

Methodological guidelines and reporting template for the 15 case studies in MATS

MATS Deliverable 3.1



Funded by
the European Union

This project receives funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 101000751.

Summary

The two key questions for the 15 case studies (CS) in MATS are (i) how given trade regimes, investments into agri-food value chains and sustainability standards impact local, and, in some cases, national, and international socioeconomic and environmental conditions, and (ii) how to foster the positive and reduce the negative impacts of agri-food trade and trade policy regimes on sustainable development and human rights.

The CS are implemented in the period 1.7.2022 – 30.1.2024. A first draft report is to be submitted until 30.6.2023 for feedback. The final CS report is due 30.1.2024.

This document provides general methodological guidelines and a common reporting template for the CS analysis. Both build on the results of WP1 and WP2. The aim is to provide a basic framework for the implementation of the CS and to facilitate a comparative analysis and synthesis. At the same time, the guidelines and reporting template are to leave flexibility for CS leads and their partners to deepen specific elements of the analysis and to best describe each case in the sense of a systemic analysis.

In the implementation of CS, CS leads need to ensure that

- data management is compliant with the EU's Guidelines on Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (FAIR) Data Management in Horizon 2020;
- all personal data are treated as strictly confidential and processed in compliance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679;
- anonymized data from surveys and interviews will be securely stored in a safe location at partners' facilities (internally, anonymized data may be shared) (see also the D7.4 'Data Management Plan' and D8.1-8.3 'Ethical Requirements' on MS Teams).

Deliverable title: Methodological guidelines and reporting template for the 15 case studies in MATS

Deliverable number: D3.1

Authors: Knickel, K., Alexovičová, I., Bassi, A., Chen, Q., Coppens, D., Guzzetti, M., Idsardi, E., Hyytiä, N., Kesteloot, T., Matthysen, J., Steiner, B. & A. Voglhuber-Slavinsky

Due date: 31 July 2022

Submission date: 18 August 2022

Nature¹: Report

Dissemination Level²: Public

Work Package: WP3

Lead Beneficiary: University of Helsinki (UH)

Contributing Beneficiaries: OSOL, SUPPORT: CRPA, UPM, FRAUNHOFER, UM-IGIR

¹ R = Report, P = Prototype, D = Demonstrator, O = Other

² PU = Public, CO = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Aims of the 15 in-depth case studies	5
1.2	Implementation.....	6
1.3	Additional analyses performed in some case studies.....	7
2	Methodological guidelines for the 15 in-depth case studies	8
2.1	Broad guidance	8
2.2	Visualisation of impact pathways.....	10
2.3	Meeting the needs of WP4 and WP5.....	11
	2.3.1 WP4 Institutional, regulatory and legal frameworks.....	11
	2.3.2 WP5 Transition pathways and policy recommendations.....	13
3	Common reporting template for the 15 case studies	14
3.1	Common set of core indicators.....	14
3.2	Section headings (proposed)	15
4	Annex 1 – References.....	17
5	Annex 2 – The 15 case studies in MATS.....	18

1 Introduction

The goal of WP3 is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the linkages between agricultural trade, agricultural and rural investments, environmental sustainability and human well-being. WP3 is led by KE, and it comprises five Tasks (see Table 1).

Table 1
Roles of partners in the five WP3 tasks

Task	Lead	Co-lead	Supporting
3.1	UH	OXFAM	CRPA; UPM; FRAUNHOFER; UM-IGIR
3.2	UPM	OXFAM	UH; CRPA; SCiO; TNI; ESRF; NWU
3.3	KE	UPM	UH; SCiO; AUA
3.4	CRPA	NWU	ESRF; AUA
3.5	UH	UPM	ALL OTHER PARTNERS

Central in WP3 is a set of 15 in-depth case studies (CS) (Task 3.2) (see Annex 2).

Task 3.1 is to provide general methodological guidelines and a common reporting template for these CS. The aim of both is to provide a **basic framework for the implementation of all 15 CS**. This framework is to

- facilitate a comparative analysis and synthesis; while, at the same time,
- leave flexibility for CS leads and their partners to deepen specific elements of the analysis and to best describe each case in the sense of a **systemic analysis** – thereby building on the work of WP1 and WP2 (see also D2.4: Section 2).

