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Executive Summary

The sixth global meeting of the Farmers’ Forum (FAFO) was held on 15 and 16 February 2016, in conjunction with the thirty-ninth session of the IFAD Governing Council. The meeting brought together almost 100 farmers’ leaders and representatives (of whom 40 per cent were women) representing millions of small-scale farmers, pastoralists, livestock breeders and fisher peoples in Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and the Middle East, for the purpose of exchanging views on the evolution of the partnership with IFAD. Also, as 2016 marked the 10th anniversary of FAFO, the global meeting provided an opportunity to assess the results of this unique dialogue and partnership process; and it set the stage for revisiting the Forum's purpose and modalities. Representatives from technical and financial partner institutions, and organizations that work with IFAD and farmers’ organizations (FOs) also attended the meeting as observers.

In line with the recommendations of the 2014 FAFO, the global meeting was preceded by a Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders (12 February), which produced a statement with recommendations for improving the partnership. Preparatory sessions were also held on 13 and 14 February at the initiative of FOs.

The Forum was opened by IFAD President Kanayo F. Nwanze; and introductory speeches were also made by farmers’ leaders members of the FAFO Steering Committee.

The first session of the FAFO global meeting was devoted to discussing the evolution of the collaboration between IFAD and FOs over the 2014-15 biennium and to further analyse how the cooperation has evolved during the 10 years of the FAFO process. Two reports fuelled the discussion: the “Autonomous Assessment of the Farmers’ Forum Process” the first one produced and written independently by FO members of the FAFO Steering Committee; and “Partnership in Progress: 2014-2015” written by IFAD.

The Autonomous Assessment was presented by Mamadou Goita on behalf of the FO members of the FAFO Steering Committee and aimed to evaluate the evolution of the FO-IFAD partnership, and the extent to which FAFO recommendations were being implemented. The assessment recognized and confirmed the importance of FAFO. Despite the progress and positive results achieved, challenges remain particularly in implementing the partnership at the national level. Based on the findings of the assessment, the following main recommendations were proposed: (i) redefine the FAFO vision, reaffirming its focus on family farming and small-scale producers; (ii) structure FAFO in two spaces with two governing structures (an autonomous space, steered by an Orientation Committee, and a dialogue space, including FOs, IFAD and other actors, guided by a Steering Committee with representatives from the Orientation Committee, IFAD and other actors; (iii) decentralize the process with a view to enhancing impact, particularly at the national level; (iv) put a mechanism in place for the monitoring and evaluation

1 The full list of participants is available in annex 2.
(M&E) of the FAFO recommendations made every two years by the participants to the FAFO global meetings.

IFAD also presented the report “Partnership in Progress: 2014-2015”, which traces the evolution of the FO-IFAD partnership and of how IFAD prepares an assessment every two years, from the IFAD perspective, on the evolution of the cooperation between IFAD and FOs. The quantitative analysis (carried out every two years since the first FAFO global meeting in 2006) shows that FO involvement in the formulation of IFAD country strategies is becoming the norm, with a steadily high level of participation since 2006 and an increase, over the last four years, of the quality of FO participation in the design of IFAD’s country strategies. The quantitative analysis was then complemented with a qualitative analysis on the partnership as it currently exists in 20 selected countries, which revealed four types of country-level partnership between IFAD and FOs, according to the quality of FO involvement. The qualitative analysis revealed that quality of the country-level partnership is dependent upon: (i) the quality involvement of FOs in the definition of IFAD country strategy; (ii) the strengths and representativeness of national FOs at country level; (iii) openness of national governments in engaging in genuine collaboration; (iv) FOs’ capacity in delivering economic services to members.

Direct financing to FOs has grown steadily over the decade; and regional programmes for FO capacity-building, such as the Support to Farmers’ Organizations in Africa Programme (SFOAP) and the Medium-Term Cooperation Programme (MTCP), are the main instruments for providing direct support to FOs.

The 2016 FAFO gave pride of place to discussion and debate on specific issues reflecting the current and future state of the FO-IFAD partnership. Four thematic working groups were held on 15 February, to discuss smallholders and markets, climate change and agroecology, women and youth, and the future of FAFO, respectively. On 16 February, five regional working group sessions were organized to discuss the status of the collaboration and the way forward in the different regions in which IFAD works.

Based on the discussions and contributions made in the debates, the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO, including recommendations to improve the FO-IFAD partnership, was adopted by the FOs representatives and discussed with IFAD Management during a plenary session, which was also attended by several members of the IFAD Governing Council.

A number of side events were also organized by IFAD, FOs and other partners on 18 and 19 February, covering the following themes: (i) follow-up to the 2014 Special Session on Small Scale Fisheries; (ii) SFOAP and MTCP knowledge sharing; (iii) IFAD knowledge management tools to improve the partnership with FOs; (iv) the experience of Italian cooperatives; (v) family farming policies in Latin America and the Caribbean; (vi) the next steps for FAFO; (vii) the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) +10; (viii) participatory guarantee systems (PGSS); (ix) findings from FAFO thematic groups; (x) the value and role of agricultural research for development and innovation; (xi) the economic activities of farmers’ organizations; (xii) the experience of the Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA Africa) programme in promoting local food procurement.

On February 19, a summary FAFO Statement was presented to the IFAD Governing Council by Elizabeth Mpofu, on behalf of the participants to the 2016 global meeting of the FAFO.
Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders
Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders

Introduction. Based on the outcomes and recommendations of the 2014 FAFO Global Meeting, a Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders was organized at IFAD headquarters on February 12. This was attended by 18 representatives from pastoralist and livestock breeders’ organizations from the five continents, along with several members of the FAFO Steering Committee, IFAD staff, representatives from Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF), and a number of selected observers.

The event was preceded by a regional consultation between pastoralists and livestock breeders which took place between end of 2015 and beginning of 2016 in Africa (three consultations covering also the Middle East region), Asia (one consultation) and Latin America (one consultation), to discuss opportunities and challenges for pastoral development and to feed the global consultation, i.e. the Special Session, on the basis of regional priorities and needs. The regional consultation process was supported by IFAD and facilitated by VSF.

Opening of the session. The session was opened and chaired by Djibo Bagna, President of the Réseau des organisations paysannes et de producteurs agricoles de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (ROPPA) and member of the FAFO Steering Committee. Following the opening of the session, participants made introductory remarks.

Carline Mainenti, President of VSF-International, wished everyone a productive and interesting working session. Antonio Rota (IFAD Lead Technical Specialist – Livestock) stressed the importance of the Special Session and the value that IFAD places on pastoralists and livestock breeders, which explains its commitment to supporting the consultation processes in the five continents. He also emphasized that pastoralism is not only about livestock production, but also concerns culture, access to basic human rights, and the protection of the environment and genetic resources. He also recognized the importance of pastoralism in terms of its contribution to nutrition and food security. He confirmed IFAD’s commitment to helping pastoralists and livestock breeders meet the challenges they face.

Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD Lead Technical Specialist – Producers Organizations and Rural Development) briefly outlined the history and background of the FAFO process, as well as its main goals and modes of operation. In particular, he stressed the relevance of having a dialogue space to enable farmers to help IFAD do its work more effectively. He further explained the rationale for the organization of FAFO special sessions to allow expression and debate on specific farmer constituencies (e.g. women, youth, small-scale fish workers, pastoralists and livestock breeders). As an output from the special sessions, a statement is prepared for inclusion in the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO.

