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Localizing Linkages for Food and Tourism: Culinary Tourism as a Community Development Strategy

Gary Paul Green and Michael L. Dougherty

The local food movement is taking a variety of forms—including farm-to-school programs, farmers markets, community supported agriculture, and direct marketing. An emerging component of this movement is culinary tourism. Culinary tourism offers new opportunities for communities to integrate tourism and local food systems in order to promote economic development, respond to the demand for quality food and dining experiences, and build on the cultural heritage of the region. This paper examines culinary tourism through a case study of the Kingdom So Delicious program in Door County, Wisconsin. This analysis is based on intensive interviews with owners/managers of four restaurants and surveys of 30 retailers and 40 farmers in the region. Retail establishments relied heavily on local produce, largely due to a commitment to help local producers. Farmers frequently combined marketing fresh food to local retail establishments with sales to wholesalers. The most frequently cited concerns with producing for local establishments involved in culinary tourism were low prices and challenging logistics. The lessons of this study are not limited to Door County but can be applied to other, similar communities seeking to strengthen culinary tourism.
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The local food movement offers new economic opportunities for small and medium-sized farms, reduces their environmental footprints, and promotes good nutrition among consumers (Kloppenburg, Lezberg, Demaster, Stevenson, & Hendrickson, 2000). Local food systems take a variety of forms, including farm-to-school programs, farmers markets, and community supported agriculture. An emerging component of this movement is food and cultural tourism, which is often referred to as culinary tourism (Long, 2004). Culinary tourism emphasizes unique foods and dishes from the culture of the host region. Many regions, for example, feature their wine industries as a focal point of their tourism programs. The Missouri Regional Cuisines Project is a recent effort to promote a group of wineries in Eastern Missouri. Other regions promote their local cuisine or other agricultural products in which they have a comparative advantage as tourist attractions. These projects are often promoted as “trails” with businesses of various types in a geographic region offering complementary culinary and cultural experiences for visitors. The state of Minnesota has an elaborate trail system that focuses on culinary experiences. Although there are a growing number of states promoting culinary tourism to address the waning economic...
vitality of many rural areas, there is very little research that has examined the effects of these programs for farmers and rural economic development. This paper evaluates some of the supply and demand issues surrounding local foods in a culinary tourism market, and examines how communities overcome some of the institutional barriers to building the local food systems that constitute the primary input into culinary tourism.

According to the Travel Industry Association (2007), 27 million travelers, or 17 percent of American leisure travelers, engaged in culinary or wine-related activities between 2003 and 2006. Culinary tourists have a significant impact on regional economies and spend about $1,000 per trip. The Travel Industry Association projects tremendous growth for the culinary traveler market, as the share of U.S. leisure travelers interested in culinary travel in the near future (60 percent) is significantly larger than those currently engaged. This projected growth in culinary travel brings opportunities for economic development to rural America, along with challenges for farmers, ranchers, restaurateurs, and communities seeking to maintain their rural character and agrarian authenticity. Given the size of the rural tourism industry and its potential for sustainable development, it is vastly underanalyzed in the academic literature.

Culinary tourism projects present several interesting issues for community development planning. First, promoting a region as a tourist destination frequently requires coordination across several communities. There are clearly benefits to having a critical mass of this type of economic activity. Having a sufficient number of farms, restaurants, and retail establishments is a key to successful marketing. Given that political boundaries often do not coincide with these regions, equity in terms of revenues, taxes and promotions can be a problem.

Second, culinary tourism involves several sectors of the regional economy that frequently have little interaction: farmers/ranchers, retail establishments, restaurants, and processors. This organization may require new markets and institutions to build and maintain the supply of and demand for local foods in the region. Markets for local foods and beverages must be supported and developed. This may require new organizations and strategies among various actors in the local food system.

