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JUVÁ, FINLAND
- Developing local food with common goals and projects

Salla Kakriainen

Introduction
The intention of this chapter is to draw a picture of the municipality of Juva as a site for the production, processing and use of local and organic food. In Juva there has been an emphasis on organic farming since the 1980s, and more recently, an emphasis on local food. Apart from this, Juva represents a rather typical Finnish rural municipality. This case study is based on information drawn mainly from interviews with local actors and from different documents. Twelve semi-structured interviews, each about a half to one and a half hours long, were made by BERAS and Lofo researchers in 2003.

One goal in the BERAS project is to study the local food system from the farm level through processing all the way to the consumers. Consumers in this project are represented mostly by institutional kitchens. These were chosen because of the big volumes that they consume. According to Paananen and Forsman (2003), municipal kitchens have the greatest potential as a marketing channel for local food. Because the BERAS project in Finland mainly focuses on delivering local and organic food to municipal kitchens, this public purchasing of food will be described in some detail below. Also, because projects seem to be a common means through which the development of the food systems is accomplished in Juva these projects (as well as other initiatives) are described.

Description of the Juva case
Geography
The municipality of Juva is located about 270 km northeast of Helsinki. The nearest cities are Mikkeli (45 km, 46 000 inhabitants), Varkaus (51 km, 23 000 inhabitants) and Savonlinna (60 km 27 000 inhabitants). Juva covers an area of 1200 km² of which about 180 km² is water. (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities: 2004) In contrast to its neighbouring municipalities, Juva has fewer lakes. The watersheds around Juva municipality are part of the Baltic Sea drainage area. The water flows through a system of shallow lakes that can easily become eutrophicated. At the moment the state of the lakes is for the most part good. (Ympäristön tila Mikkelin läänissä) Seventy four percent (87 000 ha) of the land in Juva municipality is covered with forests, and only about seven percent (8 100 to 9 000 ha) is arable land. (Niiranen; Juva; Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities 2004.)
Juva, like most parts of Finland, belongs to the temperate forest climate zone with cold winters. Mean temperatures are -9°C for January and +16°C for July (averages for the period 1961-1990). Annual rainfall is 640mm/year. Precipitation is highest during the late summer months and lowest in February and March. The growing season, with mean daily temperatures above +5°C, is 160 days, and the frost-free period is even shorter than that. (Häkkinen 1994; Rikkinen 1992) The grazing period is 120 days at the most. (Heinonen, 2002). The prevalent soil type in Juva region is till (moraine), which forms ridges running south-east to north-west.

Demography and history

Juva is a rural municipality with about 7,500 inhabitants. The municipality is sparsely populated with density of 6.8 inhabitants/km². The population has been declining for some years, as it has in many other rural areas in Finland, due to out-migration and a low birth rate. (Figure 1.)

The age structure of Juva follows the general lines of industrialised countries (Figure 2). The relative proportion of children is small and the population is growing older. Presently, for every person who has employment there are 1.6 people who are either outside of the labour
force or unemployed. (Statistics from Juva Municipality.) The proportion of young people (15–24 years of age) is low also because there are very limited education possibilities in the municipality of Juva. In addition, the statistics may over-estimate the number of residents in Juva. This is possible because many students can be registered in their home municipality although they study and live in some other place.

Compared to Finnish national figures, agriculture and forestry are very important in the economic structure of Juva (Figure 3). In this sense, Juva is a typical rural municipality. Also, as in other rural municipalities, there are fewer highly educated people, the proportion of retired people is higher and the urbanisation rate is lower. In Juva 47.8 % of the population live in urban areas. The average in rural municipalities is 51.4 % and in the whole Finland 82.3 % (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities).

During the last 50 years the structure of Finnish society has changed from an agricultural based economy to an industrial and service based economy. Agriculture has gone through major changes due to mechanization and its effects. When the work force was no longer needed on a family farm, the children, usually the youngest, moved to town and found work often in newly rising industries or services. The number of people employed in agriculture has been diminishing continuously during this period while the use of fertilizers and chemical pesticides has grown quickly up until the 1990s.