Emphasis in these guidelines is on balancing these two demands and to, at the same time, keep data collection simple while making the exercise as meaningful as possible. The planned workflows are to contribute to optimising the connections between different project components.

1.1 Aims of the 15 in-depth case studies

All CS are to contribute to a deeper understanding of the impacts of given trade regimes and practices at local level, and in some cases national and international levels. The **key questions** are (i) how given trade regimes, investments into agri-food value chains and sustainability standards impact local, and, in some cases, national, and international socioeconomic and environmental conditions, and (ii) how to foster the positive and reduce the negative impacts of agri-food trade and trade policy regimes on sustainable development and human rights.

The information that CS ought to provide results from the overarching questions driving the MATS project (linkages, impact pathways, leverage points) and, more specifically, the **information required by subsequent analyses**:

- The analysis of the influence of existing institutional, regulatory and legal frameworks on given trade regimes and practices in all CS (e.g. regulatory barriers and opportunities) (Task 4.1 led by UM-IGIR) (see Section 2.3.1).
- WP5 with the envisaged visioning and backcasting (Tasks 5.1-5.2 led by FRAUNHOFER), and the policy-related analyses in all CS (Task 5.3 led by UB-WTI, and Task 5.4 led by UM-IGIR) (see Section 2.3.2).

1.2 Implementation

The CS are implemented by partners from the project consortium together with local partners. The CS are implemented in the period **1.7.2022 – 30.1.2024**. A first draft report is to be submitted until 30.6.2023 for feedback. The final CS report is due 30.1.2024.

The implementation of the CS analysis needs to be done in a way that the information requirements defined in the **common reporting template** can be met (see Section 3.2). Particular attention needs to be paid to the information requirements related to WP4 (see Section 2.3.1) and WP5 (Section 2.3.2) which must be met by *all* CS.

The information that is provided in the final CS report is to be based on a **sound data-based analysis** following standard practice in qualitative research, quantitative research and in the application of a CS approach (e.g. Gioia, 2021; Langley & Meziani, 2020; Strauss & Corbin, 2014; Yin, 2011, 2009). The sources of data, references, etc. with full bibliographic data, number of interviewees, info on workshops organised with numbers and types of participants, etc. are provided in a dedicated section.

CS leads need to ensure that

- **data management** is compliant with the EU's Guidelines on Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (FAIR) Data Management in Horizon 2020³;
- **all personal data will be treated as strictly confidential** and processed in compliance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679;
- **anonymized data from surveys and interviews** will be securely stored in a safe location at partners' facilities (internally, anonymized data may be shared) (see also the D7.4 'Data Management Plan' and D8.1-8.3 'Ethical Requirements' on MS Teams).

³ For more information: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf

Regarding the precise **methods** to be used, we deliberately leave maximum room for manoeuvre for CS leaders (note that this does not apply to the CS referred to in the following section where in relevant areas a close coordination with T3.3 and T3.4 leaders is needed).

CS leads are required to deliver a **systemic analysis** and they have freedom to define what this means in their case. Very important: We will have feedback rounds on draft reports to encourage teams to get the maximum out of the systemic approach used.

Our expectation is that the **methodological plurality** aimed at in WP3 will ensure a more holistic analysis of the trade policy regimes, trade policy practices, investments and sustainability standards considered by the consortium, and it will, as a side benefit, provide us with insights into the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches and methods.

Comparability and homogeneity across CS will be ensured through a common understanding of quantitative and qualitative research as well as the CS approach (Gioia, 2021; Langley & Meziani, 2020; Strauss & Corbin, 2014; Yin, 2011, 2009).

Clustering and connections across CS (through for example joint workshops and data analysis) are utilised wherever possible, to improve individual CS, strengthen all analyses and enrich the lessons learned. Wherever possible, CS go beyond the core analysis needed, **working directly with stakeholder organisations** and enabling them to engage in policy dialogues (WP6). Both, clustering and engagement with stakeholder organisations will be discussed more in the Maastricht meeting (MATS Project Meeting, 6-7 October 2022).