Finally, much of the research on local food systems has focused on the role of large institutions in purchasing local foods (Pirog, 2001). This literature suggests that the sizable demand by institutions, such as schools, prisons and universities is the major hurdle to building local food systems. These institutions require a large supply of produce on a regular basis. Farmers in most regions have a difficult time meeting quantity requirements and direct marketing is further complicated by the seasonality of production. Additionally, many institutions prefer to purchase processed foods to reduce costs. Culinary tourism may not have the same constraints. In most cases, quantity of demand is much lower with restaurants than in large institutions. Also, because demand is a function of tourism, it often follows the contours of the growing season, to some extent, as well. Finally, restaurants and retail establishments involved with culinary tourism are less likely to require processed foods for their needs. They have greater capacity to process food on an ad hoc basis.

There is a limited amount of research on the motivations for purchasing local food. Starr et al. (2003) suggests that local foods may have several advantages. Food buyers may switch to local products because the improved quality outweighs slightly higher prices. Another consideration, however, may be the role of social relationships in shaping purchasing decisions (Cowell & Green, 1994). Decisions about where restaurants and retail establishments purchase food may be influenced more by social relationships and commitment to help local farms than by profit maximization. Local businesses are not totally self-interested actors, but, instead, may base their decisions on what will benefit their family, friends and acquaintances. Part of the reason may be that merchants prefer to transact with people with whom they have developed trust over time (Granovetter, 1985).
Another reason is that they may prefer to contribute to the wellbeing of the community by supporting local businesses. Both of these motives, trust and support for local businesses, could be interpreted as examples of self-interest or ethical factors. For example, purchasing food from local farmers could be influenced by the desire to help out a friend or reduce transaction costs. It may be the case that organizations and institutions involved in local food systems will express both motivations in their decisions to get involved. In any case, the moral economy may play a bigger role in the development of culinary tourism than it might in institutional buying. The concept of moral economy implies that principles of fairness and equity can be applied to an economy system.

**Culinary Tourism**

Partially as a response to the growing concentration and centralization of the food system, prominent critics have promoted alternative food production and distribution systems over the past two decades (Pollan, 2006). A growing number of communities are developing farmers markets, farm-to-school programs, and community supported agriculture organizations (Allen & Guthman, 2000). For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates there are almost 5,000 farmers markets today, almost double the number ten years ago. Despite their popularity, local food systems face several common obstacles. One of the key limitations of many forms of institutional buying, such as farm-to-school programs, has been processing. Many institutions will purchase only processed goods. Most independent farmers simply sell their raw commodities on the open market.

Another major obstacle has been the issue of demand. The demand for local food is high and the supply is often seasonal. Because small farmers are most likely to participate in local food systems, it is difficult (and costly) to meet the demand for local food by restaurants, schools, institutions, etc. Most communities lack the institutional mechanisms to coordinate supply and demand for local food. This is not to say that there have not been successful programs. For example, the number of farmers’ markets has grown rapidly over the past decade and avoids some of the obstacles that other forms of direct marketing face.

Culinary tourism, defined broadly as the pursuit of unique and memorable eating and drinking experiences, provides a way of linking local food systems with the tourist experience. Culinary tourism and agritourism can be distinguished in the following manner. Culinary tourism is a subset of cultural tourism and posits that food is an expression of culture. Agritourism is typically viewed as a subset of rural tourism and the focus is on-farm activities. Culinary tourism refers to activities both on and off the farm. Off-farm activities might include restaurants in a community featuring local specialties and foods on their menu. On-farm culinary activities could include visits to farms to learn how to prepare specialties that are indigenous to the region.

Culinary tourism has most often been associated with the wine industry. Several regions in the United States promote trails featuring regional wineries, and increasingly, breweries. Rather than marketing a specific locality, the entire region is promoted. Local breweries and wineries may offer tours and festivals. Restaurants may provide cooking classes on how to prepare regional foods. Retail establishments sell raw and processed local foods and beverages. Local farmers may sponsor on-farm visits and tours as well as participate in direct marketing opportunities such as farmer’s stands and U-pick operations. Tourists are increasingly looking for authentic experiences that take them “back to nature” (Bessiere, 1998). Experiencing local cuisine and regional culture is one way to meet this demand.