Agriculture in Finland is based on family farms. Recently these have become larger. Today the average farm is about 28 hectares of cultivated land. A typical farm also includes forests, on average about 46 hectares. (Heinonen 2002) In Juva, the total area under agriculture and forest production has remained at the pre-EU membership level but the number of farms has decreased by 30 %. (Laukkanen 2003.)

Regional/local agriculture and society

History of organic farming and food processing in Juva

The first influences of the organic movement in Finland can be traced back as far as to the beginning of the 20th century. The first still-existing

Figure 3. Economic structure of Juva compared to the whole of Finland. (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities.)
organic farms converted in the 1960s, but until the 1980s there were only a couple of dozen in Finland. When specialized marketing channels started to function and even more importantly when the state conversion aid programme was established the number of organic farms grew rapidly. (See Table 1.) South Savo and Ostrobothnia are regarded as the main pioneering regions for organic farming in Finland. In the 1980s South Savo declared itself to be an “eco province” and organic farming was one of the core ideas. Luomuliitto ry (The Union for Organic Farming) was founded in 1985 to act as an umbrella organisation for producer and other associations promoting organic agriculture. (Heinonen 2002.)

In Juva organic farming started at the beginning of 1980s. One of the pioneers was a well-known public person (an opera singer) whose farming was observed with interest. Jukka Rajala, the first organic advisor in the area started in 1983. Initially there were disputes between conventional and organic farmers about the appropriateness of different farming methods. Nowadays there is no bitterness between these groups of farmers. (Laukkanen 2003.)

During the past decade the food processing industry in Juva has grown significantly, giving rise to almost a hundred new employment opportunities. Small firms have received help through EU development projects. The strategy has been to diversify production and increase the level of processing. In this way more of the economic resources remain in the municipality and fuel the local economy. Three fields of specialisation have been developed. These include vegetable production both in the field and in green houses, organic production that started in the area about 20 years ago, and turkey production and processing.

Compared to neighbouring areas, Juva has a strong, although short, tradition of organic farming. Being a pioneer in Finnish organic farming research, Partala Development Centre for Rural Areas, located in Juva, began its activities in 1985 with broad development and research activities. The goal of the association is to promote organic farming and a sustainable lifestyle in cooperation with other organisations. Since 1990 the management and development of research activities has been under MTT Agrifood Research Finland. Today Partala serves as a research farm where professionals and tourists can make study visits. (Partalan luomutietopalvelu) In December 1989 there were 6 organic farms in Juva (Laukkanen & Suokas 1992). These played an important role as pilot farms showing that organic farming is really possible. To-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of organic farms</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>5087</td>
<td>5197</td>
<td>5225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organically farmed area (% of the total arable area)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Development of the number of organic farms and their percentage of Finland’s cultivated area (Yearbook of Farm Statistics 2001, 248–249).*
During the restructuring of agriculture during the 1980s there were major fusions in the dairy industry. The Juva dairy was also shut down, but at the same time there were discussions about its use as an organic dairy. The process to reopen as an organic dairy started with a help of a project in 1990. The establishment of an organic dairy was economically feasible because there were sufficient organic milk producers in Juva and in surrounding areas. A lot of voluntary work and trust have been needed, especially in the beginning. In 1993 the dairy Juvan Luomu Oy, was opened. It is responsible for collecting and processing organic milk. They have an agreement with the big national milk processor Valio. Valio takes care of product development, distribution and marketing of the organic products (Suokas 2003, 4-6) but Juva dairy is allowed to sell these products directly to consumers in the Juva area. Presently there are seven different products including sour milk, different yoghurts, milk and cream and some new products are being developed. Today 13% of the milk produced in Juva is organic. (Suokas 2003, 11)

