



## World café

### Summary of the 6 discussion tables

1) What type of field experiments with farmers could be replicated in different Member States?  
(Facilitator: Klaus Glenk)

Replication in different Member States enhances the likelihood that effective mechanisms are seriously considered for policy implementation.

Many types of field experiments have been suggested: European wide similar measures (or similar across regions), testing of new measures (eg. risk management, uniform versus differentiated payments, payments by results, different modalities of support, ...), cross-country issues such as land abandonment, small farms, ..., comparisons by concept (perceived level of control, control aversion, effectiveness of different nudges across contexts, ...)

Challenges:

Standardizing data collection methods / recruiting farmers as participants across countries (access via FADN network, agricultural students in different EU countries as an acceptable substitute to farmers...)

Barriers to replication: How to adjust to different contexts across countries.

Testing for convergence of results and conclusion with alternative evaluation methods is necessary.

Experiments could also be extended to policymakers / stakeholders / local governance as participants to experiment.

2) Is there scope for natural experiments or RCTs that could be deployed in the process of the next CAP reform? (Facilitator: Isabelle Bonjean)

Challenges: problem of confounding factors, difficulty to implement and find a good treatment, already too late to measure the ex-ante impact of CAP changes in 2020

RCT: Could use phasing-in of policies, “Free Lunch randomization” for agri-environment measures or information given to a group of farmer and not to another one. But there is need to ensure that

treated groups and control groups face comparable context, to coordinate the experiment across regions and to control potential contamination.

Quasi-experiment: easier and less ethically questionable but only for ex-post evaluation. Could use: eligibility criteria to certain policy (convince those designing the measures to introduce arbitrary thresholds), “Errors” in administration, sudden unanticipated shock (Brexit, ...), delays of implementation of EU policy within and across different countries.

Up to know, few members of the network have mobilized such approaches for CAP evaluation.

3) Do you know studies which have successfully combined economic experiments with other data sources and methods? How could existing database be improved to facilitate experimental work? (Facilitator: Maria Espinosa)

There are many rich databases: administrative data, agricultural census (AC), FADN, Farm Structure Survey (FSS), Survey on Agricultural Production Methods (SAPM), land use data, climate data, satisfaction survey from EU (Eurobarometer), data coming from precision (smart) farming like fertilizer use... But there are many concerns: representativeness of the surveyed sample, difficulties to merge databases, accessibility and data privacy rules.

Extensive literature on combining experimental with observational data in environmental economics: Whitehead Haab, Huang (2011) and Phaneuf and Requate (2017, page 609, “A course in Environmental Economics”) chapter on combining stated and revealed preferences.

University of Bologna (Italy) is testing a methodology linking experimental data and FADN data with a non-parametric approach in order to avoid the farm to farm matching (will be presented at the EAAE conference in Parma)

Some information on the on-going evolutions of these databases:

- FADN/SAPM are very powerful databases conducted EU-wide and with continuity. Therefore, the medium-long term effects of nudges could be assessed. But problem of data accessibility/anonymity.
- We could suggest to improve FADN with behavioural questions. DG-AGRI is pushing to have the social, environmental indicators in FADN (Flint project: <http://www.flint-fp7.eu/index.html>) but most Member States are reluctant. Each additional reporting means extra workload to the farmers. Reduce the sample size as a trade-off of collecting additional indicators. For agricultural census, the focus is on a greater consistency with Farm Structure Survey (FSS) data.

4) How can we enlarge and strengthen our network? (Facilitator: Evelien Cronin)

Insights from other disciplines can be very useful for future research. Especially in the design phase: useful information from sociologists, psychologists, health economists, etc. However, should not be central to the network to keep a manageable group

A large question remains: how to fit this methodology with other economic methodologies. This is a very interesting domain to explore further. The scientific committee mentions that they looked for somebody to illustrate this point during the workshop, but no one was available.

Contacts with farmers / policy makers (and obtain their agreement) is key. Should relevant contacts be shared?

Knowledge sharing among ourselves: should we set-up shared database?, a Linked'In group, an online platform, a blog?

5) How can we make our research more salient and more visible? (Facilitator: Douadia Bougherara)

**For both national policy makers and European institutions**

Clear identity for the network (find a name); Have synthetic messages with policy implications of research (policy briefs); Invite policy makers to participate to workshops; Organize special sessions in conferences; Get the farmers and farmer representatives on-board; Participation to events/calls for evaluation.

Blogs/Social media with large transfer potential; Website; Publications in professional/transfer journals (e.g. EuroChoices); Short films on research results; Team-up with other networks (Ag econ; European Network for Rural Development); Frame the research as European Innovation Partnership (EIP-AGRI) activity (<http://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/>)

Cost Action Groups as a way of funding: ([http://www.cost.eu/participate/open\\_call](http://www.cost.eu/participate/open_call))

6) Our intention is to create new opportunities to meet and exchange, so we need to learn from this first workshop. How should we organize the next workshop? (Facilitator: Fabian Thomas)

Location: easy to reach, surrounded by agriculture for a field trip. Osnabrück, Kiel, Berlin, Göttingen Seville, Brussels, Eastern Europe (?), ...

Scope: Keep it like this year, 2 full days with special sessions on one topic / method, demonstrate more results, discuss also ongoing work (designs / protocols)?

New challenges to cover: How to convince policy makers? Practical solutions for policy makers, Combining different methods, Data privacy / IT issues, Matching supply & demand side (of goods, of research needs, what is the social optimum?). Include presentations on new / more unknown issues (e.g. risk management strategies)

Suggestions to make the workshop more participatory: 'Getting to know each other'-game, More space for discussion, Design/discuss research projects in small groups, Open slot for unplanned contributions, Posters, plan a half-day slot for an interactive workshop (like a world café), allow some time to report / wrap up.

Suggestions for contributors: Scandinavia, Eastern Europe, Keep the mix of researchers / policy makers / etc., Farmers? Or a member of a farming cooperative, Session with practitioners, Joint research / applications, More on recruitment, Building up a database of farmers