3 The full report of the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders is available in annex 3.
4 They included: Estrella Penunia Banzuela (Asian Farmers’ Association for Sustainable Rural Development – AFA), Edgardo Garcia (Asociación de Trabajadores del Campo – ATC), Fernando Lopez (Confederación de Organizaciones de productores Familiares del Mercosur – COPROFAM), Elizabeth Mpofu (La Via Campesina – LVC) and Elisabeth Atangana (Plateforme Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d'Afrique Centrale – PROPAC).
Following the presentation of the participants and observers, the agenda was discussed and approved; and a statement by the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP) was read as a proposed new agenda item.

The consultation process. Margherita Gomarasca, Coordinator at VSF-International, gave a presentation on the consultation process, illustrating the three key elements and stages as follows: (i) a mapping of pastoralist organizations and stakeholders that made it possible to identify 441 organizations; (ii) surveys of pastoralist practices at the household/community level in eight pastoral territories (315 households surveyed), on policy measures that affect pastoralism at the country level (26 countries surveyed), and on the enabling environment (e.g. availability of services and institutional support); (iii) six regional meetings held in January 2016, which, among other things, made it possible to produce a statement for FAFO and to select regional delegates to the 2016 Special Session.

The presentation was followed by comments from the participants. Some of them pointed out that several key aspects were poorly or incompletely taken into account (e.g. land management issues), and that the main focus of the process seemed to be on pastoralism compared to extensive livestock breeding. Others noted that policies were often very poorly adapted to pastoralism, and that the agroecological complementarity of all areas should be considered (e.g. pastoralist policies in the Sahel should also indirectly involve coastal areas). The need to pay special attention to women and youth was also stressed. Finally, the low level of involvement and visibility of WAMIP in the overall consultation processes was noted.

The regional consultations. Delegates from pastoralist and livestock breeder organizations summarized the main outcomes of the regional consultations and identified the key priorities for investments, policy engagement and partnership with IFAD.

The areas identified for priority investment included pastoralist field schools, community-based tourism, empowerment of youth and women, rangeland management, capacity-building for pastoralists and their organizations, infrastructure, access to markets, natural resource management and climate change, access to credit and financial services, knowledge management and the capitalization of experiences and health services.

In terms of policy engagement, the key needs were to: (i) foster policy dialogue between governments and social movements, including pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder movements; (ii) promote policies and international legislation to facilitate cross-border mobility by pastoral and other nomadic peoples; (iii) ensure the effective application of international instruments and mechanisms to protect the rights of indigenous pastoralist communities and to recognize and respect pastoralists’ customary laws, customary institutions and leadership, common

5 Of these: 32 are in Asia; 128 in West and Central Africa; 81 in the Near East and North Africa; 170 in East and Southern Africa; and 30 in Latin America and the Caribbean.
6 In the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Mali, Mongolia, Kenya, Niger and Tunisia.
7 Munkhborj Gungaa (WAMIP, Mongolia) for Asia; Benjamin Mutambukah (Coalition of Pastoralist Civil Society organisations – COPACSO, Uganda) for East and Southern Africa; Dodo Boureima (Réseau Billital Maroobé – RBM, Niger) and Ibrahima Aliou (Association of Livestock Breeders of the Sahel and Savanna – APESS, Cameroon) for West and Central Africa; Said Fagouri (Association Nationale Ovine et Caprine – ANOC, Morocco) and Sarah Hatim (Al Massar, Sudan) for North Africa and the Middle East; Maria Teresa Álvarez (Redes Chaco, Pastoraméricas, Argentina) and Higinio Porto (rural producer, Peru) for Latin America.
property rights and customary governance and use of natural resources; (iv) create a pastoralist community communication platform for knowledge sharing; (v) support data collection and analysis on pastoralism and livestock breeding to analyse their specific economic contributions; (vi) support the implementation of free prior and informed consent in all projects involving pastoralists.

As far as the partnership with IFAD is concerned, participants stressed the importance of engaging pastoralist associations in the design, steering and implementation of IFAD projects and strategies. Capacity-building in pastoralist organizations was considered crucial for increasing their possibilities for collaboration with governments and IFAD. Participants also called on IFAD to promote the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), and to develop a policy in support of pastoralism. Finally, a request was made to include representatives of pastoralist alliances on the FAFO Steering Committee.

**IFAD-FAO joint evaluation synthesis.** Oscar A. Garcia (Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD – IOE) and Catrina Perch (Evaluation Officer – IOE) presented key findings and recommendations from an IFAD-Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) joint evaluation synthesis undertaken to review the experience of the two organizations in terms of pastoral development, based on a review of pre-existing evaluation reports. The main findings from the joint evaluation synthesis included the following: (i) pastoralism is considered relevant to the IFAD and FAO mandates to promote food and nutritional security, and improved livelihoods; (ii) poor understanding of pastoral systems meant that support often focused on encouraging a move away from pastoralism or supporting sedentary activities; (iii) efforts to reduce poverty and hunger through pastoral development were moderately satisfactory; (iv) projects generally paid little attention to risks; (v) many projects operated under the received wisdom that rangeland degradation was caused by an imbalance between stocking rates and pasture availability, leading to overgrazing; (vi) positive results were achieved with community-based approaches (e.g. transhumance corridors, rangeland management committees); (vii) women were seldom targeted as livestock professionals.

The joint evaluation synthesis made four key recommendations. In particular, FAO and IFAD should: (i) put a pastoral development policy in place to help ensure a coherent conceptual framework and systematic direction; (ii) build and adapt capacity for systemic engagement in pastoral development; (iii) prepare a risk management and resilience strategy for every pastoral programme; (iv) support advocacy by, and on behalf of, pastoralists and people whose livelihoods depend on pastoral systems.

**Working group sessions.** A presentation on the value added and needs of pastoralism was made by Michele Nori (University of Florence); and a statement from WAMIP was read out, on the importance of its global alliance, offering
insights for further discussion in three working group sessions on the following key subjects: (i) investment priorities; (ii) policy dialogue; and (iii) partnership with IFAD.

The results of the working groups were also presented in the plenary session and included the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders, which is reproduced in box 1 below.  

---

**Box 1. Statement of the 2016 FAFO Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders**

We, the pastoralist and extensive livestock breeders representatives in the 6th global meeting of the Farmers’ Forum Special Session with Pastoralists and Extensive Livestock Breeders, representing the voices of millions of people from pastoralist communities worldwide, value the Farmers’ Forum process and acknowledge IFAD’s commitment to supporting the consultation processes organized in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which brought together over 200 representatives from 38 countries, to discuss our pressing issues, our needs, our demands and our proposals to improve our livelihoods.

Pastoralism is the main livelihood in many dryland, mountainous and other areas, where other forms of agricultural practices are impossible. Pastoralists contribute to efficient management, rangeland governance and the protection of natural resources. In such challenging territories, pastoralism is the best livelihood strategy for providing food, income and employment. This benefits not only pastoral communities, but all people living in farming areas, urban centres and coastal regions, who profit from regional trade and from the value chains of pastoral products. Pastoralism also provides essential ecosystemic services, such as carbon sequestration and biodiversity conservation.

Pastoralists rely on livestock mobility and communal land for their livelihoods. We use our traditional knowledge and land tenure systems to access rangeland, produce food and take advantage of market opportunities. Mobility is essential for our communities’ adaptability and resilience strategies for coping with climate variability and mitigating crisis situations. Pastoralist women play a crucial and increasing role in conflict resolution, cohesiveness, peace building and strengthening of food sovereignty.