This paper examines the case of culinary tourism in Door County, Wisconsin to evaluate the lessons learned about this form of tourism. The central focus is on how markets are constructed and reproduced for local food. In other words, how do producers connect with buyers in the region? How is demand generated and sustained on the part of
local food buyers? Much of the literature focuses on institutions in regional food systems and the role of intermediaries in linking demand with supply. Another perspective views markets as consisting of social relationships. Information and market behavior is shaped by these relationships (Fligstein, 2001). These social relationships play a role in guiding information and market contacts in the region.

Kingdom So Delicious

Door County is located in Northeast Wisconsin (the finger-like peninsula protruding into Lake Michigan). It has been a tourist destination for decades, especially for residents from the Chicago area who are attracted to the area for its classic farmscapes, abundant water and outdoor activities, and rich culinary traditions. Door County is known for several food products, such as cherries, apples, whitefish, and maple syrup, and these foods are tied to cultural traditions, especially the fish boil (a culinary tradition in the Great Lakes states that consists of large chunks of fish boiled with potatoes in a cast iron kettle). Local foods are often featured in restaurants, retail establishments and roadside stands. Door County and its cultural traditions received national attention in William Ellis’ 1969 National Geographic article, “Wisconsin’s Door Peninsula ‘A Kingdom So Delicious,’” which sang the praises of Door County’s history and tourism industry. Even in 1969, tourism was a 100 million dollar a year business in Door County.

In 2005, Door County developed a promotional campaign entitled A Kingdom So Delicious. The program is managed by the Door County Chamber of Commerce/Visitor’s Bureau. The campaign is supported by a network of institutions including businesses, the Peninsula Arts & Humanities Alliance (PAHA), University of Wisconsin Extension, the Door County Economic Development Corporation (DCEDC), and several civic associations. Kingdom So Delicious promotes regional foods by creating “packages” for participating lodging establishments, dining establishments, and other sources of entertainment (e.g., theater and art galleries) that are linked with one another. This package creates many networks among area businesses of different varieties rather than a single, region-wide network. Additionally, a hefty program of events serves as an incentive for area restaurants to feature local foods in their dishes, and for art and theater venues to feature area history and culture-themed events. Food and beverage producers are encouraged to become involved by partnering with an art venue to offer combined art and cuisine events. One of the tools that the Chamber uses is a passport that includes a list of restaurants and retail establishments that tourists can visit. The “Passport” booklet is promoted within the Door County community itself including second home owners, as well as in the major nearby metropolitan areas of Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee and Madison and is also available electronically on the Chamber’s website.

The case study focuses on one of the most developed culinary tourism sites in the region. Local foods are an integral part of the culture and a central feature of the tourism industry in the area. Therefore, this case is optimal for assessing how producers and retail establishments have addressed some of the obstacles faced in building local food systems for culinary tourism. The fact that Door County is so unique complicates somewhat extrapolating lessons from this case to other rural communities. Nevertheless, there are important lessons to be learned.

Methods

The data for this analysis are based on mailed surveys to 83 retail establishments and 62 agricultural enterprises. Retail establishments may include restaurants, supermarkets, cooking schools, bakeries, wineries and inns. The retail establishments surveyed were selected for their participation in A Kingdom So Delicious. Retailers responded to questions
about their purchasing practices, motivations underlying those practices, impressions of local agricultural production, and the changes that businesses have undergone as a result of purchasing local foods. Out of 83 surveys mailed to retailers, 30 responded (36 percent response rate). Of these 30, seven were retail shops, 17 were food service establishments, two were supermarkets, and 10 were in the “other” category, which included bakeries, bed & breakfasts, wineries, and cooking schools, among others.

To examine farmers’ perspectives on the local market, a separate survey instrument was sent to 62 farms in Door County. This sample was drawn from a list of farmers in Door County who marketed directly to retail establishments in the region. The University of Wisconsin-Extension county agricultural agent provided the list. Of those 62 surveys there were 40 responses (64% response rate).

Finally, intensive interviews were conducted with four owners, general managers and head chefs of restaurants in the region. These restaurants were selected because they were the largest establishments involved in culinary tourism. These interviews provided several key insights into the demand for local foods in the region.

