

## **Contents**

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Leicestershire Stock Numbers
  - 2.1 Cattle
  - 2.2 Sheep
- 3.0 Assurance Scheme Options
  - 3.1 Farm Assured British Beef and Lamb
  - 3.2 The British Farm Standard Logo
  - 3.3 Leicestershire Assurance Scheme
  - 3.4 Beef Labelling Scheme
- 4.0 Potential Members
  - 4.1 Potential Producer Members
  - 4.2 Potential Retail and processing Members
  - 4.3 Organisational involvement
- 5.0 Development of the project proposal
  - 5.1 Establishing Objectives for the initiative
  - 5.2 Operational Standards
    - 5.2.1 Producer
    - 5.2.2 Abattoir
    - 5.2.3 Retailers
  - 5.3 Resource Requirements
    - 5.3.1 Development Manager or Local Administrator
    - 5.3.2 Traceability Materials
    - 5.3.3 Promotional materials
    - 5.3.4 Management
- 6.0 Potential members Feedback
  - 6.1 Producer Feedback
  - 6.2 Processor Feedback
  - 6.3 Retailer Feedback
- 7.0 Project Costs
- 8.0 Potential Income
- 9.0 Conclusion
- 10.0 Future

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Ruth Cheavins Development Manager of Lincolnshire Quality Beef and Lamb undertook this study on behalf of Leicestershire Food Links funded by the Leicestershire Rural Partnership.

The study looks at the present situation in the county in respect of, stock numbers and local marketing options available to date. The project canvassed the local meat industry to find out if a local branding scheme is wanted in the county. The report also looks at the potential costs and income generation from such an initiative in the county. In conclusion it give potential development for the scheme and possible time scale for creation.

## **2.0 LEICESTERSHIRE STOCK NUMBERS**

The study was required to ensure stock numbers in the county would and could supply a local marketing initiative, there needed to be enough stock to ensure a potential local marketing initiative was feasible in respect to stock numbers.

### **2.1 Cattle**

The information was taken from the final results of the June 1999 Agricultural and Horticultural Census: England and Wales, Regions and Counties.

#### Contents

Breeding herd:	Dairy herd total	
	Beef herd total	
	<b>Breeding herd total</b>	
Heifers in calf: (First calf)	Dairy herd total	
	Beef herd total	
	<b>Heifers in calf total</b>	
Total Cows and heifers	<b>Cows and heifers total</b>	
Bulls	Bulls for service	2 years and over 1 year old and under 2
All other cattle and calves	Females for herd replacement	for dairy herd For beef herd Total
	Two year old and over	male (excl. bulls for service) Female: for slaughter Total
	One year old and under two	male (excl. bulls for service) Female Total

Under one year old      Other male  
 Other female  
 Intended for slaughter as  
 calves  
 Total

**All other cattle and calves    Total**

**TOTAL CATTLE                    Cattle and calves total**

	Total Dairy Herd	Total Beef Herd	Total Breeding Herd
Leicestershire & Rutland	34,546	14,980	49,526

	Heifers in calf (first year)			Total Cows and heifers
	Intended mainly for producing milk or rearing calves for the dairy herd	Intended mainly for producing milk or rearing calves for the beef herd	TOTAL	
Leicestershire & Rutland	7,839	1,543	9,382	58,908

	Bulls for Service		Herd replacements 1 year & Over		
	2 Yrs. old & over	1 Yr. old & under 2	Females for dairy herd replacement	Females for beef herd replacement	Total females for herd replacement
Leicestershire & Rutland	774	260	6,759	2,515	9,274

	Other cattle two years old & over		
	Other male cattle	Females intended for slaughter	Total other cattle two years old & over
Leicestershire & Rutland	7,203	2,252	9,455

	Other cattle one year old & under two		
	Other male cattle	Females intended for slaughter	Total other cattle one year old & under two
Leicestershire & Rutland	17,338	10,358	27,696

	Under one year old			
	Other male calves	Other female calves	Intended for slaughter as calves	Total cattle under one year old
Leicestershire & Rutland	15,093	19,163	379	34,635

	<b>Total</b> cattle under one year, other cattle one year old and under two, other cattle two years old & over, total female for herd replacement	Total Cattle & calves
Leicestershire & Rutland	81,060	141,002

Distribution of holdings and beef type cows by beef type cows size groups

	0:<10	10:<30	30:<40	40:<50	50:<100	100 & Over	Total
Holdings	247	239	61	30	65	14	656
Number	1127	4192	2081	1323	4396	1861	14,980

June Census 1999 This table refers to main holdings only

Distribution of holdings and dairy type cows by dairy type cows size groups

	0:<10	10:<30	30:<40	40:<50	50:<70	70:<100	100:<200	200 & Over	Total
Holdings	34	39	28	32	77	100	95	17	422
Number	129	801	977	1391	4520	8453	12,660	5,615	34,546

June Census 1999 This table refers to main holdings only

Leicestershire has a large pool of beef/dairy stock for a local branding scheme to source from, using the most up to date figures above (1999) it would appear Leicestershire would have approximately 30,000 cattle to draw from. The figures give an idea of the numbers of stock in the county however they do not show the numbers which leave the county or numbers which enter the county as stores to be fattened. The initiative need to decide if to allow foreign stock which has not been born and/or reared in the county to be included in the pool of potential stock. This is perhaps not such a problem for cattle as a steady stream of homebred stock should be available through out the year, to allow for a continuous supply of meat for retailers.

Beef herds in the county appear to collect in larger numbers in smaller holdings than the dairy herds, with the greatest concentration of holding falling into the 0: <10 range for the beef type cows and the dairy highest concentration in the 70: <100 range. The type of holding in the county needs to be taken into account when deciding on a pricing structure, whether to go for a large annual payment, and/or levy on stock, or a system where size plays a part in payments for the farmers and/or processor/retailer.

## 2.2 Sheep

Distribution of holdings and total sheep and lambs by total sheep and lamb size group

	1:<50	50:<100	100:<200	200:<500	500:<1000	1000 & over	Total
Holdings	126	78	162	264	183	103	916
Number	2,901	5,881	23,258	88,531	128,059	185,538	434,168

June Census 1999

## Distribution of holdings and breeding ewes by breeding ewe size group

	1:<50	50:<100	100:<200	200:<500	500:<1000	1000 & over	Total
Holdings	201	170	197	233	60	22	833
Number	4,876	12,311	28,705	72,363	40,136	28,591	186,982

June Census 1999

Looking at the above figures it would appear Leicestershire would have approximately 250,000 sheep to draw from. As a rule of thumb the breeding stock produce 1.5 lambs per annual that would be 280,000 looking at the above figures.