1.3 Additional analyses performed in some case studies

Some of the analyses will only be performed in a smaller number of CS:

- **Customized system dynamics models** are created for CS #3, #5 and #14 to explore interdependencies and impacts across scales. During the Maastricht meeting we will still discuss in how far qualitative causal loop diagrams and quantitative CGE model and system dynamics models can be used also in other CS, for example to generate estimates and forecasts of outcomes across sectors, economic actors, dimensions of development, over time and in space (Task 3.3 led by KE).
- In CS #10, #11 and #13 an **in-depth assessment of the environmental and social costs and benefits of agri-food value chains**, trade-offs and competitiveness in global agri-food markets will be carried out. The analysis focuses on labour costs and environmental legislation. During the Maastricht meeting we will discuss more in how far these aspects are / can also be covered in other CS (Task 3.4 led by CRPA).

The leaders of Tasks 3.3 (KE) and 3.4 (CRPA) will be responsible for providing guidance, and for assuring effective linkages and collaboration with those CS that contribute to these tasks.

2 Methodological guidelines for the 15 in-depth case studies

2.1 Broad guidance

The following broad methodological guidance builds on the results of T2.1, T2.3 and T2.4. The eight implementation steps briefly described in D2.4 (Section 5.1) can inspire implementation (note that not all steps need to be applied in all CS).

All CS will collect and analyse **qualitative and quantitative data** (Gioia, 2021; Langley & Meziani, 2020; Strauss & Corbin, 2014; Yin, 2011, 2009). For some parts of the CS analysis we have access to and can analyse quantitative data. For other parts we will need to work with expert views, best professional judgements and more qualitative data. See some key guidance from the sources quoted above:

- CS work requires that we make explicit which methodologies and techniques we follow and which data we use.
- We consider "a CS as an interactive set of people, structures, and processes that need to be explained" (Gioia, 2021: 21).
- Transferability implies that "even a single observation can represent a principle that applies to many different contexts" (Gioia, 2021: 21).
- Any good interpretive CS should generate a plausible, defensible explanation of some phenomenon of interest. Interpretive work is not chasing some version of a "right-answer" explanation (Gioia, 2021: 27).
- In conducting theory-grounded research, the CS "is grounded in the informants' experience and their understanding of that experience." (Gioia, 2021: 21). This means in practice:
 - "We should not presumptively impose our understanding on their [informants] understanding (and we do that every time we invoke prior theory as a starting point for understanding informant experience. And that means that you as theorist/researcher need to make a conscious effort to adequately give voice to informants' understandings in the research, and also to adequately represent informant voices prominently in the reporting of the research (by directly quoting your informants throughout your reporting of findings)." (Gioia, 2021: 22)
 - "The findings also should be adequate at the level of theoretical insight, however, which means that it needs to make sense to scholars looking for deeper explanations, as well." (Gioia, 2021: 23)
 - "The research needs to report first-order (informant-centred) and second-order (theory centred) data and findings" (Gioia, 2021: 23), hence reveal both the informant and the researcher perspective.

- "The reporting of both informant and researcher voices enables a more "qualitatively rigorous" demonstration of data-to-theory connections and gives some confidence that any creative insights are rooted in the informants' experience". (Gioia, 2021: 24)
- "When beginning the analysis of the data, it is not at all uncommon for an overwhelming number of informant terms, codes, and categories to emerge." (Gioia, 2021: 24)
- Following established interview practices and designs is obviously important for cross-case study comparisons and the rigor of analysis and findings.

Important in both quantitative and qualitative analyses will be to ensure the quality and relevance of the data collected and analysed, and to contribute to the general understanding of **impact pathways** (i.e., broader project goals). The aim is to contribute to a better understanding of the linkages between broader sustainability (social, environmental), investment and human wellbeing issues and agri-food trade. The linkages include those along value-chains (commodities, actors), as well as across spatial and temporal dimensions. At the same time we want to shed light on the food systems' dynamic behaviour (using past trends to learn about social, economic, environmental and governance dynamics), and to acknowledge the role of agency in how food system issues are framed and addressed.