The results of the two surveys were analyzed separately creating individual charts and tables for each question. These charts were analyzed for inconsistencies, themes and stark findings, discarding the inconsistent data and isolating common findings between the survey and interview data. General findings are included in two technical reports that resulted from this research (Dougherty, Green, & Volenberg, 2008a, 2008b.).

The Demand For And Supply Of Local Foods

This analysis focuses on the factors influencing the organization of local food networks, or social relationships, for culinary tourism. Several questions are addressed: How much local food is purchased by retailers and restaurants? What factors influence their decision to buy locally? What are the primary obstacles to growing the local food system? On the supply side, there were several relevant questions: How many local producers sell in the regional market? Why do producers sell locally? What constraints do they see to expanding their sales in this market?

As previously mentioned, Door County possesses a robust and long-standing tourism industry. Tourism is the largest sector of Door’s economy. Ninety three percent of respondents indicated that tourists comprised between 60 and 80 percent of their clientele.

Retail establishments and restaurants reported that a significant amount of their total food purchasing came from food that was sourced locally. "Local" for purposes of this survey was defined as food that was produced in Door or adjacent counties. In some cases, produce is grown locally, but processed outside the region. Most respondents considered this local food.

Approximately 24% of total fresh food expenses came from local sources. This figure was calculated by taking the mean figure for reported total food costs from local sources as a percentage of the mean figure of total food costs from all sources. The average total food costs, per establishment, for 2007, were $64,846.25 while the corresponding average spent on locally-sourced food was $15,434.88. Door County cherries and apples were the most popular items. The third most popular was wine, followed by fish, and then maple syrup. Each of these are food items that Door County is known to produce particularly well.

Respondents indicated that local products are comparable with non-local products in terms of blemishes, consistency of shape, and shelf-life, and durability. Local foods were deemed lacking in terms of packaging, handling, and delivery consistency. This information conforms to what respondents indicated were the most significant barriers to increasing the amount of food they sourced locally.

When asked about their motivation for purchasing locally sourced food, managers of restaurants and retail establishments were most likely to point to the importance of
social relationships and the contribution to local businesses (Figure 1). Thirteen percent of respondents indicated that increased revenue was the main reason for adopting these practices and 19 percent of respondents identified consumer demand as their motivating force. Multiple respondents selected the "other" category offering rationales such as, "better quality," "the health and wellness of our consumers," and "little info available about where, how, and who to buy from." It is apparent from the data that most establishments did not see a contradiction between making good business decisions and supporting the local economy.

Figure 1. Retailer Reasons for Choosing to Source Food from Local Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable Supply</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Opportunities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Connections</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Demand</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to Local Economy</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In in-depth interviews, restaurant owners and managers emphasized the importance of supporting local farmers as their main reason for purchasing local foods. They also saw these relationships as an important source of information about the availability of local food:

The community is small so when you know somebody that buys locally they will introduce you—they will give you a name, you know? It’s a lot of word of mouth. And our employees who buy at the local market will always come back to us and say, “if you’re interested so-and-so has this.” So it’s basically word of mouth.

She [the owner of another nearby restaurant] is always helpful in providing local people who are producing. She uses a ton of local produce, and she will always let us know, through other people that we know through her, the names of people who are producing locally.

When we first started here all produce was bought from a produce company, and that was it, and, you know, over the years we started to meet these folks. And then we were able to buy a lot more stuff from them.

Demand for local products in Door County has been on the rise over the past few years (Figure 2). Fifty-seven percent of respondents indicated that demand for local foods had increased to some extent. Seventeen percent reported that it had increased significantly
while 40 percent stated that it had increased marginally. Thirty percent reported no change. No respondents indicated a decrease in consumer demand for local products. Again, however, the primary reason for increasing purchases of local food by retailers was to support local producers.

![Figure 2. Retailer Reasons for Deciding to Increase Amount of Locally-Sourced Food](image)

Although there has been a great deal of interest in local foods in the media, most restaurant managers did not report that their consumers were demanding local products. Restaurant managers discussed some of the reasons for this growth in demand for local products:

[Buying locally is] much more personal. People are nicer to deal with, you know? When you buy something from a purveyor it is not their product; they are just doing their job, whereas these people are excited about doing it. They want you to use their product because it’s theirs. The Sysco rep. doesn’t care.

