SWOT & SOR

Romania South Region

Catalin Dragomir
National R&D Institute
for Animal Biology and Nutrition, Romania

partner in REGPOT project
(project coordinator: Jovanka Levic,
Institute for Food Technology, Serbia)

Romania South region
(= 7 counties around Bucharest)

General statistics (from EuSTAT – based on INS, Romania, 2002):

Population: **3.47 millions** inhabitants
density: **100.6 intabitants / km2**
urban / rural population: 41.6% / **58.4%**
structure: **48.5% in agriculture**, 26.1% in industry and constructions,
25.4% in trade and social services

Agricultural statistics (from the website of National Agency for Agricultural Consultancy – sum of 7 counties):

agricultural land: **2.45 mil ha**;
land structure: **80.2% arable**, 15.7% pastures & meadows,
4,1% vineyards

Usage of land, per cultures	ha
Arable land	1,921,141
Wheat, barley, etc.	664,996
Corn & sorghum	498,421
Sunflower	278,224
Soybean	58,032
Rapeseed	34,661
Legumes	32,110
Potatoes	19,441
Safflower	10,910
Mellons	7,066
Pea	4,015

Farm animals	heads
Bovines	453,746
Sheep	952,011
Pigs	931,115
Birds	17,106,930
Goats	73,514

SWOT bussines sector – problem: not R&D, but general

Strengths
1.nearby market (large demand) 2.large **processing capacity** already existing **3.recent investments** in the sector **4.constant incomes**, can develop business plan 5.(recent) **trend to increase the average dimension** of the farms + quality **checking system / land areas / good quality products** from farms
Weaknesses
1.unit **price for raw animal products not set correctly**; **2.low level of association** 3.generally, low number of animals per farmer / **low average farm size** **4.insufficient land** to spread manure and grow bulk forage crops 5.problems with **manpower** (insuff. skilled workers / old ones) + **insufficient aid for small farmers** (high cofinancing very difficult financing system) / low price of the **secondary products / permanent investments needed** / business **can not be frozen** during the less favourable periods / large price addition by the **supermarkets / low-performing animals** / low **mechanisation level**

Opportunities
1.available **funds for infrastructure** development 2. possibility of **association** **3.increasing** animal products **consumption** **4.higher unit price** for the animal products 5.possibility to sell **traditional animal products** on EU markets + **support** from the authorities
Threatenings
1.development of industry & civil works at the expense of agriculture (**land**) **2.drought** & destroyed **irrigation** systems / high **expenditure for feeds** **3.cheaper imported animal products** (< than the cost domestic production) **4.checking system** not established properly and **not working properly** **5.competition for the feed resources** (biodiesel, etc.) + **intentional distruction** of animal husbandry / **no support** for small farmers / **indifference** of the authorities / **unlawful competition** / **difficult financing** / lack of proper **workforce** / **diminution of animal stocks** due to lack of forages and workforce

Votings - bussiness

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	
S 1	19	11	21	17	17	16	11	20	16	9	**157**
S 2	12	9	18	11	13	4	0	7	5	7	86
S 3	12	12	8	10	15	9	5	10	6	5	92
S 4	8	13	10	12	11	7	13	7	5	5	91
S 5	13	13	12	13	13	14	10	6	5	8	**107**
W 1	10	6	13	12	6	13	11	17	15	8	**111**
W 2	5	16	4	4	9	6	10	7	5	4	70
W 3	12	12	6	5	8	10	11	14	9	10	**97**
W 4	2	2	2	11	2	11	4	1	4	5	44
W 5	6	6	3	5	2	6	3	5	3	1	40
	99	**100**	97	**100**	96	**96**	78	**94**	73	62	

O & S	**323**
O & W	**169**

T & S	**210**
T & W	**193**

Interpretation - bussines

S: 1. nearby market (large demand)
5. (recent) trend to increase the average dimension of the farms,

W: 1. unit price for animal products not set correctly;
3. generally, low number of animals per farmer / low farm size

O: 1. available funds for infrastructure development
2. possibility of association
4. higher unit price for the animal products

T: 1. development of industry at the expense of agriculture (land)
3. cheaper imported animal products

Conclusion: "attack", and capacity to defend the threats

ways to react: - upgrade of infrastructure
- stimulate establishment of associations
- ensuring a correct price of raw animal products

SWOT RTD sector

Strengths

1.Existence of experienced specialists in areas of interest
2.Material **support** for animal husbandry RD activities
3.High **competitive capacity**, aiding to obtain funds for RD
4.Some recent endowment of RD infrastructure.
5.Concentration of experienced animal husbandry RD institutions **in the area**

\+ High number of **young researchers** / **Good connections** with international research / RD activity **properly regulated** / **Pool of knowledge** that can be applied.

