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Introduction and Purpose of the Research

The food industry is experiencing significant structural changes, as the industrialization of agriculture continues and there is increased consolidation and concentration of agribusiness firms. In a drive to increase efficiencies, businesses in the agrifood sector are developing closer connections with firms at adjacent stages along the supply chain to relay information and take redundant costs out of the system. In addition, a drive to achieve economies of scale has resulted in fewer and larger agribusinesses.

These changes have resulted in farmers facing a more competitive business environment and examining ways to improve the returns from their farm operation. One response by farmers is to form producer alliances, often structured as New Generation Cooperatives. In some cases the driving force behind the formation of the producer alliance is a desire, by farmers, to move along the value chain and capture profits from other stages. In other situations, producers find themselves without a marketing or processing plant when agribusiness firms consolidate and close local facilities. Iowa turkey farmers are one example. When Oscar Mayer was closing a processing plant and feed mill the producers formed Iowa Turkey Growers Cooperative and purchased the facility (Perkins). These producer alliances have the common objectives of producers working together towards common business goals and a desire to capture additional value from the commodities they produce. The forms that an alliance can take include: New Generation Cooperatives (NGC), Limited Liability Company (LLC), Partnership, Corporation, Buying or Marketing groups, Joint Ventures, Strategic Alliances, as well as unique ownership arrangements with regional cooperatives.
This research addresses one of the critical questions the industrialization of agriculture poses for producers: What role should producers play in the formation of these value chains, which involves decisions of where and when to invest in value-added agricultural businesses? The purpose of this research is to identify the returns and risks for producers who take the initiative in the formation of food supply chains through investment in value-added first handling, processing or other downstream activities. The results of this research will be useful to producers as they consider future investment options as well as to policy makers as they examine ways to maintain viable rural communities.

The following section of this report describes the direction of the research. The research results and implications for producers are presented in the third section of this report. This third section is structured around three important questions that are vital to the success of a producer alliance. The final section of this report contains a discussion of the dissemination of the research results. In addition, three appendices make up this report. The first appendix lists the relevant output related to this research. Appendix II is a set of PowerPoint™ slides for a presentation on “Value Added and New Generation Cooperatives.” In response to a demand for information from producers considering value added investment the article “New Generation Cooperatives: What, Why, Where and How: An Internet Guide” was developed. The article is found in Appendix III.

**Direction of the Research**

The research began by examining the risk and return implications for agricultural producers as they consider investment in value-added business activities. Three sub-
sectors of agriculture were considered in depth: corn, pork and beef. In each case a stochastic simulation model was developed. A series of M.S. theses were produced as a result of this research. In each case alternative strategic business decisions that producers could make were identified. These alternative business decisions involved investments in value-added activities associated with the commodity they were producing as well as diversification into stocks and bonds. Stochastic dominance analysis was used to evaluate the risk and return implications of the different business decisions.

There are a number of issues associated with the business organization structure that will affect the success of producer investment in value added businesses. As noted earlier, many different business organization structures have been considered and adopted as producers invest in value added agribusiness. It is insightful to consider two examples of beef producers working together to develop a producer-owned value added beef processing agribusiness: Northern Plains Premium Beef and U.S. Premium Beef. Although both of these organizations had strong leaders and a highly motivated group of initial producers, Northern Plains Premium Beef was unable to move into the implementation stage of developing a functioning cooperative while U.S. Premium Beef did successfully develop a viable and functioning business. Northern Plains Premium Beef tried to raise equity capital to develop an independent beef processing business and came up short. In contract, U.S. Premium Beef, by forming a partnership with Farmland Industries, did not have to generate as much equity capital and were also able to link up with and gain the operating efficiencies of one of the country’s largest beef packing firms. The changes associated with the industrialization of agriculture are resulting in scale economies for many aspects of value added processing, that make it essential for
producer groups to link up with another agribusiness firm to achieve efficiencies. In many cases, linking with a regional cooperative is an important alternative for producer groups to consider.