It is difficult to say from these figures the number of store animals that come into the county to be fattened; the local initiative may need to draw on outside stock if a continuous supply through out the year is to be guaranteed. However, such animals would not be considered 100% Leicestershire, where as stock which had been born, reared and finished in the county, could carry the 100% Leicestershire stock logo. The local initiative will have to decide if the need to supply retailer's 52 weeks in the year is a greater need than the complete authenticity of its stock. If the initiative decides to allow stock brought into the county to be used a residency period is recommended to ensure Leicestershire creates a stable market. The above figures do not show the number of lambs, which go, out of the county as stores to be fattened elsewhere. However the figures do allow the initiative to assume a large pool of lambs will be available to draw from.

The greatest concentration of holding appears to fall into the range of 200: <500 breeding ewes closely followed by the range 1: <50, breeding ewes size. This is again something which maybe considered in the pricing structure of the scheme.

### **3.0 ASSURANCE SCHEME OPTIONS**

In developing a local branding scheme it will be necessary to create in essence an assurance scheme in its own right. That is you are giving the consumer a set of guarantees whether this is purely born reared and finished in Leicestershire or resident in Leicestershire for 90 days on a FABBL or beef from specific breeds what ever is decided upon assurance is required.

I have outlined below some options open to the scheme and this issue will be discussed later in further detail in the "feedback form potential members" section of the report.

#### **3.1 Farm Assured British Beef and Lamb**

FABBL is part of the ABM (Assured British Meat) meat safety assurance chain which covers feed manufacturers, farms, markets, transport and abattoir right through to the retail shelf. FABBL has contracted farm inspection services (FIS), a separate company from FABBL, to conduct nation-wide farm inspections on its behalf. The inspectors all have a proven background knowledge of livestock production and are fully trained and supervised to ensure they carry out the inspection efficiently and correctly. FIS has recently been awarded accreditation by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service to EN Standard 45004. To achieve this they had to demonstrate a high level of operational competency in all aspects of

delivery of the FABBL inspections. Each farmer member has the opportunity to comment on his inspection by completing a comment form and returning it to FABBL. Membership of FABBL allows producers to prove that the standards of husbandry and welfare on farm meet nationally agreed levels of best practice and gives an assurance to the consumer that the product is safe.

The scheme standards cover six sections:

- Identification and traceability
- Farm animal management
- Environment and hygiene management
- Feed composition, storage and usage
- Housing and handling facilities
- Medicines and veterinary treatments

FABBL approved holding in Leicestershire to date:

- Beef only 178
- Lamb only 63
- Beef and Lamb 239
- **TOTAL FABBL Farms 480**

The benefit of using FABBL as a basic standard in a local scheme is that the farm stands the cost of membership, if the initiative felt they could help towards the cost that is something that could be discussed. The inspections are completely independent of the initiative and the general standard of FABBL is relatively well know, whether this is a good or bad thing is something the initiative needs to decide. The negative side of using FABBL is that it adds extra cost onto the farm, discriminates against the smaller producer, although this may change in the future, it is only a basic standard and the initiative may feel it is not sufficient for the scheme.

If the initiative do decide to use FABBL as a assurance the FABBL office will mail out an invitation to join the local scheme to all its Leicestershire approved farms if postage is covered and letter received ready to be mailed. The reason they can not give out the names and addresses is the data protection of all computerised data.

In the past funding from EC/MAFF have encouraged use of the FABBL standard.

### **3.2 The British Farm Standard Logo**

FABBL is a "Qualifying" scheme for the British Farm Standard logo which means that products from the scheme will be clearly identified to consumers as they carry the distinctive Little Red Tractor.

The British Farm Logo is managed by Assured Food Standards who inspect companies/groups wishing to use the logo on packaging and promotional material. There is a cost for the audit and it is an annual one. However, the logo has had a lot of money spent on its launch and promotion, which is not bared by a local scheme such as Leicestershire.

There are two main trains of thought on the use of the British Farm Standard logo on local branded products it can be said to confuse the consumer and water down the new local

logo/brand. However, if the consumer is aware of the British tractor logo due to the extensive marketing then he/she will insistently recognise the product as British and quality and she will discover later the local brand, adding not detracting from the local brand.

The initiative will need to decide if it wishes to explore the use of the British Farm Standard logo.

### **3.3 Leicestershire Assurance Scheme**

The initiative may wish to develop its own assurance scheme, which may reflect the industry within the county and the aims of the initiative. The problem with this is that it is very costly, inspections of farms would have to be carried out before membership approved by an independent inspector who in turn would have to be audited/policed by a further independent body. All this cost would need to be found by the initiative. However members may feel more inclined to join a local scheme if they could see the real benefits in their area and the costing basis may reflect the size of the farm. The actual areas that the scheme would be looking at and inspecting would have to be agreed by the founders of the initiative. Although perhaps strict guidelines may seem the best way forward excluding any large proportion of your potential pool of stock can cause problems with the overall running of the scheme and stock numbers.

Funding from EC/MAFF also favours inspection bodies, which either have or are working towards the European Standard EN 45004, which could also cause some problems for the initiative.

### **3.4 Beef Labelling Scheme**

The beef labelling system is a European Community wide system, which is intended to provide buyers with clear, reliable information about beef on sale. A key requirement of the system is that it should enable beef on sale to be traced back to where it originated. Compulsory rules now apply for labelling of fresh or frozen beef (and these meats when minced), from animals slaughtered on or after 1<sup>st</sup> September 2000. All beef offered for sale in the EC must be labelled with certain compulsory information. The beef labelling system governs all sales in the supply chain and is in two parts: (i) compulsory labelling and (ii) approved labelling under the Beef Labelling Scheme (BLS). It is the second part, which will affect any local initiative wishing to label its beef.

(ii) Any other labelling claims you wish to make about the origin, characteristics or production methods of the beef you sell or the animal(s) of origin, require approval under the Beef Labelling Scheme.

Any marketing material, posters leaflets etc. claiming anything about the beef on sale has to be verified by an annual audit after an application for approval has been submitted, even the label of Leicestershire will need approval. This is a costly affair; it depends on the number of processors and retailers in the initiative, but does ensure a tight control on beef in the scheme. It can be sold as a benefit to local retailers/processors if the initiative feels it can stand the cost of the audit, as all businesses selling beef need to undertake the compulsory part of the scheme and any additional labelling needs approval.

The scheme will generate paperwork for all involved, as the audit is a paper chase from the end product back to the producer through the supply chain. If the initiative intends to offer traceability the paperwork will be in place anyway.

For further information please see Beef Labelling Guide.

Please note: EC/MAFF do not fund legal requirements, therefore the cost of the Beef Labelling Audit can not be funded and the cost needs to be found from income generated by the initiative.

## **4.0 POTENTIAL MEMBERS**

To enable to gauge the reaction from potential members of a local branding scheme mail shots were sent out to potential interested parties, the response was good from all sectors of the meat industry offering optimism for the schemes' creation.