Despite the many benefits of pastoralism, our communities are facing numerous challenges that threaten our ways of life. We suffer from socioeconomic, political, cultural and environmental marginalization; exclusion from political dialogue; unfair market and trade conditions; low levels of investment, resulting in limited access to primary services and basic infrastructure. We are subject to unfair policies that lead to the dispossession of land and natural resources, induced sedentarization and displacement. Demographic pressure, climate change and environmental degradation are harming our livelihoods and fuelling conflict, insecurity and migration among pastoralist youth. Frequently, investments are made in the name of the public interest and national development, but in practice directly and indirectly harm our livelihoods by appropriating land, water and other natural resources.

Pastoralism is more than livestock production; it is a way of life, a culture and an identity. Pastoralists are citizens; and our rights, culture and customary institutions should be recognized and respected. We call upon IFAD to recognize the uniqueness of our livelihoods that need specially tailored approaches and investments.

---

9 The drafting committee consisted of five regional delegates and three working group rapporteurs, with assistance from several VSF and IFAD staff. The committee worked on the evening of 12 February and the morning of 13 February, on the basis of the outcomes of the working groups, and delivered a draft statement. In the afternoon of 13 February, all of the 18 participants and several external observers from pastoralists’ organizations, met in the plenary session to discuss and validate the Final Statement in three languages.
Priority areas for investments for pastoralists and extensive livestock breeders

We call upon IFAD to directly invest in pastoralism asset development (human development, livestock and natural resources).

Promote key infrastructures in the sector and, in particular:

- Support the provision of sustainable water points in strategic locations for pastoralists and extensive livestock breeders. For instance promote renewable energies to make use of underground water for pasture and other activities;
- Construct, rehabilitate and maintain rural roads; secure pastoral corridors to improve rangeland accessibility and mobility;
- Invest in infrastructures/units and innovative technologies for grass/fodder production, livestock product processing and value added.

Facilitate pastoralists’ access to economic services for value chain development:

- Support access to inputs for livestock production: veterinary services, nutrition, advisory services, etc.
- Promote the accessibility and marketing of pastoralist and extensive livestock breeders’ products at all levels: local, national, regional and international markets;
- Promote inclusive and coordinated cross-border services in areas such as animal health, epidemi-surveillance, early warning systems, value chain development and market information systems.

Support capacity building and institutional strengthening, especially targeting women and youth:

- Support vocational training and mobile learning programmes for pastoralists;
- Support the development of alternative and complementary income-generating activities, especially those promoting traditional knowledge and practices (artisan handicrafts, off-farm activities, eco-tourism/community-based tourism, production, processing and marketing of medicinal plants);
- Support the linkages of pastoralists and extensive livestock breeder organizations from local to international level;
- Support business and management skills, especially for women and youth;
- Document and promote the use of traditional/indigenous pastoralist knowledge and know-how on plants, breeds, ethno-veterinary medicine, etc.

Support social services adapted to mobile livelihoods:

- Provide and improve access to financial services (saving, credit, insurance, etc.);
- Provide adequate and appropriate health care, formal and informal education services for nomadic communities (mobile clinics, etc.);
- Promote social protection and safety-net programmes;
- Support information and communication technologies, such as mobile, landline phones and radio stations.

Youth and gender: Women and young pastoralists should be targeted, to empower them and strengthen their access to resources, training and leadership within their organizations.

Priority areas for IFAD to facilitate policy dialogue, advocacy and other policy initiatives in support of pastoralists and extensive livestock breeder organisations

During the Special Session with Pastoralists and Extensive Livestock Breeders at the Farmers’ Forum 2016, we, the pastoralist and extensive livestock breeders representatives hereby make specific recommendations to IFAD regarding the priorities in policy dialogue to create an enabling environment for pastoral development.
We urge IFAD to develop a policy on pastoralism also in line with the recommendations made by FAO and IFAD in their *Engagement in Pastoral Development: Joint Evaluation Synthesis*. This policy is needed because pastoralism requires a specific approach, since it is not only an economic activity but also a way of life based on a rich heritage of traditional/indigenous knowledge, culture and ownership. This policy should include special arrangements regarding women and should be gender-responsive and inclusive at all levels. The policy should also be developed within a broader human rights framework. Through its investment projects and directly through grants, IFAD should reinforce the institutional capacities and governance of pastoralist organizations in policy dialogues at the local, national, regional and global levels, through adapted legislations for pastoralists and extensive livestock breeders, and the creation and reinforcement of enabling platforms for policy making in conjunction with governments and regional institutions.

IFAD should continue to implement its policy on improving land access and tenure security, focusing specially on the security and tenure of pastoralist communal land and the governance of natural resources. Particular attention should be paid to cross-border movement, mobility and conflict in these areas. In so doing, the operational principles of “free prior and informed consent” should be systematically applied in all investment projects and programmes.

**Inclusion of pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder organizations at different stages of IFAD business model**

Pastoralism is a core issue for IFAD; and the Fund’s mandate requires pastoralist issues to be mainstreamed into various thematic areas. We therefore call upon the Steering Committee of the Farmers’ Forum to respect the principle of inclusiveness, as defined in the Farmers’ Forum Consensus of 2005; and to include WAMIP and other global and regional pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder networks as members of the Steering Committee, and involve these alliances in other national, regional and global policy and decision-making processes. We also request IFAD to include a technical specialist on pastoralism on its staff.

We call on IFAD to inform pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder organizations, on a timely and systematic basis, on the timeframe and process involved in preparing IFAD’s country strategies (country strategic opportunities programs [COSOPs]) and investment projects, to enable them to effectively participate. COSOPs should be based on a participatory assessment of social, economic and cultural aspects and livelihoods of pastoralist communities.

We call on IFAD to promote systematic gender-balanced participation and representation of pastoralists and livestock breeder organizations in the activities its country programme management teams, and in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IFAD investment projects and programmes.

In a tripartite arrangement between IFAD, governments and pastoralists and extensive livestock breeder organisations, we recommend participation in the implementation of IFAD investment projects and programmes to strengthen pastoralism and extensive livestock breeding in harmony with nature.

While recognizing that IFAD’s mandate is to work at the national level in each country, we urge it to adapt its working modality to tackle the cross-border dimension of pastoralism and include the trans-boundary aspects of genetic resources, security, animal diseases, trade and climate change.

This statement expresses the needs and priorities of pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder organizations worldwide. We acknowledge IFAD’s consultation efforts in listening to our voices. We urge that our requests be heard and lead to actions on behalf of sustainable pastoralism. We are fully committed to contributing to and participating in IFAD programmes.

Despite the many myths about pastoralists, we would like to take this opportunity to state very clearly that we are not the problem but an essential part of the solution.
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Preparatory sessions were held on February 13 and 14 at the initiative of the FOs involved in the Farmers’ Forum. These included two meetings of the FAFO Steering Committee, two meetings of the FOs members of the FAFO Steering Committee, and regional meetings among FO delegates.

The main objective of these preparatory sessions was for FOs to discuss and debate the major challenges facing the Forum, make advance preparations to ensure more effective participation in the Forum meetings, and validate the Statement issued by the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders.
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The sixth global meeting of FAFO was officially opened on February 15 and chaired by Djibo Bagna, member of the FAFO Steering Committee, in his capacity as the President of ROPPA.

The meeting was addressed by IFAD President Kanayo F. Nwanze, who expressed the hope that all participants, particularly those attending the global meeting for the first time, would find the Forum as enriching, empowering and informative as so many had in the past.

He also highlighted the benefits deriving from the FO-IFAD partnership under the FAFO process, with the common goal of promoting smallholder agriculture and empowering poor rural people. While recalling the nature of IFAD, as a financial organization operating with governments of Member States, he stressed how the relation with FOs through FAFO has tremendously improved and enriched IFAD’s work, as well as the impact and relevance of its interventions during the last decade. FO participation in the formulation of IFAD country strategies and programmes, and in the implementation of IFAD-funded projects, was hailed as a key achievement of the partnership.