CS leads have at their disposal the project's '**Sustainable trade toolbox**' (D2.3). It comprises 114 instruments that range from guiding principles and approaches to specific methods, tools and indicator sets. D2.4 presents steps to identify relevant methods, and also mentions keywords that could be used for searching the toolbox.

Please pay particular attention to a more profound analysis of **human rights** and **gender** issues related to agri-food trade and impacts (see for example <https://hria.oxfam.org/> and <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/quick-guide-to-gender-analysis-312432/>).

The **methods** envisaged to be used include: Value chain mapping and analysis (#1, #2, #9, #10, #13); Participatory qualitative research approaches including key informant interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders (#1, #2, #4, #6, #8, #9, #11, #12, #15); Analysis of publicly available macro-economic statistics, current legislations, existing studies, and triangulation (#2, #6, #7, #8, #12, #15); Analysis of publicly available economic, agricultural, environmental and climate statistics and existing studies (#3). Deviations from this original planning are possible and encouraged where meaningful, as we can now also take the results of WP1 and WP2 into consideration. It is recommended too that CS teams still screen the Toolbox for useful complementary tools.

All CS include an **engagement with key actors** shaping agricultural trade and its sustainability and investment implications, as well as with and organisations who are anticipated to be able to use the research results to address sustainability challenges. The envisaged stakeholder engagement will ensure that analyses are meaningful and applicable in different contexts, and it will help to derive concrete policy recommendations. The related activities are connected with Task 6.3 'Facilitate a civil society-stakeholder-policy dialogue', led by the OXFAM team (i.e., OSOL and OWW).

2.2 Visualisation of impact pathways

A **mapping of linkages and impact pathways** will help to clarify interrelationships, to engage with stakeholders and to visualise CS results. Causal Loop Diagrams (CLDs) will be elaborated in CS #3, #5 and #14 in conjunction with T3.3.

Four options for a visualisation and mapping of impact pathways in the other CS are:

- Logical Diagrams to explain connections and impact pathways (see for example: <https://valuingvoices.com/public-and-private-paths-to-sustained-global-development-impacts/> and https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348502723_An_Empirical_Diagnosis_of_the_School-to-Work_Process_for_Rural_and_Agricultural_Development_in_China/figures?lo=1;
- the UN Capital Development Fund provides great examples of a mapping of impact pathways (see <https://www.unCDF.org/impact-pathways/home> and <https://www.unCDF.org/Download/AdminFileWithFilename?id=12318&cultureId=127&filename=impact-pathways-methodology.pdf>);
- KUMU is a mapping software that makes it easy to organize complex data into relationship maps: <https://kumu.io/>;
- and finally, the visualisation of linkages elaborated in D1.1, which can be easily adapted to specific cases.

Particularly powerful examples of the visualisation of impact pathways from the CS will be featured in the project's communication channels.

2.3 Meeting the needs of WP4 and WP5

2.3.1 WP4 Institutional, regulatory and legal frameworks

The overall goal of WP4 is to gain a better understanding of the role of institutional, regulatory, and legal frameworks in view of the impacts of agricultural trade on the SDGs and in respect of global agreements on social, environmental and climate challenges. The **systemic approach** applied throughout the project and in the CS analysis aligns well with **Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD)** adopted in WP4 (see D2.4).

Each CS analysis is to untangle the complex relations between trade policy and its practices, agri-food value chains and markets, investments and governance arrangements with respect to sustainable development impacts in each context, as applicable. In the analysis we will need to

- identify the **key actors with their roles, interests and responsibilities**, and explore how to address risks and implications of power inequality, participation, and public interests;
- take a **human rights perspective** in this analysis that allows to identify roles of rightsholders and duty bearers, with science informing the political choices to be made;
- examine the **extent and role of transparency** in agri-food chains (including pricing, production and investment information transmission, sustainability standards transparency); digitalization, for example, carries the potential to deal with greenwashing and to create trust for consumers into sustainability claims in trade and value chains, potentially leading to a shift in demand, thereby triggering a lasting and self-sustaining transition to improved sustainability (see also D2.4: Section 4.3).