The present situation of food production and processing in Juva
The number of farms has been diminishing in Juva, as elsewhere, during recent years. The majority today are dairy farms (190), but there are also others including 69 with crops husbandry, 65 with animal husbandry, 48 producing mainly fodder grass, 28 with horticulture production and 17 horse farms. (Leväinen 2003) The situation among organic farms is presented in Table 2. Approximately 10% of the organic milk in Finland is produced in Juva. Juva cooperates with neighbouring municipalities and together these five municipalities have formed a federation of municipalities called RaJuPuSu. In the RaJuPuSu area 7.1% of the cultivated fields is organic (KTTK 2003) where as in Juva it is as much as 15.8%. (Leviäinen 2004; KTTK 2003) There are many organic dairy farms that grow their own fodder. Therefore the proportion of organic fields is large.

Compared to other rural municipalities, Juva has a strong food processing industry (Table 3). The industries use mostly local products, but the biggest ones also import some raw materials from elsewhere in Finland and abroad. The retailing in Juva is done by three big grocery stores, two in the centre and one a couple of kilometres from the centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farms (total)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field area (ha)</td>
<td>1 281</td>
<td>1 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area/farm (ha)</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>24.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy farms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep farms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop farms</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef farms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture farms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse farms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Characteristics of organic farms in Juva (Leväinen 2004).
on the main road. These represent the 3 big grocery chains in Finland (KK Market, S-Market and Spar). An additional smaller store is located further away from the centre, in Nuutilanmäki.

In the grocery stores the local products are marked with a specific kind of price tag on the edge of the shelf, which makes these products easily distinguished from others (Picture 1). This system makes it easy to find the local products in normal grocery stores. This price tag is for local products, both organic and conventional. Organic products have the organic labelling as well. In addition to sale in shops, there are also farms that have direct sales (Table 4). However, most of the local products are sold in the supermarkets not in farm shops. There are no shops that specialise in organic products only (Table 5).

Compared to neighbouring areas Juva has a strong identity in organic farming. It has been promoted and discussed for almost 20 years, which is a long time in the Finnish organic farming context. Juva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salico Oy</td>
<td>Vegetable processing, convenience / ready-to-eat salads. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Järvi-Suomen Kalkkuna Oy</td>
<td>Slaughtering and turkey processing. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennan Liha Ay</td>
<td>Processing and sales of meat products. * (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mestariviljelijät Oy</td>
<td>Preparation of vegetables for sale. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:mi Lhajaloste Kantanen</td>
<td>Smoked meat products, etc. * (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvan Luomu Oy</td>
<td>Refining of milk products, organic dairy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapion Toote Oy</td>
<td>Flour-mill; mill products. * (Production for sales is conv., but it has a licence to mill organic and does it for private people.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltolan Puutarha</td>
<td>Production of juices and nectars from own raw materials. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Berry</td>
<td>Processed berries, nectars and jelly. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipomo Konditoria Pähkinä Ky</td>
<td>Bakery products. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:mi Toivetuote</td>
<td>Bakery products. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:mi Savumaja S. Kantanen</td>
<td>Meat and processed (smoked) meat. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipomo Juvalainen</td>
<td>Bakery products. (conv.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These enterprises have also direct sales at farm shops
“(conv.)” indicates a processor of conventional, non-organic, products.

Table 3. Food processing enterprises located in Juva (Etelä-Savon elintarviketalouden kehittämishjelma 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyötäpaja</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wehmaan kartano</td>
<td>Organic meat (beef)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycogen Oy</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pien-Piispala</td>
<td>Organic meat (beef)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappion luomutila</td>
<td>Organic horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmiassät</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvan Muumaa Ay</td>
<td>Organic beestings, farm tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Väinahto luomutila</td>
<td>Organic vegetables and root crops, farm tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Päivi Seuri</td>
<td>Organic horticulture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Farms in Juva with direct sales (Etelä-Savon elintarviketalouden kehittämishjelma 2001; Luomutuotteiden osto-opas 2003).
municipality has been profiling itself as pro-organic. Being organic has a marketing value and the products are exported to other regions.