### **4.1 Potential Producer Members**

Leicestershire Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group have kindly sent out a letter to all its members 120 in total requesting interested parties to return a slip expressing their interest in the local branding scheme.

Peter Harris a Leicestershire farmers has been contacted regarding his involvement in a local branding scheme, after spending some time and effort looking into the scheme a year or so ago has offered support and information for a Leicestershire scheme. He has offered himself to attend a meeting if the scheme should call one.

### **Producers who have expressed an interest to date**

Mr. N M Jones, Manor Farm Carlton Curlieu Leics. LE8 0PH

Mr. Norman Farnsworth, Holmlea Farms Ltd, Rossley Main Street Tilton-on-the Hill  
Leicester LE7 9LF

Mr. David Haynes, Watson Haynes Ltd, Manor Farm Ullesthorpe Lutterworth Leics. LE17  
5BN

Mr. G A Crooks, G A & M C Crooks, Pawdy Rise Farm Melton Road Barrow-upon-Soar  
Leics.

Mr. Graeme Matravers, G & V Matravers, Manor Farm Long Whatton Loughborough Leics.  
LE12 5DF

Mr. Richard Tyler Dennis Tyler & Sons, Redhall Farm, Seaton Road Barrowden Oakham  
Rutland LE15 8EN

Mr. R L Eayrs, L F Eayrs & Son, Priory Farm Brooke Oakham Rutland LE15 8DG

Mr. Andrew Northen, Northen & Son, Monckton Farm Thorpe-by-Water Uppingham  
Rutland LE15 9SQ

Mr. G Payne, 4 Ash Way Frisby-on-the-Wreake Melton Mowbray Leics. LE14 2NG

Mr. Richard Harvey, R H & P A Harvey, Nanor Farm Owston Oakham Leics. LE15 8DH

Mr. F G Johnson, F G Johnson Ltd, Moscow Farm Great Dalby Melton Mowbray Leics.  
LE14 2EP

Mr. Roger Collin, W & R Collin, The Manor House Knossington Oakham Rutland

Mr. G W Johnson, , The Estate Office Wartnaby Melton Mowbray Leics

Mr. C Gilman, H P Gilman & Partners, The Grange Pickworth Stamford Lincs. PE9 4DL  
Mr. T P Gilman, T P Gilman Ltd, Manor Farm Tixover Stamford Lincs. PE9 3QL  
A J P Pochin Farms, C/o Fisher German 40 High Street Market Harborough Leics. LE16  
7NX  
Philipson Estates Blaston, C/o Fisher German 40 High Street Market Harborough Leics.  
LE16 7NX  
Mr. G B Dilworth, B W & G B Dilworth (Farmers), Manor Farm Shangton Leicester LE8  
0PG  
A J Peacock Pochin, Barkby Hall Barkby Leicester LE7 3QB

This list is by no means comprehensive and is a small number compared to the eventual take up of the scheme, but it is hoped these interested producers will mould the scheme to suit Leicestershire farmers. It should be noted I have spoken to a greater number of farmers in respect to the feedback collected for this report, this list is purely compiled from the FWAG mail shot.

## **4.2 Potential Processors and Retail Members**

A list of local butchers and processors was compiled from information from the Meat and Livestock Commission and local directories, giving rise to a mail shot of potential members in the area.

### **Retailers & Processors who have expressed an interest to date**

Mr. T Allen, J Oakland, 6 Woodgate Rothley Leics. LE7 7LJ  
Mr. Richard Wood, Michael F Wood Family Butchers, 51 Hartopp Road Leicester LE2 1WG  
Mr. Christopher Ragg, Wilson & Ragg, 24 London Road Oadby Leicester LE2 5DG  
Mr. Paul Randall, C/o KwikSave 19 Cross Street Enderby Leics. LE9 5NJ  
Mr. & Mrs. A Ringrose, A D Ringrose Butchers, Astley Court Main Street Broughton Astley Leics. LE9 6RE  
Mr. Malcolm Flack, Flackies Meats, Suite 2/4 Weston House Church Street Lutterworth Leics.  
Mr. Stephen Morris, Stephen Morris Quality Butchers, 26-27 High Street Loughborough Leics. LE11 2PZ  
Mrs. P A Smart, A J Hubbard, 23 High Street Barrow Upon Soar Loughborough Leics. LE12 8PY  
Mr. Graeme Matravers, G & V Matravers, Manor Farm Long Whatton Loughborough Leics. LE12 5DF  
Mr. Glenn Lewin, Glenn Lewin Butchers, 1 Ratcliffe Road Sileby Leics. LE12 7PU  
Mr. T C Smith, Smiths Butchers, 58-60 High Street Ibstock Leics.  
Mr. J F Briers, M Briers (Butchers), 79 Silver Street Whitwick Leics.  
Mrs. Diana. M. Thompson, Thompson's Family Butchers, 10 Market Place Melton Mowbray Leics. LE13 0DT  
Ms. Amy Matthews, Bates Butchers, 4 Church Square Market Harborough Leics. LE16 7NB  
Mr. David Morris, Joseph Morris, Walnut Tree House South Kilworth Lutterworth Leics.  
Mason Bros. (Butchers) Ltd., Ox Pastures, Southwell Road, Lowdham, Notts. NG14 7DR

This list is by no means comprehensive and is a small number compared to the eventual take up of the scheme, but it is hoped these interested retailers and processors will mould the scheme to suit Leicestershire butchers and processors. It should be noted I have spoken to a

greater number of processors in respect to the feedback collected for this report, this list is purely compiled from the mail shot.

### **4.3 Organisations who have expressed an interest to date**

During this report I have been contacted or have contact several organisations that have expressed their interest in the scheme, I have included the list, as some may prove helpful in the next stages of the project.

Miss Naomi Diamond, Leicestershire Food Links, 13 West Street, Leicester LE1 6XL  
Mr. Tony Lockley, Leicestershire County Council, Dept. of Planning and Transportation  
County Hall Glenfield Leics. LE3 8RJ  
Mr. Steve Turner, Rural Community Council (Leics. & Rutland), Community House 133  
Loughborough Road Leicester LE4 5LQ  
Mr. A Dufhie, Leicestershire Food Links, C/o Environmental Network John Storer House,  
Wards End Loughborough Leics. LE11 3HA  
Mr. Stuart Holm, Leicestershire & Rutland FWAG, Mole Cottage Brooksby Melton  
Mowbray Leics. LE14 2LJ  
Mr. Steve Geal, NFU, Melton Mowbray  
Mrs. W Hewitt, Feed Merchant, Melton Mowbray.

The above organisations have expressed an interest in the project proposal either in the form of support/help or given information.

## **5.0 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL**

In order to progress the development of the project a steering group needs to be formed some from the above interested parties maybe available to make up the group plus any other members of the meat trade who can offer expertise and enthusiasm. It is important to note at this stage that I would recommend all sectors of the meat industry be represented on the steering group as this allows for a well balanced and effective scheme to be created. This point will be reiterated in the conclusion section of the report.