The local growers understand that restaurateurs are real unhappy with corporate food, you know?

We never serve whitefish without saying this is locally caught Lake Michigan whitefish locally caught by Door County fishermen.

There are many local people that come here, and they go to the market as well. The more you get the name out [of the local farms from which you source], the more they can sell, which means that more they can produce as well, which is good for us because we can buy more.

Managers of restaurants and retailers ranked the severity of a variety of potential barriers to successfully bringing their yield to market locally (Figure 3). The most severe problem that agricultural producers encountered was that buyers pay too little. Small producers also struggle to match their output to the quantity requirements of local buyers.
The third obstacle is getting their products consistently and promptly to market. Finding and marketing to local buyers were not considered to be significant problems. The restaurant managers emphasized some of these same issues:

**Figure 3. Retailer Reasons for Not Purchasing Additional Local Food Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Quality</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Too High</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Quantity</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent Delivery</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s quantity. It really is. They just do not produce enough. I mean, we go through a lot of food, you know? In a day a lot of food, you know? I mean, we do 300 people a night during the busy season. That is the hardest thing about buying locally. So we use them [local products] a lot in the specials where you have things that you can run out of.

The delivery thing—up here I think is more of a cultural thing. Everybody is pretty laid back up here. Not many of the local farms have a consistent drive-through-town-each-day-and-drop-this-off policy. It’s like, you call on Wednesday and they might say, “I have reason to be in Egg Harbor on Friday, so that’s when I’ll come and drop it off.” And I get it. You know, they are not going to drive 20 miles to drop off some greens and spend five dollars in gas.

Direct sales are a major source of income for Door County agricultural producers. On average, Door County farms sold more to wholesalers than they did in direct sales to consumers, and restaurant/supermarket sales were, on average, quite low. The average farm had almost $30,000 in direct sales on the farm or roadside stands. At the same time, they sold about $8,000 in produce to restaurants/supermarkets, $15,000 to farmers markets, and about $92,000 to wholesalers/processors. These data suggest that there is potential for growth in the farm-to-restaurant dimension of Door County’s local food network.

About one-half of the farmers reported that their sales increased at the onset of participation in local markets. In most cases, this meant selling to several more buyers and expanding their operation.

What were producers’ motivations for supplying local markets? Their answers were very similar to restaurants/retailers. They were divided between self-interest and moral commitment to others in the community. The most important reason why Door County
farmers sell their produce locally is the desire to contribute to the local economy. It is followed closely, however, by a desire to obtain more consistent prices for products.

Farmers were asked to rank the severity of a variety of potential barriers to successfully bringing their yield to market locally. They were most likely to identify low prices for their goods as the most significant obstacle. They also recognized that the quantity demanded by local establishments was a limitation for them. Similarly, they also tended to agree with the restaurants that consistent delivery/service could be a problem in sourcing food locally.

**Implications For Culinary Tourism Beyond Door County**

This case study holds lessons for other communities that wish to promote culinary tourism as a community development strategy. Nevertheless, Door County has been able to create local food linkages for culinary tourism because of its unique mix of agricultural production, natural amenities, and its robust tourism industry. Therefore, the lessons extracted from this case may not be universally applicable.

Interest in culinary tourism is growing among consumers and restaurateurs who cater to these consumers. However, there are still significant barriers to deepening the linkages of culinary tourism. These include the quality of delivery and service, the cost disconnect, and creating linkages. In Door County, there was a lack of centralized and organized means to collect and distribute local food to area food retail establishments. This limited the willingness of food retailers to source greater amounts locally. Restaurateurs were willing to increase their locally-sourced food if it were as cost-effective and simple to acquire as industrial food. Other communities that wish to promote culinary tourism might consider establishing such centralized means (such as a website) of connecting local food with local food retail, therefore improving the fit between supply and demand within the local economy.