The important research question is: Are there conclusions relating to business organization structure that will assist producers, who are developing a project, to determine whether they should link up with a particular partner? An M.S. thesis examined this issue. First a model of business reorganization was developed. Second, a case study of the merger of two of the country’s largest regional cooperatives (Cenex and Harvest States) was developed. This case study is important because the merger resulted in a cooperative with a farm to market presence, or supply chain, in one business.

**Research Results and Implications for Producers**

The success of producer alliances depends upon the answers to three important questions:

1. Is it a Good Business Investment?
2. Will the Organizational Structure Work?
3. Are there Other Goals for the Alliance and do they Compete or Compliment the Goal of Business Profitability?

In the following sub-sections of this report each of these questions will be considered in further detail.
Is it a Good Business Investment?

There are two important questions to consider when evaluating whether an opportunity represents a good business investment or not. First it is important to examine the returns and risks associated with the business ventures. Second, one must examine the potential for the business venture from the perspective of long term strategic positioning.

**Returns and Risks**

Through a series of M.S. theses at Purdue University the returns and risks associated with producer investment in value added business activities have been evaluated. Three sub-sectors of agriculture were considered in depth: pork, corn and beef. In each case a stochastic simulation model was developed, alternative strategic business decisions for producers were identified and evaluated. Stochastic dominance analysis was used to determine the alternatives that were preferred and therefore in the efficient set.

Jones evaluated opportunities for hog producers investing in hog packing operations. A stochastic simulation model was developed first and then used to analyze alternative business strategies including investing all equity in the hog farm and investing different percentages of equity in the hog farm, hog packing and stocks (through the S&P 500) and bonds (through T-bills). Three different sizes of farrow-to-finish hog operations were considered: 300, 600 and 1200 sows.

Opportunities that were examined for corn producers, by Andreson, included investment in both wet and dry corn milling. A strategic business analysis was performed followed by the development of a stochastic simulation model to analyze the
impact of investment in a dry corn milling (ethanol) operation. An important aspect of this research was the consideration of different government programs for corn producers as well as for ethanol operations.

Opportunities for cow-calf producers were also evaluated by Van Fleet and Rosa. The scenarios evaluated reflect decisions that cow-calf producers are currently facing. These include: retaining ownership and custom feeding in a feedlot, incorporation of improved genetics in the beef herd, different pricing grids in a coordinated marketing system, spring versus fall calving, and diversification into the stock market. The different pricing grids reflect situations that producers are currently considering with cooperative marketing programs that are being established by beef producers, while the spring versus fall calving is an important consideration for these groups as they need a steady supply of beef year round to meet consumer demand.

Four important conclusions can be drawn from the results of the research involving the stochastic simulation analysis and the question of returns and risk: (i) producers will benefit from diversifying, (ii) producers will benefit from a balanced portfolio, (iii) producers will benefit from leveraging into more profitable areas, and (iv) government subsidies and programs influence investor behavior.

Producers will benefit from diversifying. Diversification into business activities other than the farm or ranch may result in both an increase in expected return and a decrease in the variability of returns (or a decrease in risk) when compared to a 100% investment in the farm or ranch. Just as nonfarm businesses place a high priority on having a diversified portfolio, farmers and ranchers should strive for a balanced portfolio of investments.
Producers will benefit from a balanced portfolio. In particular, diversification into a value added business related to a farmer’s commodity can be a good investment if there is a negative correlation between farm income and processor income. When a product is characterized by volatile commodity prices and relatively stable wholesale/retail prices there tends to be a high degree of negative correlation between farm income and processor income. This phenomena exists in the pork industry and the research, done as part of this project, revealed that there is the potential for hog producers to diversify beyond the farm into processing and increase expected return and decrease risk. Of course, achieving this potential depends upon finding an appropriate business organizational structure for successful implementation. In particular, in the case of the processing of livestock, scale economies may make it infeasible for a producer alliance to directly own the entire processing plant because they may not be able to support a large enough operation to achieve economic efficiency.

Producers will benefit from leveraging into more profitable areas. Some subsectors of agriculture do not yield as high a rate of return as outside investments. In these instances it is often argued that individuals place value on the lifestyle of farming or ranching and thus are willing to accept the lower rate of return on their equity. Historical data on the profitability of cow-calf operations provide a picture of a sector of agriculture that often earns a lower rate of return than other investments. In these situations, with low rates of return, the diversification scenarios are attractive because the other investments yield higher returns.