The IFAD President also referred to the important results being obtained from the direct support being provided to FOs for capacity building (e.g. through regional programmes such as SFOAP and MTCP), and to successful FO experiences of policy dialogue at the local, national and global levels, supported through the FAFO process.

Lastly, he stressed how, under the IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025, IFAD is moving towards greater decentralization to help achieve the common vision of a bottom-up dialogue rooted in partnerships on the ground.

He concluded his opening address by thanking participants for adding value to IFAD with their knowledge, ideas and innovations; and he looked forward to the
Box 2. Excerpt from the opening address by the President of IFAD at the sixth Global Meeting of the Farmers' Forum.

(…) Ten years ago, IFAD stuck to the letter of its mandate. We were an international financial institution; and we belonged to, and worked for, national governments. In other words, our relationship with producer organizations was one-step removed.

Imagine trying to connect with the soil through a pair of gloves. You can’t do it. You need to feel it with your bare hands.

It was a huge step for IFAD to connect directly with producer organizations; but the relationship has enriched our work tremendously. I hope the same is true for you.

(…) Back in 2006, we had a common vision of this Forum as a process to connect IFAD and producers – from the grassroots to policy dialogue at the highest levels. We’re not completely there yet. But with your help, we will arrive.

Our efforts at inclusiveness across the spectrum have led to one of our most important achievements. National farmer associations now participate in the formulation of our country strategies. In many cases, national or local organizations are involved in the design of IFAD-funded projects. And they help us make the most of opportunities in the countries where we work. (…) Your input has clearly enhanced the relevance and impact of IFAD operations. In some cases, three-way agreements have empowered producers’ organizations at the policy level as well. (…) The Farmers’ Forum deserves credit for these achievements.

(…) Another notable achievement is directly related to the strength of your own voice. From the outset, you wanted IFAD to provide direct support to farmers and rural producers’ organizations. I’m proud that we have considerably increased this direct funding (…). The Medium-Term Cooperation Programme with farmers’ organisations in Asia (MTCP) and the Support to Farmers’ Organizations in Africa Programme (SFOAP) are both in their second phase. We’re eager to hear your thoughts about their relevance and impact.

Let me also mention the results of the special sessions held on women, youth, small-scale fisheries and now pastoralism. In each case, the special sessions voiced the specific needs and aspirations of a distinct constituency of the rural people we are working with. In each case, they have enriched the Forum’s statements to the Governing Council; and in each case, they have triggered new approaches or projects on the ground.

Lastly, the Farmers’ Forum has helped build our capacity – and yours as well – to influence national, regional and global policy. Specifically, it has helped us both ensure the interests of smallholders are heard at the highest levels. As examples, I would mention the Guidelines on Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries, the Rio+20 Conference, and the International Year of Family Farming. I look forward to continuing our work with you on these, and other processes.

(…) As we get “bigger, better and smarter”, we are counting on the Farmers’ Forum to help us achieve results. (…)
other actors); and he underlined IFAD’s importance while recognizing the value of FO interventions.

Edgardo García also stressed the importance of the virtuous circle that characterized the alliance between IFAD, governments and other actors to confront and tackle poverty and the challenges of climate change. He stated that FOs were ready to move forward in this win-win partnership.

While thanking IFAD for 10 years of collaboration, Elizabeth Mpofu from Zimbabwe, General Coordinator of the international peasant movement, LVC, stressed the need to pool efforts to attain the common objectives that guided both FOs and IFAD.

Ibrahima Coulibaly, first Vice-President of ROPPA, described FAFO as a “revolutionary initiative” for direct dialogue between IFAD and FOs. He added that, after 10 years, FOs were proud of the journey thus far, although mindful that there was still a long road to travel. In particular, the quality of the work accomplished at the global level needed to be more effectively translated into regional and national initiatives. Similarly, achievements by the regional networks of FOs, in terms of participation in regional policy dialogue, should lead to projects and programmes being implemented in the different regions. He concluded by expressing the wish that, as a result of the meeting, partners would make a qualitative pact to make a reality of the original goal of putting smallholders at the core of projects and programmes.

Fernando López, Secretary General of the Confederación de Organizaciones de productores Familiares del Mercosur (COPROFAM) noted that the REAF Commission on Family Farming (REAF) was a practical example of how to build dialogue for the design of public policies supporting smallholder farmers. He also stressed that, despite the progress made, much remained to be done to improve the linkages between governments, IFAD and FOs at all levels. He expressed his hope that this sixth edition of the FAFO global meeting would propose concrete solutions in that regard.

Herman Kumara Wijethunga, delegate of the World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP) and Convener of the National Fisheries Solidarity Movement (NFSM), of Sri Lanka, referred to the challenges faced by farmers, not only in terms of fighting poverty, unemployment and the devastating effects of climate change, but also in surviving from the criminalization of their actions in protests at government decisions. He stressed that FAFO is a fundamental space for FOs to come together and raise their voices in pursuit of shared solutions.
The important contribution of small-scale fishers to food nutrition and poverty alleviation against the poor support and understanding of fishers needs at the local, national and international levels was pointed out by Ujjaini Halim, Treasurer of the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers (WFF). She said that the sector employed an estimated 37 million people in both fishing and fish farming, of whom 90 per cent are in Asia. Many of these fishers and fish workers were women and young people; and their contribution went under-recognized. She thanked IFAD for the support provided for FOs’ participation in the process of negotiating the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (the SSF Guidelines), and for disseminating them at different levels. The speaker also emphasized how the 2014 Special Session on Small-Scale Fisheries, and FAFO itself, are great opportunities for making grassroots voices heard on macro platforms.

Theo De Jager, President of the Pan-African Farmers’ Organization (PAFO) and of the Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions (SACAU) shared the experience of the PAFO as a continental platform enabling FOs to pool efforts to combat poverty in rural Africa.

Ms Ujjaini Halim (WFF) emphasized the relevance of the FAFO

“FAFO is such a platform of small scale producers where all of us have the opportunity to share our experiences, to learn from each other and to also interact to come up with a strong action plan for the way forward. I believe that in next few days all of us will have very constructive interaction and dialogue together with (…) IFAD colleagues and we will be able to come up with strong recommendations (…) in order to strengthen small scale producers (…) and small scale fishers.”

Mr Theo De Jager (PAFO) shared the experience of farmer associations in Africa

“We represent some of the poorer farmers in the world but (…) we also represent some of the best commercial value chains driven by farmers on the continent and our vision is to ensure that within our life time we will bring hunger and poverty on the continent to an end.”
Estrella Penunia, Secretary General of the *Asian Farmers’ Association for Sustainable Rural Development (AFA)* retraced the main elements and steps in the FAFO process from 2005 to 2016. She recalled the definition of “farmer organization” involved in FAFO, as indicated in the 2008 FAFO Statement; and she reaffirmed the important identity of the process in terms of its mission and goals, features and operating principles. After five global meetings, she urged participants “to look back at what was achieved, what was partially achieved and what was not achieved at all” as a basis for moving forward and improving the partnership, particularly at the national level.

She went on to emphasize the achievement of MTCP and the relevance of sharing experiences with SFOAP, to improve the management of the programme and enhance the capacity of FOs to deliver services by learning from peers.

She also stressed the importance of the strategic partnership between IFAD and FOs in international policy dialogue (e.g. within the context of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) or during the IYFF.