The second barrier which other communities must overcome is the cost disconnect. Food retailers perceived that sourcing locally was more expensive than buying directly from wholesalers, but that the added cost was marginal relative to the added value of selling local food. Yet farmers consistently articulated the idea that buyers pay too little. Establishing greater communication between food producers and food vendors may help overcome this limitation in other communities. Also, educating food retailers on the added promotional opportunities that accompany culinary tourism may contribute to overcoming the price disconnect.

For culinary tourism to flourish in a community, and for the economic benefits of this sector to be distributed widely and equitably, culinary tourism must be promoted as trails rather than by individual businesses. In Door County, there were many civic associations spearheaded by the Visitor’s Bureau, which organized the *Kingdom So Delicious* campaign. This program generated linkages between and within different sectors of the economy such as food vendors, art venues, agricultural producers, and retail shops. This program involved the coordinated effort of organized civil society. Therefore, in communities like Door County where civic life is robust, it may be easier to establish the linkages to successfully promote culinary tourism trails, which economically benefit a wide swath of the community.

Another consideration is that because tourism has been the leading sector of the Door County economy for several decades, there is a highly competitive restaurant market there. This market saturation has caused restaurants to cultivate niches for themselves in order to differentiate their products from those of competitors, and in many cases that niche has been local food promotion. In other, less saturated markets, it may prove more difficult to convince restaurateurs that the added value from sourcing locally justifies the costs.
Finally, Door County’s proximity to several major metropolitan areas is a significant factor in its successful tourism industry generally. Door County is within 300 miles of four major cities in three states, Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and Madison, and Door County tourism advertises in all of these markets. Therefore other communities must take advantage of their proximity to diverse urban markets to promote their culinary tourism trails.

Conclusions

Culinary tourism provides a novel approach to promoting economic development, constructing local food systems, and celebrating regional culture. It simultaneously supports the tourism and agricultural sectors and builds bridges between the two industries. Door County has been relatively successful in mobilizing its local assets as part of its tourism program.

Although culinary tourism has opened up new markets for producers, it has not had a major effect on the prices that farmers receive for their goods. The benefits would appear to be more indirect, through additional consumer spending in the region. The primary benefit to farmers may be in that it diversifies their income and protects against some of the uncertainty they may face in other markets.

There are several limitations to this study that should be noted. First, the Kingdom So Delicious program was developed in a region that already had an economy dominated by the tourism industry. Door County has been a major tourist destination for decades, especially for Chicago residents, and Door County has many draws. Therefore, it is difficult to measure the added economic value of culinary tourism in this setting. Additional data is needed to examine how many tourists were attracted to the region solely because of the promotion. Culinary tourism has been initiated in other regions that have not been as dependent on tourism. Evaluations of culinary tourism in these different contexts would help provide better understanding of the obstacles and opportunities this community development strategy faces.

Second, this case study does not reflect the wide variety of culinary tourism projects that exist. Additional research is needed to examine other forms of culinary tourism, such as wine tours, cooking classes, etc. These contexts may have a very different set of consequences for producers, retail establishments and others involved in culinary tourism.

This case study raises several important issues for community development and local officials interested in planning for tourism. Establishment of local markets for farmers requires some community-wide effort to coordinate supply and demand. Although a surprising number of restaurants relied on informal contacts to help them supply their needs, a more formal process would have provided some additional support in this area. Of course, intermediaries would cut into the profits of either restaurants/retail establishments or producers. One strategy might be to develop a more transparent market through a method of identifying the actual demand for and supply of food products in the region.

Second, culinary tourism typically involves collaboration across communities and different sectors of the regional economy. Regional marketing and promotion involves costs that all of the actors may bear, yet some localities may benefit more than others. Similarly, culinary tourism usually involves farmers, restaurants, retail establishments, bed and breakfast inns, and other regional businesses. How do you ensure that the various actors are rewarded fairly? There are no easy solutions for this issue. In this case study, farmers were concerned that they were not receiving a fair price for the produce. Some communities have benefited more from the promotion than others. Institutional mechanisms are needed that provide equitable solutions to these problems.
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