I would like to point out at this stage non of the proposed development in this section is cast in stone and it is only my suggestions, the steering group need to discuss and adopt standards which reflect their own requirements and objectives. However, I have included all the major developments I feel need to be addressed to allow for the creation of a smooth running and successful scheme.

### **5.1 Establishing Objectives for the initiative**

During the steering group discussions the overall objectives for the project need to be agreed for example:

- *To develop a secure long term market for high quality beef and lamb which has been born, reared and finished within the county or which has been sourced from farms within the county.*
- *To provide a vehicle for the development of the livestock/meat industry in the region through providing new opportunities for income generation and job creation*

To achieve the above the steering group will need to agree key elements for the project.

1. In order to guarantee the supply of high quality beef and lamb referred to above; the project will require fully integrated quality standards covering each stage of the production chain.
2. Full product traceability will be a crucial element of the initiative to provide the brand with the credibility it will need to gain customer loyalty in the market place
3. In addition to setting in place systems to guarantee the quality and traceability of all stock marketed through the initiative it will be vital that the initiative is promoted effectively. Leicestershire beef and lamb brand will be new on the marketplace and so significant resource will need to be allocated to the task of ensuring that consumers are aware of what the brand represents.

All these points have been raised and discussed and accounted in the feedback section of the report.

## **5.2 Operational Standards**

The key to the success of the project will be ensuring all those involved in the supply of Leicestershire beef and lamb adhere to a set of standards which accurately reflect customer requirements.

- 5.2.1 Producer - FABBL membership/Leicestershire Assurance Scheme  
Traceability, Self declaration and movement documents/Ear tags  
Stock sourced solely from farms within Leicestershire supply 100% Leicestershire or stock allowed to come into the county  
Target classifications standards of 0+3 or better for beef and 3L or better for lambs  
All beef to be at least 75% traditional beef (Pure beef or beef/dairy dam crossed with a pure beef sire)/ All dairy and beef allowed in the scheme  
Environmental review of member farms/environmental conditions imposed on farmer members
- 5.2.2. Abattoir - Responsible for maintaining traceability of stock through the abattoir and marking accordingly in line with legal requirements  
Responsible for using the appropriate marketing material supplied by the project/ incorporating the initiative logo into own marketing material  
All beef to be hung for a minimum of 7/14 days prior to sale  
All lamb to be hung for a minimum of 3/6 days  
All abattoir operators must consistently achieve a hygiene score of at least 75/65 to be eligible to handle Leicestershire beef and lamb  
A minimum of HACCP accreditation for food safety  
Ensure compliance under Leicestershire Beef and Lamb beef labelling approval
- 5.2.3. Retailers - commitment to source Leicestershire beef and lamb only through registered abattoirs

Commitment to being proactive in marketing Leicestershire beef and lamb  
Complete necessary paperwork for the beef labelling approval  
Minimum of HACCP accreditation for food safety

### **5.3 Resource Requirements**

#### 5.3.1. Development Manager or Local Administrator

The Development Manager will be responsible for controlling the marketing of stock through the initiative and managing promotional activities and funding requirements. The Development Manager will report directly to the steering group, key activities:

- Co-ordinate the bid for funds if required
- Co-ordinate the promotion of the initiative to beef and sheep producers in Leicestershire
- Work in partnership with abattoirs and retailers to promote the initiative to consumers
- Co-ordinate the provision of sufficient quality cattle and lambs from registered Leicestershire farms to meet the demands of the market
- Develop promotional marketing material
- Maintain regular contact with retailers and caterers involved with marketing beef and lamb to ensure correct marketing material is being utilised
- Maintain records on the performance of all aspects of the initiative

#### 5.3.2. Traceability Materials

Development of traceability materials, self declaration and movement documents for producers/ear tags and roller markers and stamps for abattoirs and stickers and identifying marketing material for retailers.

#### 5.3.3. Promotional Materials

- Development of logo
- Brochures
- Stickers
- Signs
- Price tickets

#### 5.3.4. Management

The scheme has many options it can create a company, tag onto existing organisations such as Leicestershire Food Groups or County Council etc. If the company route is taken the steering committee will hopefully form the board of directors with a chairman, Chief Executive and company secretary for the proposed company to run Leicestershire Beef and Lamb a company limited by guarantee. Or if the initiative is run by a local organisation members of the steering group can become members of the appropriate boards to ensure control is not lost as it is the member who will shape and run the scheme towards success.

## **6.0 POTENTIAL MEMBERS FEEDBACK**

Part of the project was to discuss the proposed local branding scheme with potential members to give feedback to the report on the possible direction for the scheme. In this part of the report I have collated generally held views after extensive conversations with many potential members to give a good overview of the ideals held in Leicestershire. The views shown here do not commit the group to any of the directions expressed and as you will read many views are conflicting. All will need to be discussed by the steering group and an overall consensus agreed upon.

### **6.1 Producer Feedback**

Having discussed the potential project with many Leicestershire farmers the following feedback has been collected, I did try and ask the same questions to all farming interviewees, however, as conversations got under way many took a slightly different route. Notes were taken of all interviews and I have tried to represent all individual views fairly. I have set out the general question and noted responses and then given my opinion and advice.

#### **Do you feel a Leicestershire/Local brand is something, which is, needed in Leicestershire?**

- All except those farmers I spoke to in Rutland wanted a Leicestershire logo, they were proud to be a Leicestershire farmer and wanted the collective name to be used. On further discussion very few had considered what Leicestershire would mean to other people further a field and fewer still could give me one thing that encapsulates Leicestershire as a county in reference to the logo.
- *The response for the Leicestershire brand from the farming sector is very strong and I feel enthusiasm for such a scheme will waver if "Leicestershire" in some way is not branded. It does give instant recognition to a local market and a sense of belonging to the producers. The logo or brand may cause more difficulties and serious thought needs to go into what you decide on. In your case it maybe something which does not just market beef and lamb however the advice I will give here is on deciding on your design have very few people present but canvass a large audience for reaction. The logo is something you have to live with and has to be instantly recognised by the consumer and conjure the correct image in a consumers mind, green gently rolling grassed fields full off happy wandering stock, giving rise to tasty wholesome good for you quality meat. Not too much to ask! Do not however connect the two, that is stock and meat bad bad news, so no fluffy cute lambs please.*

#### **Do you feel a Leicestershire/Local brand is something, which is, needed in Leicestershire?**

- Rutland farmers expressed their determination to have a "Rutland" brand, however as I explained limited stock numbers may cause difficulties in managing such a small local brand. One or two Rutland farmers are doing their own thing on a very small scale and I think would utilise a local brand if possible, however their business is being built on their own brand and not all felt it necessary to replicate.