Specifically, for implementing WP4, it would be helpful if each CS could provide input on the following questions related to, respectively, **(I)** trade and investment; and **(II)** IP rights (please check with the UM team in case of questions):

I. Trade and investment measures

- a) Identify **specific domestic government measures** that have a bearing on achieving the sustainable development outcomes for your CS. Domestic government measures include:
 - i. Any type of measure: including (a) border measures such as tariffs, import/export quotas, bans or other restrictions affecting access of relevant products to the market; (b) internal measures, such as product standards, internal taxes, mandatory labelling requirements, or subsidies, affecting the (competitive) position of relevant products on the market; and (c) investment-related measures and/or treatment of investments or investors, affecting relevant in-bound or outbound investments positively or negatively, such as investment facilitation, investment-related subsidies and incentives,

investment screening, pre-entry or post-entry discriminatory treatment of investments/investors vis-à-vis those in similar circumstances, performance requirements for inbound investments, local engagement with or against foreign investments;

- ii. Adopted by a government (as opposed to private initiatives, such as private standards imposed by a company in the value chain, voluntary labelling of products, private contracts);
 - iii. In import or export markets (*e.g.*, in the EU, or in the country of origin);
 - iv. At any level of government (*e.g.*, EU, national, regional, local); and,
 - v. Already adopted (existing measures) or under consideration (proposals).
- b) Identify specific **private initiatives** (*e.g.*, private product standards, labelling, contracts) that have a bearing on achieving the sustainable development outcomes for your CS.
- c) If possible, identify **specific international trade, investment, or environmental rules** that you believe have a bearing on achieving the sustainable development outcomes for your CS. This could include international rules under the World Trade Organization (WTO), Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) (*e.g.*, UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, Convention on Biological Diversity). If you are not aware of any of these specific international rules, UM-IGIR will investigate this as part of WP4; and,
- d) If possible, **develop hypotheses** around, and, potentially, **test**, the impact on the sustainable development outcomes for your CS of: the specific domestic measures identified under (a); the private initiatives under (b); and/or the international rules under (c).

II. IP Rights

- a) If possible, identify the relevant **jurisdictions in which IP rights have been obtained** in relation to products relevant for your CS (*e.g.*, geographical indication, trademarks, plant variety protection, supplementary protection certifications, patents, trade secrets) and which entity owns the right;
- b) If possible, identify which **technologies** the product/process relies on and whether it is available to producers and under which conditions (licensing, royalties); and,
- c) If possible, explore what the short and mid-term **plans** are for using technology for relevant products in the CS.

2.3.2 WP5 Transition pathways and policy recommendations

The overall goal of WP5 is to derive **transition pathways for desirable changes** in trade relations and practices at macro, meso and micro level, to identify suitable instruments, and to formulate corresponding policy recommendations. A visioning process focused on alternative trade regimes and practices will lead to participatory backcasting (or road mapping) activities and the design of transition pathways (see also D2.4: Section 4.4).

WP5 builds on and is carried out in close cooperation with WP4 related to institutional, regulatory and legal frameworks (incl. WTO compatibility) and with WP6 in engaging with civil-society actors, trade and value-chain actors, and policymakers.

Key questions to be covered in each CS report related to WP5 (please check with the FRAUNHOFER team in case of questions):

- What are key determinants/topics in each CS (commodity, value-chain, region) shaping future developments and sustainability impacts?
 - What are indicators evidencing future developments?
 - Categorising key determinants/topics using the PESTEL categories (Issa *et al.*, 2010): political, economic, social, technological, environmental, and legal.
- Signals for change (sustainability transition) already visible today, confirming the direction of change.
- Key stakeholder organisations who can be involved (and are likely to be available) in the foresight process.

FRAUNHOFER might still provide more detailed requirements for the CS analysis after the Maastricht meeting.

3 Common reporting template for the 15 case studies

The common set of core indicators and the common reporting template presented in this section are to ensure comparability across CS (to the extent this is possible).

3.1 Common set of core indicators

One feature of the MATS project is a common set of **12-15 core indicators**. These indicators were identified to be meaningful to most (if not all) CS in a process of expert (CS team members) solicitation and prioritization.