Government subsidies and programs influence investor behavior. This conclusion is highlighted in the results of Andreson’s study of corn producers investing in ethanol
production. In particular, the business scenarios involving investment in an ethanol project only remained in the efficient set when subsidies for ethanol production were in place. It is therefore vital for producers to evaluate all relevant government programs as part of the evaluation of a new business venture.

*Long Term Strategic Positioning*

A strategic business analysis that carefully and systematically identifies all assumptions and evaluates the potential actions and reactions of competitors is an important step in the evaluation of investment alternatives. A typical framework for this analysis is to examine the five forces as set out by Michael Porter. In the analysis of the corn sub-sector a Porter analysis was done of wet corn milling and dry corn milling. One interesting result follows from the analysis of “rivalry among competitors” force. In wet corn milling, industry concentration is very high with the top three firms having almost 80% market share in the corn sweetener market and the top three firms having over 86% market share in the lysine industry. From the perspective of competitive rivalry the wet corn milling industry is not a good prospect for any firm to enter, and certainly not one for farmer owned cooperatives to try and enter. The advantage of hindsight from a real world example confirms this. Guebert reports an interesting 1994 meeting where Dwayne Andres, then CEO of ADM, urged Joe Famalette, then CEO of American Crystal Sugar, not to build the ProGold high fructose sugar plant. American Crystal Sugar did proceed with the ProGold plant but it experienced financial difficulties and is now being operated by Cargill.
Will the Organizational Structure Work?

Four important conclusions follow from the model of business reorganization and subsequent analysis by Andrew Porter. First, the resulting structure of a business reorganization (e.g. merger, acquisition, joint venture, strategic alliance or divestiture) will be a function of the forces that drove the leaders of the businesses to reorganize.

The driving forces behind business reorganization may be external or internal. External driving forces include changing demand, technology advances, government policy or increasing competition. A change in consumer demand that puts greater emphasis on traceability may lead firms along the supply chain to coordinate their efforts via joint venture agreements. In contrast a technological advance that lowers the average cost of production only if the business is large will result in firms merging to achieve the scale economies.

Internal driving forces include company goals and objectives, resources, trust, commitment, communication, the nature of the benefits of reorganization, the penalty for reneging on an agreement, financial stability of the firms involved, the number of firms involved and the degree of similarity of the firms involved. It is expected that the business reorganization would be an acquisition when the goals and objectives of the one company were to become the largest firm in the industry. In contrast, we would expect to observe two firms that are already working closely together (and trust each other and communicate well with each other) to develop a joint venture when they set up the business structure to take advantage of a newly identified set of cost savings activities.

Second, the success of the business reorganization will depend upon the combination of the driving forces that lead to the reorganization and the business structure that was
selected for the reorganization. As noted in the previous paragraphs there is a tendency for certain business structures to result when certain driving forces are the impetus for change. The success of the business reorganization is dependent upon whether the business structure and the driving forces are consistent with each other. For example, a joint venture business arrangement is not expected to be successful when the firms involved do not trust each other. The success of a business reorganization is multidimensional and must be evaluated from a multidimensional perspective. These components can include customer satisfaction, operational effectiveness, financial analysis, and innovation and learning perspectives.

Third, important reasons for business reorganization within the cooperative system include: strategic positioning, increased competition, need for growth, and development of an integrated supply chain. An examination of the case of the merger of Cenex and Harvest States cooperatives revealed that the driving forces behind the merger were factors often associated with the industrialization of agriculture including having a cooperative that is strategically positioned to serve the producer members and be effective in the face of increased competition. In addition, the cooperative leaders identified that the cooperative needed to grow larger to achieve scale economies and remain competitive. Finally, they noted that it is necessary for cooperatives to develop an integrated supply chain in order to be effective in the new industrialized agriculture.