- *The feeling from the Rutland farmers who are not marketing to consumer at present is that a "Rutland" brand would be good, but after further discussion many understand the difficulties and felt that a combined "Leicestershire & Rutland" brand maybe the answer. Many of the Leicestershire farmers are not so sure where as others feel it would offer more to the consumer and take nothing away from the brand. I do not know if your further funding is just for Leicestershire or does it reach Rutland? If it does these questions need to be addressed, if not no further discussion required. I would offer the advice that the greater area that stock can be drawn from may at times prove invaluable to ensure a continuous supply. However, a brand needs to be specific and instant and this may cause confusion in the consumer's mind, although Leicestershire & Rutland are often put together but so are Lincolnshire & Rutland. I think once a decision is made either option can be sold to the Leicestershire farmer, however depending on the outcome if Rutland is excluded then they may try and establish their own brand and flood the market as very close and cause confusion in the consumers mind. I do feel that a combined brand will be the best option for all involved, not just for the increased stock numbers but if from the beginning the brand is combined then the consumer will take it on board.*

### **Do you want the scheme to work on a liveweight or deadweight system or both?**

- All farmers I spoke to could see the benefit of a scheme, which worked on both a liveweight and deadweight system, even if they themselves preferred one to the other.
- *I would like to see a Leicestershire brand using both systems for several reasons. Liveweight marketing is a great advert for such a scheme; farmers can see it working before they sign up to it, invaluable for a somewhat cynical sector. It also gives support to the livestock markets, who over the past few years have been finding it tuff in particular over the past year almost impossible, so offering local businesses a chance to increase and strenghten their market, good for all the county. Despite the glowing report for live marketing it is also necessary to incorporate deadweight marketing, which does not necessarily have the same visual impact but is still a very important part of the live stock industry. Many farmers will only sell deadweight and some buyers will only buy deadweight so not to exclude anyone it is essential to include both systems. It will help in particular with local farmers and butchers who already have a relationship buying and selling to each other. It will allow the scheme to sit easily with this trade and require very little change from either party, always a good thing. It is important to ensure if a farmer and butcher who have been buying and selling in a particular way for years can still continue this trade with additional advantages of using the local brand. This is the best way to encourage take up of the scheme, so be open as possible and cover as many options as possible to ensure no one is left out.*

### **Do you think traceability is important?**

- Most farmers felt this was an important part of a scheme as most were aware that it was a "buss" word for the consumer, however not all were keen on extra paperwork or further ear tags.
- *After explaining the system LQBL use most felt it was the best of a bad job, more paper work but not too odious. Ear tags were a big no no; far too time consuming and all felt*

*they had enough all ready. I feel all can be persuaded to do a little extra paperwork if necessary.*

### **How much are you prepared to pay for the scheme?**

- Of course when asked all said that no further cost was desired as they felt they bared sufficient cost for the industry. However, once I explained a cost was inevitable they were keen to express that it would not only be them paying. That is others in the supply chain need to bare some of the cost of the scheme as well as them, as they feel they always seems to carry all costs of the industry. As for the amount they were prepared to pay, as little as possible was generally the answer. On further discussion of either a large one off annual payment or a smaller payment and a levy on stock in general the smaller payment and levy was felt the fairest option. It was also suggested the size of the farm should be taken into account with the annual payment both the large and smaller version.
- *No one wants to pay for anything unless they are forced; I feel the industry can afford a token amount but not the realistic costs of running a scheme. Farmers are prepared to pay if they can see a benefit, not necessarily direct to their bank balance initially but their products identified on the shelf. I never offered them a premium, however I did explain the basic economic theory of supply and demand. I feel they are prepared to look at it in the long term, but long term has a limit. I think it is important to make a note of the sliding scale possibility for an annual fee, as many of the farmers who maybe interested in the scheme will be smaller producers who can afford less than the larger scale operations. The levy idea does take this into account, but I still feel there is room for further discussion in this area.*

### **Do you think you should offer the consumer some form of farm assurance additional to the traceability claim?**

- Many felt information for the consumer would be a good thing, for example grass fed or breed specific etc. I did point out any claim the brand makes needs to be 100% true, that is all suppliers have to do the same thing, which can cut out large parts of the sector. I did feel it was necessary to have some underlining standards and conditions for the producers and all appeared to expect conditions to be part of the scheme, but all warned against adding too much additional work as they all felt they were doing a good job already. I explained that LQBL use FABBL as the basic standard for producers the reasons being it is independent of LQBL and recognised by retailers. Also, many farmers are already FABBL for other reasons such as selling to supermarkets. Not all were convinced that using FABBL was such a good idea and could see no reason why Leicestershire could not establish its own standard, in theory easy in practice very difficult and expensive. They also felt if a farmer had to pay to be in FABBL why should they have to pay again to brand Leicestershire, the smaller producers were more concerned regarding the cost.
- *In an ideal world I would like Leicestershire to promote itself under its own set of criteria and standards unique to its brand, however this would be a very costly business. If you were to set up your own assurance scheme a great deal of your time would be involved in setting it up and running it rather than concentrating on the promotional aspect of the brand which is what will ensure the success of the scheme. First a set of standards would need to be produced, not an easy task in its self, careful consideration would need to*

*ensure the correct standards were issued to allow for a good standard of husbandry and paperwork to back up any claims made to the consumer. If feed restrictions as suggested were part of the standards then supplier need to be listed and appropriate checking system employed, this can be applied to any restriction or condition, once you go into this you open a can of worms. If you have say 100 farmers who all need to be checked annually plus at least one spot check through out the year, so you can say at least two visits per year per farm to assure consumer that is a total of 200 visits per year. Each full inspection will take a least half a day depending on detail a whole day maybe required, which would need to be independently audited and policed. An example of cost LQBL's beef labelling audit which covers only a small percentage of our retail outlets cost approximately £1,500 per year and that is to check 10 shops and two abattoirs, not cheap. If it is the will of the steering group to create a Leicestershire Assurance Scheme I would like to point out the cost of FABBL and the eventual cost of the Leicestershire scheme if using FABBL will be a lot smaller than if an independent assurance scheme was employed. I would not like to say FABBL is perfect it is not and in particular for smaller producers it is expensive. However, what I would suggest is if the steering group wants further restriction and conditions than FABBL just to add then on top, that is the Conditions of the scheme could be FABBL membership and say breed restriction, which could be monitored at the selling point. I have used FABBL as the example of a national run assurance scheme as it is the one I have had the most dealing with. However, more and more farmers in my area over the last few months are moving towards complete farm assurance under several different logos. All are very similar and require the annual inspection and as a group we are happy to recognise all national run assurance schemes, this is something Leicestershire would need to discuss. Overall I think it is a good idea to add your own specific details to a brand, the consumer will assume a great many thing with a local brand which she has been asked to pay for, high farming standards are just one of them. It is always good to have back up information for your brand, but not always necessary to display all of them all the time, I would recommend an assurance scheme back up and possibly additional Leicestershire add ons.*