**Municipal kitchens as institutional consumers**

Consumers in this project are represented mostly by the institutional kitchens. These were chosen because of the big volumes that they consume. Of the food that is eaten outside of the home restaurants serve about 49%, public institutional kitchens 23%, lunch restaurants (for working people) 8% and cafés about 20% of the portions. (Partanen 2003) This means that the public kitchens are a major provider of meals. According to Paananen and Forsman (2003), municipal kitchens are the channel with the greatest potential for marketing local food.

The municipal kitchens are important for several reasons. Firstly, if these public kitchens used local organic food it would make a big impact on demand levels. Secondly, these public institutional kitchens, especially the school kitchens, have an important educational task. If the ideas of organic and local food consumption reached all the pupils while at school the information would spread more effectively. Also knowing about the origin of the food creates more respect for it. Thirdly, municipalities, in addition to meal provision, are also responsible for the environmental and economic welfare of the residents and of their territories. Today this responsibility presents some major challenges that the use of locally produced organic food could help to meet. However there are still issues that need to be solved if locally produced organic food is to become a real option for these institutional kitchens. These include questions of supply, availability, logistics and costs. Interest for using local and organic products does exist.

If the amount purchased by municipal kitchens is over 200 000 euros they must follow the law on “General Terms of Public Procurement for Finland (1416/93)”. According to this, there needs to be open competitive bidding before a purchase is made. Because these procedures are relatively time consuming for small units they have formed cooperatives. For example, Juva Municipal kitchens have formed a regional cooperative together with 34 other kitchens. The total amount of supplies needed is estimated and a centralized invitation to traders is made. This procedure is repeated approximately every second year and in praxis each kitchen is obligated to purchase the amount of goods they have estimated. The threshold values of the purchasing cooperative are such that vegetables, fruits and bread are actually the only groups of foodstuffs that have not been tied to this common competitive bidding. It is important to understand how this cooperative works, because it has a major effect on what is purchased and where.

The municipality has a certain amount of money in the budget that can be used for food and the matrons are responsible for staying within the given frame. The municipality itself has no interest in these purchasing cooperatives, but the kitchen staff and others who do the actual work and make the every day purchases have organised it.

| Meat products  | 7.7% |
| Dairy products | 2.0% |
| Vegetables, root crops | 5.6% |
| Grain | 8.3% |
| Bakery products | 11.6% |
| **Total** | **6.6%** |

*Table 5. Share of local (includes both local and local organic) products of total sales in S-Market, Juva (Hartikainen 2003).*

*Picture 1. Local products have their own label. The picture on top shows the label for products coming from Juva. The other label is for the products coming from the county of South-Savo.*
Representatives from the different municipalities or bigger kitchens make the decisions based on the tenders received. One problem for the producers is that one or two years (duration of an agreement) is too short a time to develop the local organic chains, because investments and planning have to be done for a longer period of time.

**Projects as part of the food system**

The strategy of diversifying production and being a rural municipality with strong agriculture base has been successful in maintaining and even increasing the farm acreage of the municipality even during EU membership. Food production has been consciously chosen as a core municipal strategy, also for the future. Juva wants to be a rural municipality that builds its welfare on farming and food processing. Through research and development projects the municipality tries to guarantee that the small firms receive the latest information. (Laukkanen 2003.) Many projects have been implemented that substantially promote organic and local food production and consumption in Juva. The will to develop local organic food systems has been in the background in planning these projects. This general ambition to increase the use of the local organic food has in praxis included many smaller initiatives and projects.