In his closing remarks, the Chair summarized the main issues and challenges to be addressed by the FAFO process, including the need to: (i) have an autonomous space for dialogue for FOs and a vehicle for dialogue with IFAD; (ii) set up an M&E framework to monitor the implementation of FAFO recommendations; (iii) decentralize the process to bring it closer to the base and renovate; (iv) involve governments also at the local level; (v) improve synergies within IFAD projects and programmes, and also in other mechanisms such as the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), to defend the vision of smallholder farmers; (vi) target support on capacity building for FO leaders, to enable them to effectively defend their vision and priorities; (vii) improve communication and the sharing of experiences between IFAD and FOs.

IFAD President, Kanayo Nwanze, closed the Opening Session by thanking speakers for their contributions and reaffirming his appreciation of such a unique dialogue space.
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Part I: Presentation of the Autonomous Assessment

The first plenary session of the global meeting was chaired by Herman Kumara (WFFP), who, after validating the agenda, invited Mamadou Goita to present the Autonomous Assessment of the Farmers’ Forum Process and the implementation of recommendations made to IFAD, in his role as facilitator of the process.

Mamadou Goita, briefly described the objectives and methodology of the assessment, and he summarized the main findings and recommendations, as detailed below.

Objectives. The assessment aimed to evaluate the evolution of the FO-IFAD partnership within FAFO, and the extent to which FAFO recommendations were being implemented by IFAD. Based on the analysis, recommendations on how to improve the functioning and performance of FAFO were proposed.

Methodology. The process comprised three main stages: (i) analysis and review of FAFO-related documents; (ii) organization of interviews with farmers’ leaders, IFAD country-level staff and government officials in 10 countries for each region (Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa); and (iii) organization of three continental meetings in Jakarta (November 2015), Managua and Ouagadougou (December 2015), to discuss FAFO governance, results, perspectives and recommendations.

Main findings. The main findings of the assessment are summarized below:

- The importance of the FAFO space was recognized and confirmed as enabling significant progress in dialogue and mutual knowledge between IFAD and FOs, as well as between FOs from different countries and regions;
- FAFO effectiveness and capacity to improve projects and programmes. There were challenges in identifying which results were attributable to FAFO and which to other initiatives and dynamics. An analysis of the level of implementation of all FAFO recommendations revealed several positive outcomes (e.g. the launch of regional programmes of direct support for FO capacity-building, such as SFOAP and MTCP. This also resulted in improved dialogue between national and regional FOs; and participation by FOs in mechanisms for programming and steering IFAD-funded projects).

10 The full document is available in annex 5.
Nonetheless, it also identified major persisting challenges and issues. In particular, many recommendations (e.g. the need to decentralize the process at the country level) remained outstanding owing to the lack of a mechanism to monitor their implementation;

- **Governance.** Although FAFO is relevant, it needs to be redesigned to better structure and institutionalize an autonomous space of dialogue between FOs. Consultations from this space would feed the dialogue with IFAD and other participants in the global meeting.

**Main recommendations.** Three groups of recommendations were produced in the three regions. These were merged by the FOs’ representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee to produce 17 main recommendations including the following:

- **FAFO vision:** redefine the FAFO vision by affirming and better clarifying its strong focus on family farming and small-scale producers;
- **Governance and structuring:** (i) structure the Forum in two divisions with two governing structures (an autonomous space steered by an Orientation Committee and a dialogue space including FOs, IFAD and other agricultural development actors, guided by a Steering Committee with representatives from the Orientation Committee, IFAD and other actors; and (ii) decentralize the process to improve its impact particularly at the national level;
- **Role of women and youth:** reaffirm the role of women and youth, and work towards 50 per cent female participation and 30 per cent youth participation in both FAFO-related events and FAFO governance;
- **Planning and programming:** (i) target support on FO capacity-building, to enable negotiation with governments on the design of projects and programmes; (ii) further support regional programmes where these are operating and expand them to other regions;
- **Monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management:** (i) put an M&E and knowledge management mechanism in place for all FAFO recommendations, to ensure that their conclusions can be identified and monitored in the different spaces; (ii) institutionalize periodic autonomous evaluations; and (iii) systematically share FAFO recommendations with IFAD Country Programme Managers (CPMs), to be used as a basis for negotiating with governments on the inclusion of FOs in IFAD-supported projects and programmes.

**Open discussion.** Following the presentation of the Assessment, the Chair invited contributions and comments from the participants. The main issues raised concerned the vision and principles of FAFO, governance issues, challenges in implementing FAFO recommendations and the need to establish M&E mechanisms.

Djibo Bagna (ROPPA) recalled the rationale for launching the Autonomous Assessment and stressed the need for a clearer vision for FAFO – namely to target family farming and small-scale agriculture as a key outcome from the Assessment. He added that this should be
considered a key criterion for the affiliation of organizations in the process. On this point, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) said that, although the definition or redefinition of the FAFO vision could be expressed more clearly, IFAD saw its vision as broadly the same as originally defined in 2005: it targets smallholder and family farmers and works to improve their livelihoods, dignity and political power. Based on the above, there was nothing to prevent IFAD from reaffirming this vision more clearly in the common agreement.

Theo De Jager (PAFO/SACAU) stressed the need to further clarify the proposed governance mechanisms and specify them in greater detail, particularly the criteria for admittance and participation in the proposed spaces and governance structures, and the accountability mechanisms. He also expressed concern and disagreement with the idea of having two distinct steering structures, which risked setting up first- and second-class groups of participants. He questioned the moral basis for excluding organizations that embrace small-, medium- and large-scale farmers, thus implying that smallholders in those organizations were less important than those organized in exclusive structures. His concerns were shared by Marco Marzano De Marinis, Secretary General of the World Farmers’ Organisation (WFO), who urged participants to keep the governance mechanism simpler and lighter.

Munkhborol Gungaa (WAMIP, Mongolia) thanked IFAD for putting pastoralism on the IFAD agenda, and she stressed the need for development partners to recognize organizations not just as recipients of support but as agents of change. In response to her request for IFAD to include pastoralists in the constituency of the steering mechanisms, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) pointed out that inclusion in the FAFO Steering Committee is collectively decided. He recalled, for example, that when the Intercontinental Network of Organic Farmers Organisations (INOFO) and WFO applied for inclusion on the Steering Committee in 2012, IFAD was in favour, but other members were not and wanted more time for discussion. He added that this is a process in which it takes time to build consensus.

Sayra Ticay, of ATC, drew participants’ attention to gender and youth participation in FAFO. She recalled that the commitment to have 50 per cent women and 30 per cent young people participating in FAFO had been under discussion since 2008. Nonetheless, the proportion of young people and women at the 2016 global meeting and on the FAFO Steering Committee was not encouraging. She also reminded participants that gender and youth issues should not be addressed merely in terms of specific spaces, but also in terms of resources allocated in recognition of their role and contributions.

While noting that the IFAD document had been received late, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) welcomed the positive evolution of the common FAFO process, as shown by the Autonomous Assessment. He also partially disagreed with some participants’ perception of the low rate of implementation of FAFO recommendations. He insisted that monitoring implementation is not about monitoring the implementation of FAFO recommendations (which could be accepted, not accepted, or partially accepted by
the IFAD Management), but instead the implementation of agreements. He proposed going beyond the recommendations to formalize monitorable agreements/action plans.

The Chair thanked Mamadou Goita and the FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee for the Assessment and their contribution to the discussion, and declared the session closed.

