attitudes
New principles for welfare and SS

• **Subsidiarity.**
  • According to which the State reduces its direct universal and standardized intervention, while maintaining its responsibilities and acting in support of understanding and solving social issues and services.

• **Co-production.**
  • With planning innovative solutions aimed at responding more effectively and with non-specialist and less costly resources, to the community needs. Co-production can be related to different elements, like the opportunity:
    • to **co-design** services among providers and users of the services;
    • to **co-create** economic and social values (e.g. food and social inclusion);
    • to produce **public and private goods** at the same time (e.g. economic and social sustainability).

• **Civic economy.**
  • The building of new business attitudes, based on responsibility and the ability to include the values of sociality in economic processes, within production processes as in the construction of markets, based on reputation, trust and the creation of new networks, including consumption networks.
Social farming in Italy: 5 level of complexity

People:
Complexity 1: To organise on farm resources in the provision of innovative services (not focused in this presentation)

Projects:
Complexity 2: To organise a public/private partnerships

Territories:
Complexities 3: To organise clusters of projects
Complexity 4: To define new rules and procedures in public services
Complexity 5: To organise laws and policy tools
Complexity 2: To organise a public/private partnership: **Orti E.T.I.C.I.**

1 The project:

- A joint venture to test innovative pathways
  - Pisa University, Bio Colombini farm, Ponteverde Social Coop, strong link with public health services

2 Aims

- To design innovative value creation models
  - To face the crisis
  - To design innovative answers for local social and economic needs
  - To grow relationships
  - Food for citizens, Land use, social inclusion for less empowered people, didactical resources

3 Outcomes (win-win)

- Economic values in food production
  - vegetables for local consumers
  - direct selling at affordable prices

- Social values
  - Active social inclusion for added people, ex prisoners, psychiatric people
  - A sense of possibility, of future, of connectivity

- Environmental values
  - Organic production
  - Preventing from urban sprawl in periurban areas

4 Outcomes

- What is in 1kg of organic vegetables? 1.70 €/kg
- Users: 6’ of inclusive work
- Project: 0.30 € of net value
- Consumers wealth (organic, fresher less expensive -0.70 on the price of big retailers, ethic concern)
- Effectiveness in social inclusion better than traditional methods
- Less expensive public authorities save 0.74 € in comparison with other health path (some voices were not considered like reduction in use of pills)

www.ortietici.it
Territory (complexities 3,4,5): transition and T management

T agenda

Farms – public bodies
Agricultural world

To create new solutions, concepts, ideas
In a collective way

Knowledge creation

To promote organisation

New models, transferable solutions, rules and procedures, policy tools

To create new shared ideas

Health and social world
Social cooperatives, associations public services

T reflexive

T Arena

T experiments
Turin area
(Di Iacovo on data Coldiretti Torino)

Legenda

- Coop A Coop B Coop IAP ASL IAP Consorzio servizi Ente locale Associazione
- Scuole
- Legame economico Legame istituzionale Legame sociale
SF, services and social innovation in rural areas: facing EU2020

**Smart**
- subsidiarity, co-production, civic economy

**Sustainable**
- local agriculture, local markets, reputation

**Inclusive**
- active social inclusion, innovative services, vibrant communities
Policy challenges

Policy tools:
• Better finalize 2014/2020 RDP measures like cooperation, vocational training, advices, investments aids, start-up and management supports, promotion of quality products
• European Innovation Partnership, social innovation and transition, brokerage knowledge and a diverse path to innovate in rural areas

• Policy integration
  • With ESF, ESRF and national health/social funds

• Responsibility of local/regional/national actors (especially those more empowered)
  • To quickly facilitate the emerge of new solutions defined on the ground and their introduction (genuine) into the political arenas

• A stronger commitment for innovative patterns to promote prosperity
Thank you