Organic farming in Juva has the MTT research station as well as the Partala Association as important supporting structures. In the case of Juva it could be said that the driving force has been the interest to increase the use and production of organic food and more recently also even local food. Many different projects and activities have been useful and necessary in reaching this goal. Many of these activities have been funded by different EU-programmes. Leader is one such programme. This initiative to “increase local/ecological food” has therefore no documented history, but it is built up around a couple of strong, stable actors/institutions¹, support from the municipality and a common goal. Different projects have, of course, different visions about how to reach the goal. Some of the projects have concentrated only in Juva and neighbouring areas while others have been implemented at the national level. A brief description of these projects is given below.

1) The project **Elinvoiman eväät** concentrates on finding ways to use local food in municipal kitchens. There is legislation concerning purchasing by municipal kitchens. Therefore it is highly relevant to know how a call for offers can be made that both comply with the legislation and also do not exclude small and local producers from making an offer. In practice the project has helped buyers draw up offers in a way that facilitates the participation of local small-scale producers. The project also gave ordering software for testing to the staff

---

¹ ”Actor” in this paper is a person in a food chain. It can be a farmer, shop keeper, developer, consumer, producer or something in between.
in municipal kitchens and some deliverers. This project is a nationwide and has pilot areas in different parts of Finland. One of the pilot areas is in Mikkeli, but it works at the moment as an independent project.

This project is run by Efektia Oy, which is an enterprise mainly owned by the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities. The project is funded by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, MTK the Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners. Elinvoiman eväät is a response to a problem that the steering committee of a project called “Renewable food services” identified. During this project different needs and themes were discussed in the steering committee. The promotion of local food was one of them. Because of its wide relevance it became a separate project.

2) a) Makuapaja develops new ways to process and use local products in municipal kitchens.

In Juva there is an experimental kitchen where processing of local products can be tried out and developed. The initiative to this project came originally from one association (Rural Women’s Advisory Organisation) and small active entrepreneur groups. Due to the growing interest from both producers and consumers the project has grown and led to the setting up of an experimental kitchen. The present project has been preceded by two others.

b) Makulog concentrates on the logistical questions. This project was designed by advisers, economic developers of the municipalities and local food producers and other interest groups. Many small producers used a lot of their time for transporting products to shops. This project tries to find solutions for such problems.

c) Elintarvike- ja maaseutuinnovaatit RaJuPuSu-seudun voimavarana (Food and rural Innovations as a RaJuPuSu regions’ resource). The basic idea is to concentrate on a sector that is most important to the region and find different ways to support the activities.

These three projects are run by RaJuPuSu which is a federation of five municipalities (Joroinen, Rantasalmi, Juva, Puumala, and Sulkava).

3) Consumers, decision makers and local or organic food

This project examines, nationwide, how consumers define local and organic food, how willing they are to use it and how much they trust it. It is run by the National Consumer Research Centre (coordinator), VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, MTT Agrifood Research Finland.

4) a) Rahti-raitti finds and presents different logistical systems for products and materials for small and medium size enterprises.
b) Eteläsavolaisesta raaka-aineesta palvelutuotteeksi
This project started because there was a need for consumers and producers to get together. One of the main constraints hampering the use of local food is that producers and buyers do not know who to contact and what to do. This project connects producers to the end customer – the clients of the kitchen. The development of new recipes has been one practical outcome of the project. Logistics and marketing have also been developed.

c) Cultural heritage
Culinary experiences within the tourist industry and business development (logistics) in the South Savo are two projects run by the YTI Research Centre in Mikkeli.

5) a) Local food systems: impacts and learning challenges (Lofo) is a nationwide multidisciplinary project which studies Juva and Rajupusuaarea to find out more about the effects that the use of local food has on municipal economy, cooperation, landscape and environment.

b) Valttikorttina luomuvihannekset. This project aims to develop organic vegetable farming methods and to improve the competitiveness and profitableness of organic vegetable producers in South Savo. The agricultural expert organisation ProAgria works together with farmers to reach this goal.

c) Baltic ecological recycling agriculture and society (BERAS)
This project studies the economical, ecological and social effects that local food has on the area. It is an Interreg III B funded research and development project with partners around the Baltic Sea.