**Part II: Trends and developments in IFAD’s partnerships with farmers’ organizations**

The second part of the first Plenary Session was chaired by Ujjaini Halim (WFF). The practice in FAFO global meetings requires IFAD to present the report *Partnerships in Progress: 2014-2015* which analyses the evolution of the partnership in the biennium in question. It also takes stock of IFAD’s different experiences in collaborating with FOs investigating the modalities of the ongoing collaboration, and it highlights success stories and achievements.

Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) made an introductory comment to provide some background information. He clarified that the report was IFAD’s instrument for monitoring the extent to which the major FAFO recommendations were having an impact on the partnership, or not. Despite problems in attribution, which was difficult to analyse, some positive changes had taken place.

The contents of the presentation†† as delivered by Roberto Longo (IFAD Senior Technical Specialist – Farmers’ Organizations and Markets) are summarized below.

**Methodology.** Compared to the reports delivered to the Forum in earlier years, this 2016 report contained some novel features and news. The document was the outcome of:

- A qualitative analysis of the partnership as it exists in 20 selected countries,‡‡ through in-depth portfolio reviews, structured interviews with IFAD CPMs and with FO representatives;
- A quantitative analysis of: (i) participation by farmers’ organizations in IFAD country strategies and project design, through an analysis of 10 COSOPs and 60 projects approved in the biennium (90 per cent of all projects approved); (ii) the amounts of grants approved in the biennium. This quantitative analysis has been based on the same survey since 2005 and makes it possible to view trends over the last 10 years.

†† The full presentation is available in annex 6.
‡‡ Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, China, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, The Gambia, Guinea, Kenya, Madagascar, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Senegal, Uganda and Viet Nam.
Main trends in the design of IFAD strategies and projects. The main trends indicate that FOs’ participation in COSOP formulation is becoming the norm, with a consistently high level of participation since 2006. In the 2014-2015 biennium, this trend was confirmed with 88 per cent FO involvement in COSOP design. Moreover, for 2012-2013, another interesting trend was that FO involvement as “special players” (special stakeholders closely involved in the formulation process) had grown over the last 10 years from 55 per cent in 2006-2007 to 75 per cent in the last biennium. The quality of the partnership in project design has diminished however, thus confirming a declining trend that began in 2012, although the frequency of consultation remained high.

Direct financing to FOs. Direct financing to FOs has increased steadily over the decade; and all FO proposals for direct financing over the last four years were approved. In this context, regional programmes for capacity building in FOs, such as SFOAP and MTCP, are the key vehicles for providing direct support to FOs. Regional grants also enable IFAD to strengthen or develop key alliances with key stakeholders, to the benefit of FOs and their members, such as the European Union (EU), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Agence Française de Développement (AFD).

The FO-IFAD partnership in selected countries. The analysis identified four types of country-level partnership between IFAD and FOs. These were defined by the degree of comprehensiveness of the collaboration (strong, moderate, unbalanced and weak), and according to the quality and depth of FO involvement. The case of the National Programme to Support Agricultural Value Chain Actors (PNAFA) project in Guinea was shared as an example of a good partnership mode.

The findings from the analysis include:

- A higher quality/level of FO involvement in COSOP design results in stronger partnerships with better mutual understanding;
- The strength and representativeness of national FOs directly influences the depth/comprehensiveness of the partnership;
- The quality of engagement with national FOs also depends on government willingness;
- The type of collaboration in project implementation depends heavily on the capacity of FOs to deliver economic services to their members;
- There is a disconnect between support through regional grants and country-level cooperation.

Roberto Longo (IFAD) concluded the presentation by posing a few questions for participants to address concerning the way forward: How to scale-up best practices in collaboration? What are the boundaries of country-level collaboration? How to improve synergies between direct funding to FOs and IFAD country programmes? How to better monitor and evaluate the impact of partnerships?

Open discussion. Following the presentation from IFAD, the Chair opened the floor for discussion. Participants commented on the achievements and shortcomings of the partnership at the country level and proposed improvements.

The IFAD intervention on good models was complemented by a number of FO representatives who shared additional information on successful country experiences, such as the Agricultural Value Chains Support Project (PAFA) in
Senegal and, once again, the PNAFAA in Guinea. Hadja Fatoumata Noumou Camara, from Artisans de Guinée, urged IFAD to keep supporting initiatives of this kind, in which FOs are key players, and to extend them to other countries.

Other speakers focused on the challenges faced by FOs when partnering IFAD at the country level. Mahamadou Fayinkeh, President of the National Coordinating Organization for Farmers Association in The Gambia (NACOFAG) claimed that entrenched conditionalities prevented FOs from accessing the matching grant setup in his country. Annick Sezibera, Executive Secretary of the Confédération des Associations des Producteurs Agricoles pour le Développement (CAPAD) pointed out that the involvement of FOs and the depth of the partnership often depended on the willingness and sensitivity of IFAD staff in the countries. Changes in the composition of the teams could sometimes put all past efforts on reset. This risked disrupting the continuity of collaborative work, and undermining the possibility of building on the experiences and progress achieved in the partnership. She asked IFAD to ensure progress, good practices and experiences could be made durable within a sustainable dialogue mechanism.

A number of additional comments considered the need to learn from the positive experiences of FO participation in COSOP design, as mentioned by Julie Matovu Nakalanda, East Africa Convener of INOFO from Uganda.

Moises Osorto Caceres, from the Asociación de Pescadores Artesanales del Golfo de Fonseca (APAGOLF) in Honduras asked IFAD to include artisanal fishery, and not just small-scale fishery, as a sector to be supported by IFAD-funded projects. Artisanal fishers actually make an important contribution to food security while facing the same challenges as described by the other speakers.

Lastly, Maria Teresa Álvarez from Redes Chaco, Pastoraméricas (Argentina) asked IFAD to explain how it monitors investments to achieve the goal of benefiting smallholders.

Roberto Longo (IFAD) provided some feedback and responded to participants’ interventions. He pointed out that improving access to IFAD financing entailed establishing a genuine partnership between IFAD, FOs and governments, mainly when the country strategy was being formulated, since that was when all parties got to know each other, and strengths and weakness were identified. He stressed that the key success factor in Guinea was effective subsidiarity in terms of the roles of the national FO (e.g. on advocacy, technical assistance, knowledge management) and their members involved in value chains at the grassroots level. He added that IFAD Management was aware of the challenges and was committed to enhancing engagement with FOs to make the partnership more systematic according to possibilities.

The Chair thanked IFAD for the informative presentation and declared the session closed.
Part III: Presentation of the Statement from the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders

The final part of the morning plenary session consisted of feedback from the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders. This was introduced by Ujjaini Halim (WFF), who invited Munkhbolor Gungaa, on behalf of the participants to the Special Session, to read the Statement from the Special Session (the full statement is available on box 1 of this report).

After that, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) noted that many of the points raised were well targeted on IFAD. He thanked VSF as a key partner in facilitating consultation processes in the different regions, leading to the organization of the 2016 Special Session. He also asked the Drafting Committee to select a few key points for inclusion in the FAFO Statement to be communicated to the Governing Council.

Before closing the session, the Chair described the main objectives of the four working groups that would meet later, and he asked delegates to distribute themselves among them.
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Four thematic working groups were organized on 15 February; their outcomes would also be included in the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO during a meeting of FOs delegates to be held later.