### **Do you think a Leicestershire/Local branding scheme should allow stock from outside the county to be marketed under the local logo?**

- Most farmers initially felt all the stock, which would be eligible to be marketed under the logo, would need to be born, reared and finished in the county. However, after further discussion they did become a little more receptive to the idea of allowing outside stock into the scheme, many however still felt uneasy with the idea after extensive discussions. Some who bring stock into the county to fatten felt instantly that all stock from Leicestershire farms should be allowed into the scheme.
- *In an ideal world only 100% Leicestershire stock would be allowed in the scheme, that is all stock born, reared and finished in Leicestershire. This however, may prove difficult through out the year as demand increases. I feel the consumer can be pacified with the marketing slogan of "all stock sourced from Leicestershire Farms" backed up with assurance of quality in all sectors of the industry. This question needs addressing and can only be completely agreed upon once the direction of the scheme is clear. If the scheme wishes to supply on a very small scale and to retailers who are happy to live with seasonal variations in supply then 100% Leicestershire stock can be utilised. If however you are looking to expand markets and offer a continuous supply of quality meat 52 weeks*

*of the year the 100% Leicestershire may need to be diluted a little. It is not for me to decide this issue it needs to be discussed in depth at the steering committee level.*

### **What if any back up support do you think a local branding scheme requires?**

- In general they all expected the scheme to be run by someone and they were prepared to play a very small part in the day to day running other than of course supply the stock. They felt their expertise did not extend to marketing and logistics of traceability, however they did appear open minded regarding the potential outlets and felt if only someone would tap into the local and London markets money was to be had!
- *As ever everyone is keen until they have to do something towards the setting up and running of the scheme. I must confess there were the odd one or two who did appear potential steering group members, however the majority of them were not prepared to offer a great deal of day to day help. However, they were ready to market now and could not see why everything was going to take such a long time, they felt they maybe missing out as time goes by. I do not want time to go and enthusiasm to go with it, however I feel there is little chance of them all getting together to set something up on their own so I think they will wait for Leicestershire Food Links to come up with the goods.*

## **6.2 Processors Feedback**

Having discussed the potential project with many Leicestershire and local processors the following feedback has been collected, I did try and ask the same questions to all processor interviewees, however, as conversations got under way many took a slightly different route. Notes were taken of all interviews and I have tried to represent all individual views fairly. I have set out the general question and noted responses and then given my opinion and advice.

### **Would you be prepared to work with a local branding scheme?**

- Both Local markets (Melton Mowbray & Grantham) have expressed an interest and I feel would come on board the steering group if asked. Grantham are all ready on the Lincolnshire Quality Beef and Lamb board and so may offer valuable experience to the group. Further markets in time maybe included and all need to be informed however it would not be necessary to include them at the steering group stage.
- *Important to get them involved at the early stages as on a day to day basis they will be selling the idea to farmers and buyers who they talk to on a regular basis, also very helpful with databases of both farming customers and buying customers.*

### **Do you think there is a place for a local branding scheme in Leicestershire?**

- Processor I have spoken to vary a great deal, the smaller abattoir/butcher are generally very busy and running at full to capacity. Leicestershire has a lack of medium sized family run abattoirs, however I have spoken to Mason Bros. who do not have an abattoir in Leicestershire but do buy a lot of stock from the county and are very keen to get

involved in the scheme. The local larger more supermarket-dominated abattoir have not in principal ruled out working with the scheme and would like further details of the schemes logistics before they completely rule it out.

- *I would like to see the smaller butcher/abattoir companies being involved, the stock they slaughter now could in general be Leicestershire and go through the scheme. Most feel if properly handled could be a benefit to their business, it would be nice to have one of them on the steering committee. The medium sized abattoir is going to be vital to the scheme; they are looking for that edge and a local brand could give it to them. They also deal in larger stock numbers and have a larger retail network. The slight worry is that they are not exclusively Leicestershire orientated therefore a great deal of care will need to be taken over traceability and promotion of the scheme. However, I feel it is vital to get them on the steering committee as a valuable part of the scheme. The larger abattoir I feel will not be capable of working with the initiative unless the supermarkets are the targeted outlets; this is something the steering committee will need to decide. If they want to go down the supermarket track then they will be an important part of the scheme. I advise you keep the abattoir up to date with developments, as they still may prove valuable in the smaller scale retailers, never cut anyone out until absolutely sure they and you can not work together.*

### **What if any conditions and standards should participating members of the scheme adhere to?**

- Conditions and standards for processors has been discussed generally and feeling were that they felt they all had so many conditions and restriction on a day to day basis already that no more were required. They felt the standard was high to begin with and needed little adding to it. However they did recognise the need for additional traceability requirements for the scheme.
- *I would be inclined to go with them on this, the type of processor involved in a local branding scheme is likely to be the forward thinking and progressive company who have invested time and effort to be ahead of the game. In particular abattoirs have such restrictions and requirements it is very difficult not to be of a high standard if following all rules. Not that I think the scheme should not have conditions for processor, but the majority of them will be doing them already, which is not a bad thing. The traceability aspect is the important one and in particular regard to the beef labelling scheme.*

### **How much are you prepared to pay for the scheme?**

- Cost, again no one is prepared to offer money, but further discussion and an explanation of the benefits to ones business and companies become a little more relaxed on the subject. I feel both livestock markets and abattoirs will be prepared to pay a nominal fee to be part of the scheme, again I would not guarantee the industry would be able to support a realistic amount but a token jester would be tolerated.
- *It is difficult to asses how much and how processors should pay, it would be possible for them to pay a levy on stock and a membership fee if the steering group felt it was appropriate. It does need to be an appropriate amount and again the fairest option maybe the levy option. I will point out that Grantham market already pays for*

*membership to LQBL so further additional expense may be harder to take, I am not saying they will not pay but they need to see an increase in business to justify, as with all the processors. The ability to collect levies needs to be looked at and the time required to do this, if a system is in place which creates work loads which exceeds the financial benefit then a waste of time. If processors are prepared to collect producers levies and their own at the same time this may ease the work load time for the scheme. However the processor may feel they are doing too much work and paying for the privilege, all these aspects will need to be discussed at steering group level. LQBL do not collect levies from processors they pay an annual membership fee only.*

### **6.3 Retailer Feedback**

Having discussed the potential project with many Leicestershire and local retailers the following feedback has been collected, I did try and ask the same questions to all retailer interviewees, however, as conversations got under way many took a slightly different route. Notes were taken of all interviews and I have tried to represent all individual views fairly. I have set out the general question and noted responses and then given my opinion and advice.