The University of Helsinki, Mikkeli Institute for Rural Research and Training, and MTT Agrifood Research Finland are involved in these three projects.

6) Label for local products was a project that was planned and financed by the farmers, processors and shopkeepers in Juva. Their interest was to create a truly local brand name. An initial meeting was held in the beginning of 2001 where local shopkeepers and producers were present. Prior to this some of the farmers had collaborated but widening the cooperation to include the shopkeepers opened new possibilities. The necessary money was contributed by all concerned: the municipality, producers, processors, buyers associations and shops. Every one received a starting package after only three months. This label is used in all the grocery stores in Juva.

The BERAS-project cooperates with several of the other projects, which are run by different extension organisations in the region. Most projects
need actors (farmers, entrepreneurs, officials, shops, developers etc.) from grass root level, and the number of such people is limited as is their time to get involved in new initiatives. Therefore cooperation is important so that the different projects do not go to the same people again and again, asking similar questions. In addition participation in a project often requires a small amount of money and if the actor does not feel that he or she has received something useful from the project, their reluctance to join new projects increases. This would result in a situation where it would be very difficult to get these actors involved in the projects and there is no sense in having a project if the local actors are not interested in it. This is a real risk, when there are several projects in a small area. Links among projects serve as a forum for all the project actors where they can get information from each other or become aware at least that other projects exist. At the same time it gives developers a broader view of what is currently being done in the region. This increased awareness of other projects and the broader picture will help guide discussions and planning of new projects and in this way help bring continuity to development work and research.

**Future**

One of the bottlenecks in Juva and the neighbouring municipalities seems to be that the supply has not reached the required volumes. Production from one farm is not enough to meet the needs of the kitchen. And even if the production itself were sufficient, the level of processing is usually not in line with the demands of the kitchen. The kitchen needs carrots processed in different ways – farmers have carrots that are not processed at all. So both the issues of quantity and degree of processing provide challenges that need to be addressed. These problems were addressed in an actor meeting held in Juva in December 2003. (See Appendix 1.)

According to the research of Marsden et al (2000) in the UK, there are various options. One is that farmers form some kind of cooperative (to provide needed quantity and steady supply); another option is that there is a middleman (see also Marsden et al 2000). Whatever the solutions might be, it is clear that these projects must work in a way so that local institutions are strengthened and able to carry on project activities after the project has come to an end. If the resources and responsibility remain in the project, activities will come to an end when the project comes to an end. During the project it is possible to work together to create something new and sustainable.

One possibility builds mainly on the institutional kitchen units because they are big and relatively stable consumers in the region. However, the legislation concerning public purchasing coupled with these kitchens’ limited budgets does limit the extent to which they can commit themselves to purchasing locally-produced organic food products. These kitchens have made their needs clear to producers, i.e. farmers. They need more “ready for the pot” products. At the moment
there are too few small scale processors to meet this demand. One solution is that farmers start processing but this would require considerable investment on their part. If farmers try to respond to the needs of the kitchens what do the kitchens and other customers need to do to facilitate this? Who is best suited to provide the needed services and how can the necessary long term investments be financed?

Both farmers and developers at the municipal level have been working with these issues. A couple of farmers collaborated in an attempt to process carrots and other organic vegetables for institutional kitchens. Despite the cooperation between the farms and the staff at the municipal kitchens it proved to be too much additional work for these individuals who already had full time jobs. The development phase of manufacturing is demanding – both in terms of time and experience if effective processes that are economically viable are to emerge. There are plans at municipal level to work with this and find a solution how to organise peeling of local root crops including potatoes. Logistical systems for distribution already exist but they need to be used more and further developed.

The initiative to develop local organic food systems seems to be moving ahead slowly but steadily. The municipal council of Juva has passed resolutions for using more organic food in municipal kitchens. The matrons in the kitchens are interested in using locally produced organic food – within the given budgetary limits. The concept of local food is becoming more familiar among many different practitioners, providing new opportunities for its use. Despite this the concept is still vague and is often used to refer to different things. Depending on the perspective local food can mean food produced in the same municipality, food produced in Finland and everything in between.