Given the focus of MATS, all indicators in this set help to describe the linkages between agriculture trade policy, trade policy regimes and investments with sustainability, and particularly the SDGs (see also Figure 1 in D1.1; D2.1; and Section 3 and Annex 1 in D2.4).

Our common set of core indicators includes 2-3 indicators on each of the following **four dimensions**: Social; Human wellbeing; Economy and markets; Environmental and natural capital; and, Policy, governance and regulations.

The CS can use many more indicators, but the common ones – 2-3 from each dimension – must be included in each CS report.

The final list of 12-15 core indicators will be presented in a discussion paper following the forthcoming project meeting in Maastricht. This paper will also provide detailed methodological guidance on each indicator to ensure comparability.

3.2 Section headings (proposed)

All CS reports need to respond to the following headings as this will ensure that we can work with insights from a wide spectrum of cases in WP4, WP5 and WP6.

The need to cover the different headings will also ensure that we look at situations from different angles; thus apply a more holistic, systemic approach. At the same time it is expected that some CS include a more profound analysis on one aspect, while other CS go deeper in other aspects.

Executive summary

- (1) Introduction
- (2) Box: Basic data for the case study
- (3) Objectives and approach: Brief description of specific objectives and methodology used for the case study, in particular data collection and analysis
- (4) Key features of trade policy regime, investments in agri-food value chains, and sustainability standards
- (5) Key impacts of agri-food trade on sustainable development and on human rights
- (6) Linkages: From trade policy regime, investments and sustainability standards to impacts; description based on the common set of core indicators *plus* case-study specific indicators
- (7) Impact pathways: Visualisation and identification of key leverage points in agri-food trade/impact system
- (8) Actors and gender: Key actors with their roles, interests and responsibilities; Gender issues; How to address issues of power inequality, participation, and public interests
- (9) The role of national and supranational legal and policy frameworks with particular attention paid to the EU and the WTO (information required for WP4) (facultative: to respond to 2.3.1 you could prepare a political economy mapping of the different protagonists, including WTO rules, FTA, national authorities, local actors, private sector, donors)
- (10) Based on the evidence from the case study: Key determinants/topics for each case study shaping future developments and sustainability impacts; Ways forward; Recommendations on fostering the positive and reducing the negative impacts of agri-food trade (information required by WP5; see Section 2.3.2)

Some more specific items (please address at least two in your CS report):

- Role of investments, especially for supporting equitable agri-food systems and effective sustainability transitions? Links to cost of compliance with voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and labour rights.
- How to reduce negative transboundary impacts and foster mutually beneficial trade relations?
- How to increase the effectiveness of sustainability standards in European, EU-Africa and global agreements on agri-food trade (please consider voluntary sustainability standards and standards set by law)?
- What are the responsibilities of the public and private sector when it comes to enforcement of agreed sustainability goals and standards (industry driven vs. government driven standards)?

4 Annex 1 – References

- Gioia, D. (2021). A systematic methodology for doing qualitative research. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 57(1), 20-29.
URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0021886320982715>
- Issa, T., Chang, V., & Issa, T. (2010). Sustainable Business Strategies and PESTEL Framework. *GSTF International Journal On Computing*, 1 (1), 73-80.
URL: <http://dl6.globalstf.org/index.php/joc/article/download/429/2263>
- Langley, A., & Meziani, N. (2020). Making interviews meaningful. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56(3), 370-391.
URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0021886320937818>
- Strauss, Anselm, & Corbin, Juliet (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 4th ed. URL: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/basics-of-qualitative-research/book235578>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods (Vol. 5)*. sage. URL: https://www.academia.edu/13784473/Case_study_research_design_and_methods_4th_ed_Robert_Yin
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Sage Publishers. 3rd ed. URL: <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/applications-of-case-study-research/book235140>