#### **Do you want a Leicestershire brand for beef and lamb?**

- Many retailers on the edges of Leicestershire were unsure regarding the Leicestershire brand; they felt a local brand with a radius of suppliers covering for instant 25 miles of the shop would be a better idea. Some however felt the county logo would be a good thing and an advantage for them in the shop, some wanted to see an organic Leicestershire logo. I discussed with several retailers further a field and they had mixed feeling towards Leicestershire, their first image was of Leicester not the county as a whole and then they could tell me very little else about it, that is what type of farming and countryside it had.
- *In respect to the idea of a local logo for all the shops near the border, this is completely unworkable on an individual shop basis. The scheme could go for within a certain mile radius of the county of Leicestershire, but if you ask me that would water down the idea behind the scheme and would cause problems with the actual branding name. "Leicestershire Beef & Lamb and Beef & Lamb from anywhere else as long as with in a 25-mile radius of the county" not the snappiest brand name I have ever come across. The farmers supplying from out side the county would also not be very happy about not having their county name displayed so I think it is a non-starter far too complicated. However if the steering group has a butcher who is very keen on this idea then they could investigate further, but I would not recommend it. I think if you set up the scheme establish the Leicestershire logo many of these shops will begin to use the brand as long as you give them the option of using other meat as well, that is not exclusively Leicestershire meat. They feel a logo is a good idea and I feel they will think one logo which covers most of the meat better than non, it may even encourage them to become completely 100% Leicestershire. As for the retailers further a field, little can be done for now on the image of Leicestershire, in time a campaign of gentle persuasion and education can begin. However I feel concentrating on the home market initially is a good idea before venturing into unknown territory, as this will prove more difficult and expensive. It will be easier selling Leicestershire beef and lamb to a Leicestershire person. Once you have*

*established a good solid home market there is no reason why you can not look further a field for new markets if that is the way you wish to develop.*

### **How much are you prepared to pay for the scheme?**

- Cost again, butchers I feel are even more concerned with cost than farmers, hard to believe I know. Initially they are not prepared to pay anything for selling Leicestershire meat, especially as many are already doing so. However, if you explain that they can have free marketing material and traceability certificates with all the Leicestershire meat and of course all the free advertising they will be getting from being part of the Leicestershire scheme a way forward begins to appear. It is also necessary to mention the beef labelling scheme expenses that can be if the steering group decided included in the retailer's fee.
- *Once again I do feel a realistic price will not be appropriate for the initial stages of the scheme, however a nominal charge will be stomached by retailers, especially as they will be receiving free marketing material and advertising. I would like you to note butchers are very used to receiving free marketing material from the MLC and so it is somewhat expected in some quarters. As for the beef labelling in theory all retailers need to conduct an annual audit of beef supplies to ensure the labels are correct, this is something the scheme can offer on a group bases and cut costs for the individual butcher significantly. However many retailers are not concerning themselves with this yet as the law only came in on Jan 2002 and Trading Standards do not have the resources to monitor and check compliance, this may change.*

### **What if any conditions and standards should participating members of the scheme adhere to?**

- The greatest concern put forward by retailers is the need to buy meat for different purposes from different suppliers, that is not Leicestershire. Many felt that if they were restricted in this area it would prevent their inclusion in the scheme. Other conditions discussed was record keeping the majority keep good records under HACCP and felt this would be adequate for the scheme if not the minimum additional paperwork would be welcomed, as with most businesses today, paperwork equates to far too much of work time.
- *I could not recommend the exclusive use in all shops of Leicestershire meat, nice as it would be, practical it is not, I agree with the retailers concerns in this area and feel any scheme needs to be flexible in this area. I feel other conditions would be straight forward and not cause too much concern to retailers, most of whom are approved under the HACCP scheme which requires a great deal of record taking and high standards of competency.*

### **Do you have any further comment regarding the potential branding scheme?**

- Retailers were concerned with supply, would it be continuous and the quality and consistency of it.

- *It is somewhat difficult to guarantee this, however, the reason why I keep trying to ensure the maximum amount of producers are able to supply the scheme is to ensure as far as the scheme can that supply is sufficient. It is also important to keep the range of producers open as well as the number as you can guarantee each retailer will be looking for something slightly different. It is important to ensure the retailer gets the type of stock they require, as they in turn know the type of stock their customers like. I can not stress this point sufficiently if you can not through strict stringent conditions supply retailers every week of the year with quality meat then the scheme will fail, retailers will demand this. There maybe some room for seasonal promotions, spring lambs for instants, but the bulk of Leicestershire stock needs to come consistently and with quality through out the year.*

## 7.0 Project Costs

I have based the project costs on the assumption that the Leicestershire branding scheme is set up as an entirely separate project in its own right. That is, no account has been made to share costs with any other project, which in practice is likely to happen. I have excluded any employment costs for a manager of the scheme as I feel this type of information is not required for this project Report. The following costs are based on a project of similar size to Lincolnshire Quality Beef and Lamb, which I feel needs to be considered as anything smaller becomes almost a waste of time in the amount of work, effort and money which is needed.

<b>Project Costs</b>	<b>2002 - 2003</b>	<b>2003 - 2004</b>	<b>2004 - 2005</b>
<b>Marketing Budget</b>			
Logo Development	1,000		
Brochures - members	2,000	1,000	1,000
Brochures - consumer	2,000	1,000	1,000
Posters	1,000	800	800
In store stickers/price tickets etc	1,000	800	800
Launch of initiative - members	500		
Launch of initiative - consumer	2,500		
Promotional events	2,500	5,000	5,000
<b>Traceability Material</b>			
Self Declaration Documents	1,000	500	500
Roller Markers & Stamps	3,000	1,000	
<b>Management</b>			
Business Planning Consultancy	3,000	2,000	2,000
"Closed" Meetings	500	500	500
<b>Administration</b>			
Secretarial Support	2,500	2,500	2,500
IT & Office equipment for year 1	3,500	1,000	1,000
Office Costs	2,000	2,000	2,000
Accountancy	2,000	1,000	1,000
Office Rent	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subsistence	1,000	1,000	1,000
Beef Labelling Audit	1,500	1,500	2,000
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<b>35,500</b>	<b>24,600</b>	<b>24,100</b>

The above costs are only a guideline of possible expenses, the Leicestershire project is unlikely to have all the set up costs of a new project with office equipment and office rent to find so the amount is likely to be less in those areas. However, more can be put into other budget areas if the money is available for further activities. The marketing budget can use any amount given to it, I have set the amount to reflect the possible local activities, and the more money allocated the greater number of marketing activities accomplished.

The beef labelling audit depends on the number of shops in the scheme and number abattoirs both in the scheme and independently audited. For example an abattoir with an audit themselves, would cost the scheme £50.00 to check and one which does not would cost a minimum of £500.00 to check, so these figures are difficult to predict.