Puumala (2900 inhabitants) is one of Juva’s neighbouring municipalities. Their poor municipal economy has put pressure on them to find ways to cut expenses. One option under study is combining the small municipal kitchens into one bigger centralised kitchen that would deliver food for all the others. At the moment the day care centre kitchen uses almost only organic food that is locally produced, and with the help of personal contacts and direct sales it is possible to produce meals at a competitive price. There is a fear that if there were only one big kitchen the use of organic food would stop due to two main problems: the lack of supply of big amounts of organic food and the pressure to cut prices.

Discussion
Obstacles and possibilities
The local and local organic food in Juva has been actively promoted for some period of time. The initiatives have been coming from many different interest groups including farmers and government officials. As a result many different projects have been launched. Developing with the help of projects has been a typical feature for Juva. These projects
are stable and active because those who participate come from stable institutions such as the federation of municipalities or research organisations. Presently there are several projects that have both local and national level connections.

It seems that the concept local food is well recognised in Juva, though it still has various meanings from being a national product to a product produced in one’s own municipality. The activities for promoting local and local organic food have also been successful. This is evident from the many direct connections between municipal kitchens, shops and farmers. Local products are available in the supermarkets and can be recognised as such from a local label. Organic food also offers possibilities, as the organic dairy in Juva shows.

Local purchasing has to compete with big national and internationals markets. As kitchens are forced to restructure into larger units it often becomes more difficult for single farmers to compete with various wholesalers. Maintaining direct contact and direct sales provides opportunities for new ways of organising things and therefore most likely also more work – either for the buyer or for the seller. Is one of them in a position to take such an initiative? How does the kitchen’s demand to have few invoices and orders relate to this practice? What does it mean to the farmer if she/he is able to occasionally sell part of the produce through “unconventional” ways from time to time? How could this cooperation be encouraged? These questions represent some of the future challenges in developing local food systems. Developing these also means defining “local” over and over again.

From the perspective of the municipality there are some constraints for them to use local and local ecological food. Kitchens need to ask for tenders for all the purchased products, and generally the cheapest should be accepted. There are of course possibilities to use other criteria but it has to be explained and justified. There are also issues concerning budget limitations. At the moment there is insufficient information about the multiplicative effects that the use of local food has on the local economy and therefore it is difficult to calculate its value. Issues of scale also need to be addressed. With today’s existing socioeconomic structures processors need certain production volumes for an activity to be profitable. Often the demand in one municipality is not enough. Also the investment costs can be relatively high in the beginning. In addition farmers need both time and interest to make contacts and market their products locally. It is not possible for all to invest the extra time needed to build up the local food system. Despite all these constraints some people have been championing the cause of local and organic food for many years. They have taken part in projects, discussions and activities, but they have not seen a real movement for local organic food evolve. They are getting a bit tired. They would like to see something concrete happening, not just attend meetings and seminars.
Developmental questions posed by BERAS
Promotion of local food is a two way process. The genuine will for doing it has to exist or be generated in the region and at the same time ideas, encouragement and help can be brought from outside, for example by projects like BERAS. One of the basic ideas of BERAS WP1 is to include the actors in the research process so that discussion between the researchers and actors is a genuine two way process. Researchers ask how and why something is the way it is and also try to understand the actors’ point of view and support existing initiatives. Both the process of exchanging information and thinking about different possibilities as well as the end result are important.

The concept of local food will have different meanings in different situations. For some, local food can be made of foreign raw materials as long as the processing and work is done close by. Others have much stricter criteria for local food. It seems that different products require different levels of locality. It is important to understand these different situations and perspectives. Despite how it is defined, however, it is clear that local foods require another kind of supply chain than buying from wholesalers.