5 Annex 2 – The 15 case studies in MATS

Topic	Key aspects	Main locus	Lead partner
1) Effects of trade on commercialisation and processing of food products	Improving the livelihoods of smallholder farmers through trade and food value chains; localisation of food systems, strengthening of territorial markets	Uganda, Tanzania	University Helsinki (UH), John Sumelius, with Makerere University and Moshi Co-operative University
2) Trade, resilience and social sustainability: oats value chains in the Nordics	Resilience of trade-dependent food value chains in the context of intra-EU agri-food trade and social sustainability; sustainability and equity	Finland, Sweden, EU	University Helsinki (UH), Bodo Steiner
3) Trade, sustainability and environmental linkages in Finnish dairy production	Mapping the linkages of dairy production and dairy trade with environmental externalities and production of ecosystem services	Finland, EU, trade partners	University Helsinki (UH), Nina Hyytiä, Antony Starr
4) Accessing export markets with high quality/social/environmental standards	Standards and market access; challenges related to WTO Rules and Regulations and/or EU requirements; strengthening of territorial markets	Sub-Saharan Africa	Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), Hoseana Bohela Lunogelo, with University of Dar-es-Salaam
5) Role of agricultural inputs and policy regulation in sustainable value chains	Emerging markets; poultry chains; role of policy regulation regarding animal welfare, inputs and trade; competitiveness, sustainability, livelihoods	Ghana	Technical University of Madrid (UPM), Pablo Vidueira, with CSIR – Science and Technology Policy Research Institute
6) Farm gate prices and sustainable business models: towards living income	Experiences, obstacles, impact and lessons learned from a multi-stakeholder initiative on sustainability standards in the cacao sector	EU, Côte d'Ivoire	Oxfam Wereldwinkels (OWW), Bart Van Besien
7) Impacts of EU policies on local dairy value chains in Africa	EU agricultural, trade, investment and development policies; impact on the development of local, fair and sustainable dairy chains	EU, Africa	Oxfam Solidarité - Oxfam Solidariteit (OXFAM), Thierry Kesteloot
8) EU climate and energy policies and their influence on trade and land use	EU biofuel policies and mandates; sustainability criteria biofuels; EU climate funding, carbon markets, offset mechanism; palm oil; land use change	EU, America, Africa, Asia	Oxfam Solidarité - Oxfam Solidariteit (OXFAM), Alba Saray Pérez-Terán
9) Human rights and environmental due diligence in the coffee value chain	Integrating human rights and environmental due diligence in coffee chains; impact on production practices and smallholder farmers	Tanzania, Burundi, Uganda, Ethiopia	Oxfam Wereldwinkels (OWW), Sarah Vaes

Topic	Key aspects	Main locus	Lead partner
10) Beef and policy coherence for sustainable development	EU agricultural, trade, investment and development policies; impact on local, fair, sustainable beef chains, including consumers and retailers	EU, Africa, South America	Research Centre on Animal Production (CRPA), Alberto Menghi, with Agri-benchmark Beef
11) Private standards and sustainable trade	Impact of processors/retailers' standards on development of local, fair, sustainable food chains; GLOBAL G.A.P.	Africa, Asia	Research Centre on Animal Production (CRPA), Alberto Menghi, with Global G.A.P
12) Ethical trade initiatives in the South African wine industry	Assessment of local and global ethical trade programmes in South Africa (e.g. Fair Trade, Ethical Trading Initiative, Ethical Trade Association)	South Africa, trade partners	North-West University (NWU), Ernst Idsardi, with Stellenbosch University
13) Dairy production, standards and competitiveness in global markets	Labour costs; additional costs resulting from environmental regulation; total production costs; processing and retail	EU, Africa, America	Research Centre on Animal Production (CRPA), Alberto Menghi, with International Farm Comparison Network (IFCN)
14) Changing land-use trajectories due to the EU-Mercosur trade agreement	The case of pork exports from Brazil to the EU: trade agreements, EU-Mercosur; pork value chains, soya and palm oil production; deforestation.	EU, Brazil	Technical University of Madrid (UPM), Pablo Vidueira, with Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP)
15) The new generation of EU Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and their impacts	Impact of EU-Tunisia FTA on incomes and market opportunities for farmers, fishers, breeders; ecological resilience, especially water scarcity	EU, N Africa (Tunisia)	Transnational Institute (TNI), Pietje Vervest, with Tunisian Observatory of the Economy