Weaknesses

1. **Low number of specialised staff** (**lack** of staff / **overloading**)
2. Current **infrastructure** (equipment, etc) **old aged and insufficient**
3. **RD financing brings problems** (insufficient funds, cash crises)
4. Low, **unattractive wages** (compared to other areas or to private business)
5. **Poor collaboration** between related public institutions

\+ **disparition of some research units** & areas / Poor RD **staff stability**./ Too **many small units**./ Low proportion of specialists with **background** in animal husbandry / **Deficient management** in many institutions / **Improper core financing** is ensured only for universities and extension system, but not for the RD institutes (extrabudgetary)

Opportunities

1. **Investment in RD infrastructure**
2. **potential to train new specialists** in animal husbandry (including abroad)
3. **Enhance RD results transfer** to producers/processors
4. Redirect RD to the **development of new products** according to consumer demands
5. **Adopt the European system** for RD organisation

+ RD **consortia** / Increased **access to operational funds** / Promote **fundamental research** / higher **potential** of animal production sector **to absorb RD results** / **Trainings** in management and marketing / Collaboration with research units from **other areas** (human health, etc.)

Threats

1. **Difficulties attracting well trained young specialists** (wages, education level)
2. **Poor capacity** of animal production sector to **absorb RD results**
3. **Wider gap between national and European** RD, esp. in infrastructure.
4. Surviving problems (land, farms, labs) - **real estate business expansion**
5. Important **topics/directions may be left outside** the RD circuit.

+ lower **public funds** for RD / low capacity of animal production sector to **directly finance** directly RD activities / Loss of specialists due to **„brain –drain”** / **Smaller market** for animal products.

Votings - RTD

	O 1	O 2	O 3	O 4	O 5	T 1	T 2	T 3	T 4	T 5	
S 1	8	12	12	13	15	16	5	8	10	11	**110**
S 2	13	8	7	10	11	6	8	6	13	8	**90**
S 3	9	7	5	13	14	5	5	4	10	10	82
S 4	6	6	5	10	6	4	3	7	8	5	60
S 5	6	10	13	6	7	4	7	5	6	6	70
W 1	10	11	2	1	8	14	6	6	8	12	**78**
W 2	12	6	2	2	7	11	8	14	11	9	**82**
W 3	8	4	4	1	3	12	4	7	1	10	54
W 4	6	4	0	1	3	17	1	6	2	8	48
W 5	1	2	8	2	5	0	11	6	0	8	43
	79	70	58	59	**79**	**89**	58	69	69	**87**	

O & S	**232**
O & W	**113**

T & S	**180**
T & W	**192**

Interpretation - RTD

S:1. Existence of experienced specialists in areas of interest
5. Concentration of experienced animal husbandry RD units in the area

W: 1. Low number of specialised staff (lack of staff / overloading)
5. Poor collaboration between related public institutions

O 1. Investment in RD infrastructure
2. potential to train new specialists in animal husbandry (+ abroad)

T: 1. Difficulties getting well trained young researchers (wages, education)
2. Poor capacity of animal production sector to absorb RD results

Conclusion: "attack", but vulnerabilities

ways to react: - upgrade of infrastructure
- stimulate acquirement of promising young scientists

Comments on SWOTs

Focus on the ojective:

choice of animal products - Feed to Food focuses on the food chain of animal products;

- our main field of expertise and network of relationships is on animal nutrition

participants to SWOT:

bussines

3 farmers

2 food processing

2 researchers/professors

2 consultancy / checking system

** 1 proc. replaced with 1 res. on voting*

RTD

2 farmers / association;

1 food processing

4 reseachers / professors

2 consultancy & checking system

** 1 consultancy didn't participate to voting*

Problems while performing SWOT & SOR:

- in bussiness SWOT, many **couldn't focus on innovation** and referred to **general issues** of the sector (consistent with the results of a former FP6 project = poor RD activity in private companies);

- many participants focused only on their own problems and **couldn't have a broader view**: IMPORTANCE OF PARTICIPANTS !!

- compromise between the need to **explain** the SWOT & SOR and **give examples** and need to prevent **involuntary manipulation** of participants

- during discussions – participants tendency to **easily accept ideas picked-up or supported by moderator's / opinion leaders ideas**, rather than promoting their own ideas (even these are better), with the exception of conflicts

-some participants **simply cannot keep the focus** during the discussions (loss of time)

-difficult to **prioritize the 5** S, W, O, T: **influence of the moderator is too high** (a non-professional would be better?)

- many participants made **confusions S <–> O & W < -> T** (moderator had to...

less time remained for interpretation of votings

- the **conflict** farmers – processors raised up

- only few **mistakes in votings**, but still...

- didn't have time to **divide** the group

- not enough time to discuss the **mostly voted combinations**

Q: did we extract the true issues of the sector ?

catalin.dragomir@ibna.ro

www.ibna.ro