The simplest network is here understood as a connection between two actors. One question is how more contact between the producer and consumer can be created. In general, this connection is weaker than wished or needed for developing local food. Stimulating the sharing of information about present challenges and future perspectives seems to be one of the main possibilities to create interaction between the actors and through that also cooperation can emerge. The BERAS project is trying to increase cooperation among local actors in order to make the supply and demand fit. Knowing about the origin of the product brings respect to it. One relatively easy way to “give face to the food” is to present the farmer who is producing the food. Consumers also have certain wishes and suppliers need to be able to meet them somehow. Is it possible to get the customer networked to the natural environment? Do the matrons feel that they have an educational task in addition to cooking nourishing food?

Conclusion
It is clear even from this short introduction to the Juva case that the issue of increasing local organic food production and consumption is very complex. Active, interested people are needed to promote local food at all levels of society. Different regulations, laws and instructions constitute constraints. In addition to these limitations there are the present trends, instructions and eating regulations that influence every day actions. Combining all these is not simple, but experience indicates there are ways to overcome the problems. A necessary, but not always sufficient, requirement is cooperation between the actors. This often requires time, effort and resources that are not always available. Sometimes these efforts are rewarded.
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### Appendix 1.

**Obstacles and solutions identified in the actors’ meeting / Juva December 8th 2003.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor group</th>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Producers   | • diverse vegetable production takes time  
             • packing, pre-processing and marking takes time  
             • payment to farmers for bread grain is too low  
             • waste regulations eliminate small slaughterers  
             • there are no (almost no) processed products from organic meat  
             • prices, price relationship between producer/shop | • cooperation between the farmers  
                                                                 • the time for bidding on offers should be changed |
| Processors  | • starting up processing  
             • to get the logistics to work well  
             • small volumes  
             • municipal kitchens; many small kitchens where the products should be delivered, prices, packaging  
             • handling of small amount takes lot of time  
             • bureaucracy, book keeping  
             • investments in machinery vs. small volumes  
             • broad selection of products makes cooperation difficult  
             • transportation of small volumes  
             • availability of quality grain has diminished  
             • municipal kitchens need good quality for a low price  
             • transportation  
             • ergot | • cooperation in marketing  
                                                                 • cooperation with shops |
| Municipality | • processing is needed  
              • there is no will | • Cooperation with a big company |
| Kitchen     | • products should be processed, ready for the pot  
              • greater selection of vegetable is needed (fresh vegetables from Juva, ordering from one place and delivered to the kitchen  
              • ordering small amounts directly from the farmer  
              • ordering  
              • availability  
              • right amounts = packing size  
              • rate of processing  
              • logistics | |
| Retail      | • small amounts  
              • ordering | • showing the value to the consumer  
                                                                 • producers take care of the shelves by themselves  
                                                                 • setting the price of the products |
| Consumers and Teaching Kitchen | • price, availability, storing  
                               • many opinions  
                               • untreated turkey (and chicken) is not available | • small amounts available, juicy appearance, unpeeled  
                                                                 • Organic kitchen centre in Suonenjoki |
| Research    | • research and development takes time  
              • low productivity of organic vegetable production leads to too independent activity of the farm  
              • amounts in production are low, not there when needed | • kitchens report their monthly requirements to a list  
                                                                 • producers have an organisation for cooperation  
                                                                 • logistics – how will the supply be coordinated? |
| Organic     | • transportation did not start | • sales of the Saimaan Luomu  
                                                                 • shopping guide of the organic products |
Summary of the present situation:
• potential does exist
• problem is the small volume in the region.

How to go proceed?
• Get information about the logistical systems and terminals of Suur-Savo
• Resepti–Reetta (computer in a shop which gives out recipes; ideas for cooking)
• Quantified data about local economy is needed for county cooperation and decision makers
• Environmental information is needed (for use in marketing)
• People passing by and summer residents need to be noticed
• Cooking on a “local food-day”
• Use of Makupaja (experimental kitchen)
• Markets
• “Summary day”