The following parallel working groups were organized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG no.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Farmer organization speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Which markets work for smallholders? Learning from FOs and IFAD experiences in connecting smallholders to markets</td>
<td>Italian Conference Room</td>
<td>Fernando López COPROFAM</td>
<td>Javier Sanchez (LVC), Nadjiou Sall (ROPPA), Elizabeth Mpofu (LVC), Philip Kiriro (EAFF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Smallholders and climate change: how to mainstream agroecological approaches for adaptation and mitigation</td>
<td>Oval Conference Room</td>
<td>Herman Kumara WFFP</td>
<td>Renaldo Chingore João (UNAC), Smita Bhatnagar (SEWA), Ibrahima Coulibaly (ROPPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Working together to promote the rights of women and youth in agricultural development: follow-up to the Special Session on Women in Agriculture (2010) and Special Session on Youth in Agriculture (2012)</td>
<td>Conference Room C500</td>
<td>Elizabeth Atangana Plateforme Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d’Afrique Centrale – PROPAC</td>
<td>Esther Penunia (AFA), Sayra Ticay (ATC), Serenia Senikavika Madigibul (PIFON), Nery Caceres (ONAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improving the functioning of the Farmers’ Forum</td>
<td>Conference Room C600</td>
<td>Djibo Bagna ROPPA</td>
<td>Ujjaini Halim (WFF) and Edgardo García (LVC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main issues addressed and the recommendations that emerged from each working group are summarized on the next page.
Group #1: Which markets work for smallholders? Learning from FOs and IFAD experiences in connecting smallholders to markets

**Chair/Moderator:** Fernando López (COPROFAM, Uruguay)

**FO speakers:** Javier Sanchez (LVC, Spain), Nadjirou Sall (Secretary General of ROPPA, Senegal), Elizabeth Mpofu (LVC, Zimbabwe), Philip Kiriro (President of EAFF, Kenya)

1. Introduction

**Objective.** Work is ongoing in the CFS on the topic “Connecting Smallholders to Markets” in which both FOs and IFAD are participating. Substantial evidence has been collected to show that territorial, internal, informal markets are the main channels for the food consumed in the global south, and they are expanding in Europe and North America. Yet there is a serious data gap on these markets, which makes them “invisible” to policy-makers who tend to favour “modern” food supply and retail chains, in which small-scale producers are at a disadvantage.

The group had access to the contribution prepared by small-scale producers for the “zero draft” of the policy recommendations to be negotiated in Rome in June.

**Guiding questions.** The main questions to be addressed by the working group included:

- What are the key challenges facing markets that are beneficial to small-scale producers, building on small-scale producers’ experience?
- What types of public policies are needed to defend these markets and help them meet the growing demand for food?
- What can IFAD and FOs do together to promote these markets and policies?

2. Farmer organization speakers’ interventions

Following the opening of the working group by the Chair, FO speakers provided initial inputs and contributions to fuel the discussion.

They firstly described the chief characteristics of territorial markets, and then outlined the main market access challenges faced by smallholder farmers and producers.

In addition, several experiences, instruments and strategies for addressing those challenges were shared. Philip Kiriro (EAFF) described his federation’s experience in addressing the challenges and opportunities of market expansion, and particularly the regional market within the East African Community. He argued that such expanded markets required greater organization, professionalization and infrastructure, and have regional standards that small farmers could not meet. EAFF strategy and action to enable farmers to be competitive in that market was based on two main pillars: FO and policy engagement. According to Philip Kiriro, it was only through association that smallholder farmers and producers could gain power, negotiate profitable markets, mitigate post-harvest losses, and seek partnership to add value. EAFF supports producer cooperatives as the ideal model. He added that EAFF been participating in a process to develop a regional law on cooperatives that would be crucial in enabling cooperatives to connect with the
regional market, take advantage of regional trade and gain more power in the market place.

Javier Sanchez (LVC) stressed public procurement as an extremely important market for smallholders. He suggested that initiatives, such as already supported by IFAD, should be empowered and promoted, not only because local production is closer, but because it is linked to the culture of the territory and is crucial to the profitability of small-scale farmers and producers.

In conclusion, the FO speakers emphasized that, as territorial markets were the main source of food consumed in the global south, they had to be supported through specific public policies and regulatory instruments. Such policies should be devised on a transparent and inclusive basis, involving smallholders and their organizations. At the international level, FO participation would be a key factor for finalizing the inputs of the Civil Society Mechanism for the zero draft on “Connecting Smallholders to Markets”.

3. Discussion

The Chair opened the floor for the discussion, and participants elaborated further on the market access challenges based on their experiences, and proposed possible solutions. The main elements of the discussion are summarized below.

**Which market for FOs?** There was a consensus on the need for FOs to focus firstly on territorial markets. In IFAD’s view, the type of market was not important, provided it offered fair prices to smallholders, who were an IFAD target group.

**Challenges identified.** Participants noted that farmers are the largest part of the population in many countries but they remain the poorest owing to the following main factors:

- **Lack of access to and availability of information and data on territorial markets** (e.g. as mentioned by FO representatives from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Togo and Uganda);
- **Poor access to land, land grabbing and ocean grabbing, and the privatization of beaches** (e.g. as mentioned by FO representatives from the United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda);
- **Shortage of infrastructure** (e.g. storage facilities, roads, electricity, water);
- **Challenges in raising productivity to improve product quality and competitiveness**: the high cost of farming inputs that directly impacts production costs; negative impact of chemicals on product quality; lack of mechanization; high post-harvest losses; low processing and value added; no access to proper packaging; the effects of climate change (e.g. as mentioned by FO delegates from the Philippines, Rwanda and Uganda);
- **Inadequate public funding and access to finance** with usually high interest rates on credits, such in Cambodia where loans for infrastructure and financing charge 3 per cent per month, i.e. 36 per cent per year;
- **Invasion of markets by large traders and middlemen**;
- **Weak capacities among farmers in various areas**: lack of bargaining skills to set contract prices and respect them; lack of solidarity and unity among farmers, preventing them from competing with middle men and the private sector;
- **Youth and gender**: accessing markets becomes even harder for vulnerable population groups such as women and youth;
Policy issues at the national and global levels.

- Entrenched rules, norms and standards are not adapted to small-scale and family farming. For example, Marisa Boschetti, Director of the Federación Agraria Argentina (FFA) reported that health and hygiene standards in Argentina were the same both for transnational enterprises and for small local companies or cooperatives;
- Lack of public policies for taxation specific to smallholder producers (e.g. in Uganda);
- Negative impact of international and bilateral agreements and regulations on local markets. Subramaniam Kannaiyan (General Secretary of the South Indian Coordination Committee of Farmers’ Movements – SICCFM) described how free trade was destroying local smallholder markets in his country. He mentioned that India has a public procurement policy and public distribution system enabling the Government to purchase directly from cooperatives. Around 600 million tons of food grains were procured, stored and distributed to poor people by the Government. At least 15 per cent of India’s 1.2 billion urban population and 70 per cent of its rural population gained access to food grains from this system. Unfortunately, since 1990, private companies had been able to compete with cooperatives. Similar negative impacts stemmed from the free trade agreement between India and the EU: in 1995 only 5 per cent of the country’s edible oil had been imported; today the figure was 60 per cent.

How to address challenges? Learning from IFAD and FO experiences. Participants recounted several positive experiences and initiatives to connect smallholder farmers to markets. Roberto Longo (IFAD) highlighted a number of IFAD-funded projects as practical examples of how IFAD can support FO initiatives and experiences (e.g. supporting structured markets with multi-stakeholder platforms in Uganda; promoting quality/certification of production reaching international markets in Sao Tome and Principe; facilitating linkages between FOs and the private sector in Madagascar).