Finally, the business reorganization involving the merger of Cenex and Harvest States Cooperatives was successful because there was commitment, trust, communication, homogeneity of the two cooperatives and a unified vision of why the merger should happen. CHS Cooperatives, the business that resulted from the merger of Cenex and
Harvest States, is an important and viable business in the agribusiness marketplace. By many measures the merger of Cenex and Harvest States Cooperatives was a success. Important factors contributing to the successful merger are that key decision makers in both cooperatives were committed to the merger, there was a high degree of trust and communication among the key decision makers from the two cooperatives, the two cooperatives shared important values, and there was a common vision of the opportunities that would result with a unified cooperative.

These conclusions suggest some important factors for producer alliances to examine when considering an agreement or partnership with another firm involved in value added processing. Questions that will be particularly important to ask include: (i) Are there driving forces in place that may result in the firm reorganizing in the near future? (ii) If the firm is involved in a reorganization, what type of reorganization would it likely be and what is that likelihood that the reorganization would be successful? Producer alliances will want to align themselves with firms that are successful in the long run, both before and after any reorganizations.

Are there Other Goals for the Alliance and do they Compete or Compliment the Goal of Business Profitability?

It is important to identify and evaluate all of the goals that members, or potential members, of a value added business venture have for the business. Examples of goals that members may have include: generating new markets for the commodities they producer, increasing income, generating new jobs in the area, and enhancing rural development in the area. It is certainly the case that some value added producer alliances will generate additional economic activity in the rural area, generate new jobs, enhance
the local tax base, and strengthen local demand for retail goods and services. However, the success of the value added business venture will be judged on the profitability of the business by lenders and investors. It is therefore important for producers to first explicitly identify all of the goals for the value added business. Then they can determine whether these goals are complimentary or competing. Finally, producers can proceed with the project focusing on the goals that are most important for the project.

**Dissemination of Results**

Extensive dissemination of the research results has already taken place, as listed in Appendix I. The results were presented to groups of producers in Indiana at two county Farm Bureau meetings, the Farm Show in Fort Wayne, and a Cooperative Extension County meeting. The results were presented to producers in North Dakota during a workshop at the annual Marketplace of Ideas in January 2001. The results were presented to County Educators as part of the Purdue Extension Annual Forum in 2000 and to the ANR training in 2001. In addition, the results were presented to a group of Community Development Specialists in June of 2001. During the fall of 2000 the results formed part of the annual Outlook presentations that Purdue faculty delivered.

Important printed documents included the results of this research as well. These include: a follow up from the American Agricultural Economics Association pre-conference on Policy Issues in the Changing Structure of the Food System, the document that accompanied the annual Outlook campaign from Purdue University, an article in the Purdue Agricultural Economics Report, and the internet guide that is published as a Cooperative Extension report.
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Outputs Relevant to this Project

Masters Theses Completed:


Presentations that resulted from the Research:


Fulton, Joan R. “Structural Change in Agribusiness: Challenges and Opportunities for Producers.” Presentation at Ripley County Farm Bureau Conference on Structural Change in Agriculture. November 17, 2000.

Fulton, Joan R. “Producer Business Organizations Alliances/Networks/New Generation Cooperatives.” Presentation at Fort Wayne Farm Show, January 17, 2001

Fulton, Joan R. “Structural Change in Agribusiness: Challenges and Opportunities for Producers.” Presentation at Lawrence County Farm Bureau Meeting. April 9, 2001. Bedford, IN.


Purdue Faculty. “Agricultural Outlook 2002” (During September 20002 Purdue Faculty will deliver Outlook programs across the state of Indiana reaching about 2000 people with Value Added Opportunities for Agriculture as part of the program.) September 2001.