## **8.0 Potential Income**

It is difficult to predict the eventual membership fee and levy figures, as this is something for the steering group to discuss and decide. However, I have given some figures below to show the potential amount of income generated from membership and stock numbers.

I have given examples below of levels in both the annual fees and levies and have kept the membership numbers and stock number the same so comparisons can be made.

### **Case Study 1**

100 producer members supplying an average of 150 cattle per month (1,800 per year) and an average 750 lambs per month (9,000 per year)

2 Livestock Markets

3 Abattoirs

30 Retail Members

If membership is £30 across the board a total of 135 @ £30 = £4,050

If levy is charged only to producers at say £1.00 per beast and 20p per lamb

1,800 @ £1.00 = 1,800

9,000 @ 20p = 1,800

**TOTAL INCOME FOR YEAR = £7,650**

### **Case Study 2**

100 producer members supplying an average of 150 cattle per month (1,800 per year) and an average 750 lambs per month (9,000 per year)

2 Livestock Markets

3 Abattoirs

30 Retail Members

If membership for producers is £30 a total of 100 @ £30 = £3,000

If levy is charged to producers at say £1.00 per beast and 20p per lamb

1,800 @ £1.00 = 1,800

9,000 @ 20p = 1,800

If levy is charged to processors at say £1.00 per beast and 20p per lamb  
 1,800@ £1.00 = 1,800  
 9,000 @ 20p = 1,800

If membership for processors and is £30 a total of 5 @ £30 = £150  
 If membership for retailers is £50 a total of 30 @ £50 = £1,500

**TOTAL INCOME FOR YEAR = £11,850**

### **Case Study 3**

100 producer members supplying an average of 150 cattle per month (1,800 per year) and an average 750 lambs per month (9,000 per year)  
 2 Livestock Markets  
 3 Abattoirs  
 30 Retail Members

If membership for producers is £30 a total of 100 @ £30 = £3,000  
 If levy is charged to producers at say £2.00 per beast and 30p per lamb  
 1,800@ £2.00 = 3,600  
 9,000 @ 30p = 2,700

If levy is charged to processors at say £2.00 per beast and 30p per lamb  
 1,800@ £2.00 = 3,600  
 9,000 @ 30p = 2,700

If membership for processors and is £100 a total of 5 @ £100 = £500  
 If membership for retailers is £100 a total of 30 @ £100 = £3,000

**TOTAL INCOME FOR YEAR = £19,100**

### **Case Study 4**

100 producer members supplying an average of 150 cattle per month (1,800 per year) and an average 750 lambs per month (9,000 per year)  
 2 Livestock Markets  
 3 Abattoirs  
 30 Retail Members

If membership for producers is £40 a total of 100 @ £40 = £4,000  
 If levy is charged to producers at say £2.00 per beast and 25p per lamb  
 1,800@ £2.00 = 3,600  
 9,000 @ 25p = 2,250

If membership for processors (Livestock Markets) is £40 a total of 2 @ £40 = £80  
 If membership for processors (Abattoirs) is £200 a total of 3 @ £200 = £600  
 If membership for retailers is £50 a total of 30 @ £50 = £1,500

**TOTAL INCOME FOR YEAR = £12,030**

It is not for me to set the membership or levy figures, that is something for the steering committee to decide. However, I would like to point out the industry does not need additional costs so the minimum you can get away with the better, but I will stress it is necessary for all members to pay some form of fee to use the logo.

## **9.0 Conclusion**

In conclusion having set out to investigate the potential for a local marketing brand for beef and lamb in Leicestershire I feel optimistic that the will, drive and enthusiasm is in the county to develop such a brand. It maybe difficult to find at times and may need a little gentle persuasion now and again but having spoken to many in the meat industry a need is there. The points I would like to stress again which I consider essential for developing a successful brand in the county are:

- The steering group must consist of all sectors of the industry; I would like to see producers, small, medium and large, beef and lamb specialists; auctioneers; abattoir owners, small and medium; and, retailers, small and medium if possible. I am sure there will be plenty of expert help form local and national organisations such as the MLC, NFU and Food Links itself.
- The brand must stand for something clear and traceability giving it a real local identity, but remember to back up with assurance because consumers will ask and need to be reassured, I would however not recommend Leicestershire set its own assurance scheme up.
- "Leicestershire & Rutland Quality Beef and Lamb" is a bit of a mouth full however the most obvious brand and instantly recognisable. I am not going to tell you not to consider any other branding identity, however I would like to remind you that you have to keep in mind what the brand needs to stand for.
- I am a little concerned with time scales, everyone I have spoken to in relation to time scales have all suggested unrealistic expectations. I have tried to explain nothing will happen over night and give the example of Lincolnshire Quality Beef and Lamb it took two years from the first steering group to employ the Development Manager and then a further 8 months before trading in stock. In general the response is disbelief, I have pointed out it is unlikely to be as long for Leicestershire, as some of the work has already been done. However, time will go by when they feel nothing is happening, and the idea put to one side, I have tried to reassure were possible that all is being done with the constraints we are working with. However, I can not guarantee my message has been received loud and clear.
- I would like to say one of the abattoirs who has expressed an interest in the scheme has already suggested a potential pilot scheme on a small scale, if the steering committee felt it was appropriate. However, I would like to say a great deal of the marketing work would need to be done before this trial, else I feel it would be somewhat of a point less exercise.
- In conclusion I would like to offer any further help to this project and if the steering group would find it useful I am happy to attend a meeting to discuss my report.

## **10.0 Future**

The project has a real chance of success if a scheme can be developed and implemented in the shortest possible time scale. I feel if time is allowed to elapse greatly then those interested parties will find other options and even one or two may try something on their own. However, the next stage of creating a steering group and developing standards and conditions, logos, marketing material and traceability systems do not happen over night. The scheme could realistically have a pilot up and running sooner, but still the majority of the planning and back up is needed to be in place before even this can go ahead. However, a pilot does mean little recruitment in the early stages will be needed which could save some valuable time as an interested abattoir has already suggested this is something he could do quickly as the trade already exists.

Once all the operational standards and logistics have been put into place and someone has implemented them the scheme will develop and grow at its own pace.

The time scale really depends on the work rate of the organisational aspects of the scheme, that is how soon a steering committee can be put together how often they can meet and how soon the work suggested by them can be developed and implemented. Along with the necessary marketing material and activities for launching the scheme and the implementation of the marketing strategy to the consumer. In my own experience I would suggest at least two steering committee meetings before operational standards were decided upon. At least a further two for suggested marketing material to be made up and decided upon. A further two for marketing strategy and launch and the necessary potential membership strategy. I would guess at 6 to 8 months from the initial steering group meeting to launch of initiative, if necessary input from a manager can be guaranteed to ensure essential work is completed in-between meetings and organisational requirements met. This is the best case scenario if the management input is not available, or steering committee find it hard to arrange meetings and decide on strategies then the scheme could take many more months to implement.