Publications:


Appendix II
Value Added and New Generation Cooperatives

Dr. Joan Fulton
Department of Agricultural Economics
Purdue University

---

WHY THE INTEREST?
- Time of Dramatic Change
- Desire to "capture" additional value

---

Structural Change in Agribusiness
- Time of dramatic change
- Increased Consolidation/Concentration amongst agribusinesses at all stages
- Take advantage of scale economies and efficiencies associated with coordination
- What are the Opportunities for producer investments in value added agriculture?
- Recent and ongoing research at Purdue
**Slide 4**

**Research at Purdue University**
- Develop database of Structural Change among agribusinesses
- Investor Oriented Firms
- Cooperatives
- Regional and National Level
- Mergers, Acquisitions, Joint Ventures, Strategic Alliances
- January 1990 - December 1999
- 837 Entries

---

**Slide 5**

**Type of Activity by Year**

- Acquisition
- Strategic Alliance
- Joint Venture
- Merger
- Licensing Agreement
- Other

---

**Slide 6**

**Activities by Area of Business**

- Agricultural Equipment
- A
g
- Animal Health
- Animal Nutrition
- Livestock
- Crop Protection
- Genomics/Biotechnology
- Fertilizer
- Seed
- Pharmaceutical
- Dairy Food
- General Farm Inputs
- Grain Handling/Processing
- Industrial Chemicals/Petroleum
- Other

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Restructuring Activity by Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ownership by Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOP-COOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOP-IOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOF-IOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restructuring by Area of Business for Coop-Coop Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Chemicals/Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Handling/Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genomics/Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrifinance/Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restructuring by Area of Business for IOF-IOF Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Chemicals/Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Handling/Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Farm Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genomics/Biotechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrifinance/Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Restructuring by Area of Business for Coop-IOF Ownership

Most Active Companies
- Monsanto 53
- Farmland Ind. 48
- Cargill 41
- Novartis AG 28
- Dow AgroSc. 27
- AgrBioTech 22
- Land O'Lakes 22
- Con Agra Inc. 20
- DuPont 20
- ADM 17
- Zeneca 17
- Mycrogen Corp 16
- Suiza Foods 16
- Terra Ind. 16
- Dean Foods 14
- Pioneer Hi-Bred 14

Business Forms are Available
Most Appropriate Business Form
Slide 13

Business Forms
- LLCs
- Partnerships
- Corporations
- Buying or Marketing Groups
- New Generation Cooperatives
- Common Themes
  - Joint Business Goals
  - Desire to "capture" additional value
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Will the new Businesses be Effective?

Slide 15

Will Producer Businesses Work?
- Is it a good Business Investment?
  - Return and Risk
  - Long Term Strategic Positioning
- Will the Organizational Structure work?
- Are there other Goals?
  - Complementary with Business Investment Goals
  - Conflicting with Business Investment Goals
    - e.g. Local Economic Development
Return and Risk

Purdue Research
- Examined Pork, Corn, and Beef subsectors
- Developed stochastic simulation model to evaluate ROI for producer diversifying beyond the farmgate
  - Value added processing of their commodity
  - Diversification into Stocks and Bonds

Conclusions from Purdue research
- Producers will benefit from diversifying
- Producers will benefit from a Balanced Portfolio (financial portfolio)
- Producers will benefit from leveraging into more profitable areas of business
- Government Subsidies/Incentives do influence behavior

Long Term Strategic Business Decision
- Porter’s Framework (Five Forces)
  1) Barriers to Entry
  2) Rivalry Among Competitors
  3) Substitute Products
  4) Bargaining Power of Buyers
  5) Bargaining Power of Suppliers
Slide 19

Rivalry and Wet Corn Milling

- Industry Concentration
  - Corn Sweeteners
    - ADM – 33%, A.E. Staley – 25%, Cargill – 20%
  - Lysine
    - ADM – 48-54%, Ajinomoto – 22-23%, Kyowa – 16-21%

- Incumbent Reactions to Entry
- Is this an industry you would recommend any firm to enter?

Slide 20

Will the Organizational Structure Work?

- Multi-faceted Issue
- Organizational Form needs to be compatible with Objectives
  - Appropriate incentives are important
  - Don't let the Legal Structure drive the selection of organizational form of the business

Slide 21

Organizational Structure

- How do we get producers to work towards a common goal?
  - Common Property Problem
  - Want to avoid the "Tragedy of the Commons"
- Game Theory
  - Prisoner's Dilemma and Assurance Problem
Organizational Structure: Necessary Conditions for Success

- Trust
- Commitment for the Long Run
- Communication
- Financially Stable
- Positive Benefits from working together
- Smaller Number of Homogenous Players
- Penalty for those who Defect
- Mechanism to share Profits/Losses and Risks

Are There Other Goals?

- Important to identify all of the goals of the business operation
- Markets for product
- Enhanced income
- Increased employment
- Rural development
- Are these goals conflicting or complimentary?

A Specific Business Form

- New Generation Cooperatives
New Generation Cooperatives

- Origin
- Structure
- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Steps
- To Watch for

Origin of New Generation Cooperatives

Early 1970's sugar beet producers in Red River Valley of ND and MN
Response to a need to increase vertical integration and invest in value-added processing
New Generation Cooperative has often been the structure used
Recently “cooperative fever” or “hype”

Structure of New Generation Cooperatives (NGCs)

- Link producer equity contributions and product delivery rights
- Tradeable equity shares and delivery rights
- One-member, One-vote
- Earning distributed on bases of patronage
- Value-added processing of member's commodities
- Significant equity investment by members
Slide 28

**Strengths of NGCs**
- Provide producers opportunity to become part of integrated food system
- Share in profits
- Address imbalance of market power issue
- Overcome free-rider problem and horizon problem that faces traditional cooperatives

Slide 29

**Strengths of NGCs**
- **Free Rider Problem**
  - Why should I invest in the cooperative so long as everyone else invests?
- **Horizon Problem**
  - Refers to the investment perspective of the cooperative members. Members may have little incentive to support long term investments that will pay off after they retire.

Slide 30

**Weaknesses of NGCs**
- Significant up-front investment required which means some producers can’t afford to get in
- Capital requirements for the cooperative business are so large there is not sufficient membership to support the investment
Slide 31

**Weaknesses of NGCs**

- Farmers who want to buy in after the initial equity drive will have to pay more if the share value has increased
- Financial risk implications
- Aligning goals of the cooperative with goals of the owners can be difficult

Slide 32

**Steps to Organizing a NGC**

- Hold an Organizational meeting of Potential Members and form a Steering Committee, collect initial fees
- Conduct a Feasibility Study
- Hold a Meeting to report Results of Feasibility Study
- Prepare a Business Plan
- Incorporate the Co-op by filing Articles of Incorporation and Draft Bylaws

Slide 33

**Steps to Organizing a NGC**

- Secure Financing for the Cooperative
- Recruit Members for the Cooperative
- Hire a Cooperative Manager and Staff
- Hold the Cooperative’s First Membership and Board Meetings
- Start Operations
Slide 34

To Watch For
- Lack of a Clearly Identified Mission
- Inadequate Planning
- Failure to Use Advisors and Consultants
- Lack of Member Leadership
- Lack of Member Commitment
- Inadequate Management
- Failure to Identify and Minimize Risk
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To Watch For
- Overly Optimistic Assumptions
- Not Enough Money and Excessive Debt/Equity Ratio
- Inadequate Communication
- Problems with the Physical Plant
- Noncompetitive Business Location

Slide 36

Response to Structural Change
- Increased concentration and consolidation in Agribusiness is with us
- Need to be proactive
- Alliances/Networks will work when:
  - A Good Business Investment and
  - Organizational Structure works and
  - Other Goals are Satisfied
Appendix III
An Internet Guide

Michelle Schank and Joan Fulton
Michelle Schank is a Graduate Research Assistant and Joan Fulton is an Associate Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics

As consolidation and the industrialization of agriculture intensify, the food chain is experiencing significant structural changes. Increased concentration and increased vertical coordination are occurring as businesses in the agrifood sector are trying to increase efficiencies, relay information along the supply chain more quickly, and take advantage of profits at other stages of the food chain. Many agricultural producers are responding to the changing environment by cooperating with other producers to develop value-added businesses. One common organizational form that producers are using for the value-added business is the New Generation Cooperative.

This Internet Guide is intended to be a resource for locating electronically available information on New Generation Cooperatives. In the following sections we provide a brief explanation of the What, Why, Where, and How of New Generation Cooperatives, along with related references to publications and other information that is available on the internet.

What is a New Generation Cooperative?

New Generation Cooperatives (NGCs) are a relatively new cooperative structure. NGCs have particular characteristics that differentiate them from traditional agricultural cooperatives. These characteristics include: value-added processing of members’ commodities, a significant equity contribution by farmer members, obligation of product
delivery based on equity contribution, and the ability to trade equity shares and delivery rights. Two characteristics of NGCs that are similar to traditional cooperatives are: earnings based on member patronage and one-member, one-vote.

Fulton et. al. examine the growth and development of New Generation Cooperatives along with describing the structure of NGCs and the strengths and weaknesses of this form of business. This overview can be found at:


Other useful articles that provide an overview on New Generation Cooperatives include:


Why do Producers form New Generation Cooperatives?

There are many reasons why producers form a New Generation Cooperative.

Producers may individually be looking for the opportunity to increase their margins and thus their income, diversify their investment portfolio, reduce their risks, or increase their
market. In addition, producers may decide to form a NGC if their local processing plant closed and they needed somewhere to market their product. Another reason for forming a NGC is to increase or maintain the number of jobs in the local community.

Articles can be found on the following websites that describe some of the problems associated with traditional cooperatives along with an explanation of the emergence of NGCs.

http://www.ssu.missouri.edu/faculty/mcook/cv/finnish.pdf

http://www.agecon.ksu.edu/accc/kcdc/PDF%20Files/VALADD10%202col.pdf

Articles can be found on the following websites that provide further explanation concerning why individual producers would invest in a NGC:

http://www.ag.ndsu.nodak.edu/qbcc/BloomquistLectures/1999sinner.htm


http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/cobia.html

Articles on the following websites provide information concerning the economic benefits that communities enjoy when a NGC is established in the region:


http://agecon.lib.umn.edu/cgi-bin/pdf_view.pl?paperid=2225

http://www.americancooperation.org/Browse.htm
(Select 1996, Select the Article, it is located under Chapter 1)

**Where are New Generation Cooperatives being formed?**

The sugar beet producers of the Red River Valley, located on the North Dakota/Minnesota border pioneered the first NGC in the early 1970’s. However, the number of NGCs established has taken off only within the last decade. A large
proportion of these cooperatives are in Minnesota and North Dakota. However the concept of NGC can be applied in any area.

Directories of NGC can be found on the following sites:


http://www.agecon.ksu.edu/accc/kcdc/PDF%20Files/Kansas2.pdf

The following case studies of NGCs provide an overview of these new businesses:


http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/fra/carrington.pdf

University of Manitoba and Agri-Food Research Development Initiative. (1999) “New Generation Cooperatives on the Northern Plains” 
http://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/afs/agric_economics/ardi/index.html


**How is a New Generation Cooperative formed?**

A number of useful references are available for producers that are interested in determining what it takes to form a New Generation Cooperative.
USDA Rural Development – Cooperative Services has published numerous Cooperative Information Reports (in booklet format) dealing with establishing and operating a cooperative. These reports are just as relevant for New Generation Cooperatives as they are for traditional cooperatives. The following website lists all of the Cooperative Information Reports published by USDA:

http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/pub/cooprpts.htm

Selected Cooperative Information Reports, that are of particular interest to those organizing New Generation Cooperatives are listed below:


http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/pub/sr54/sr54.htm

Articles and reports at the following websites provide information on the formation and operation of New Generation Cooperatives:


http://www.ext.nodak.edu/extpubs/agecon/farmmgt/eb67w.htm

http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/develngen.html

Missouri Department of Agriculture. Agriculture Innovation Center. “A Checklist for Producers Starting a New Value-Added Business”

University of Manitoba and Manitoba Rural Adoption Council. “Forming a New Generation Cooperative in Manitoba”
http://www.umanitoba.ca/afs/agric_economics/MRAC/

http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/morris.html

http://www.iira.org/pubsnew/publications/IVARDC_Other_5.pdf

http://www.iira.org/pubsnew/publications/IVARDC_RRR_44.pdf

http://coop-studies.usask.ca/NGC2/DEVELGDE.pdf


http://www.americancooperation.org/Browse.htm
(Select 1996, Select the Article, it is located under Chapter 5)


http://www.wisc.edu/uwcc/info/i_pages/aquacul.html