FO representatives also shared other successful experiences in their countries. Mahamadou Fayinkeh (NACOFAG) described the case of The Gambia’s market information system, which had been developed to provide market information by sending an automatic SMS. Serge Bergstrøm, Chair of the Seychelles Farmers’ Association (SeyFA) showed how IFAD support channelled through SACAU had enabled SeyFA to create an enterprise to link FOs to buyers through a value-chain approach. The experience of a successful pilot project in organic production for international markets was described by Seu Rany, Chair of the Farmer and Nature Net (FNN).

What FOs should do to address the challenges identified. There was broad consensus among participants that the main response to the challenges identified involved the FO and collaboration. Association made it possible to pool production, thus improving both its quantity and its quality. Participants also agreed that the best model of FO was offered by cooperatives, which enabled them to be
recognized as relevant actors and to gain access to markets through bulking systems. Nonetheless, further capacity-building from the public sector and other actors such as IFAD was considered crucial, particularly to support FO and association at the different levels.

**What types of public policies to meet the needs of small farmers?** Participants agreed that FOs should engage in policy dialogue and advocacy for differentiated policies adapted to smallholders’ possibilities and markets. In particular, policies and regulations should:

- Invest in infrastructures (storage facilities, roads, electricity, water);
- Support product value added and quality improvement;
- Develop specific standards and norms for smallholder farmers’ products (e.g. participatory guarantee systems – PGSs);
- Provide instruments, such as information systems, adapted to smallholder farmers;
- Promote indigenous seeds and agroecology in family systems;
- Provide transparent seeds and agroecology in family systems;
- Develop transparent legal frameworks for contracts within public-private partnerships;
- Tighten the regulation of informal markets with some control from smallholder farmers;
- Provide opportunities for public procurement through farmers and their cooperatives.

**What joint actions should be taken by IFAD and small-scale producers to assist public policy?** In terms of IFAD support, the following key elements were identified:

- FOs need to develop innovations around association;
- FOs have a role to play in reaching out to the most vulnerable farmers;
- IFAD should provide institutional support and investments to FOs (including low-interest loans directly to cooperatives) on a long-term basis;
- IFAD should strengthen smallholder farmers within FOs for production and marketing;
- IFAD should continue supporting public procurement;
- IFAD should support knowledge management to promote the exchange of know-how between FOs and IFAD.

### 4. Conclusions and recommendations

FO speakers thanked and congratulated participants for the enriching discussion and summarized the key elements discussed. The main recommendations to IFAD, governments, regional institutions and United Nations agencies in collaboration with FOs, as adopted by the working group, are listed below.

- Promote political processes that are transparent and inclusive of smallholders and their organizations;
- Promote adapted public policies, paying special attention to market access for women and youth;
- Establish systems for collecting data on territorial markets;
- Develop appropriate credit systems emphasizing direct support to small-producer networks;
- Develop infrastructure (roads, processing plants and packaging for small-scale food, electricity, water) and community tools such as warehouses, seed banks, etc.;
- Strengthen small-farmer networks as informal cooperatives or producer associations, targeting women’s groups focused on processing and marketing;
- Develop appropriate rules and standards for small farmers, while guaranteeing the health of the consumer;
- Regulate public-private partnerships for sustainable markets;
- Strengthen the position of small-scale producers in the value chain (production, processing and marketing) and mastery of standards;
- Support governments in strengthening regional integration.

Group #2: Smallholders and climate change: how to mainstream agroecological approaches for adaptation and mitigation?

Chair / Moderator: Herman Kumara (WFFP, Sri Lanka)

FO speakers: Renaldo Chingore João (Community Development Officer of UNAC, Mozambique), Smita Bhatnagar (Senior Coordinator of SEWA, India), Ibrahima Coulibaly (ROPPA, Mali).

1. Introduction

The aim of the working group was to discuss agroecological approaches as a tool for mitigating the effects and impact of climate change, by building on small-scale producers’ experiences. The discussion was structured around the following three main questions:

- What opportunities does the challenge of climate change offer to promote agroecological approaches that build on small-scale producers’ experience?
- What are the obstacles to taking advantage of these opportunities?
- What can IFAD and FOs do together to overcome them?

2. FO speakers’ interventions

The session was opened by Herman Kumara (WFFP). The Chair gave the floor to FO speakers who provided initial inputs and contributions to fuel discussion around key issues. The speakers described various experiences in promoting agroecology in their respective countries.

Smita Bhatnagar (SEWA) presented the holistic approach adopted by her organization to ensure food and nutritional security using a combination of: (i) capacity-building interventions in areas such as farm planning and management, and locally run field schools; (ii) awareness-raising of rights and policies; (iii) technical support on soil health, organic farming, pest control services, low-cost greenhouse development and access to quality seeds and equipment (e.g. grain banks); (iv) risk mitigation measures and financial services with timely credit; and (v) market linkages and value-chain promotion (cotton and castor). The speaker also highlighted the main challenges faced by SEWA members (e.g. in terms of...
irregular farming patterns, unpredictable weather conditions, depletion of natural resources, unsustainable income, and poor output quality).

She also argued that, to ensure food and nutritional security, efforts should be made to: support climate resilient eco-friendly agriculture, bringing back traditional resilient varieties and crops into farming systems; use sustainable soil, crop and water management; and promote on-farm agroprocessing. In addition, she advocated for policies to address the risks taken by farmers through insurance schemes on crops. A good example of the marketing of weather-indexed agricultural insurance to smallholders was described, showing that it can be a tool for farmers and governments to manage risks and compensations.

Renaldo Chingore João (UNAC) stressed the importance of adopting agroecology to overcome drought and climate change; and he advocated for policies that recognize agroecology as a sustainable means of production. He also shared UNAC’s experience in creating a network of some 40 agroecology schools providing farmer-to-farmer training.

Ibrahima Coulibaly shared the experience of the Coordination Nationale des Organisations Paysannes du Mali (CNOP-M). A major challenge faced in Mali was that, apart from cotton, there were no advisory services for smallholders and it was challenging for FOs to provide services to enable their members to be competitive and independent from fertilizer companies. He also described the steps taken by his organization to promote agroecology as a solution to this challenge. In particular, 150 farmer-trainers had been selected to provide mass training on advanced agroecological techniques in farmer field schools. He also reported that an agroecology campaign had been launched on radio to raise awareness of the importance of agroecology in coping with climate change.

Following the FO speakers’ interventions, the Chair raised an issue concerning the challenges involved in obtaining government recognition of the aforementioned practices for mitigating climate change.

3. Discussion

Following FO speakers’ interventions, the Chair opened the floor to discussion.

Participants agreed that agroecological approaches were relevant for mitigating the impact of climate change, offering several benefits such as: no emission of greenhouse gases, high-health quality products, use of indigenous seeds that are climate resilient, recovery of degraded land, improved biodiversity.

Nonetheless, the following main challenges were identified:

- **The promotion and use of chemicals and hybrid seeds by multinationals** (e.g. in India, Mali and Mozambique) made farmers dependent on international companies. Some countries, such as Bangladesh, had no bans on genetically modified organisms (GMOs), which were sold on the open market. On this point, Smita Bhatnagar (SEWA) added that although indigenous seeds were climate resilient and had good nutritional qualities, companies were still promoting GMOs;

- **Natural resources captured by multinationals.** Participants pointed out that multinationals captured natural resources (e.g. land in Africa). Manuel Segundo Llao Calcumil, President of the Movimiento Unitario Campesino y Etnias de Chile (MUCECH) explained that in his country the Government had amended the law
to allow large companies to access water markets. This was having a tremendous effect on farmers.

- **Extension services and technical assistance.** Service providers and extension services were reluctant to reach remote areas and use agroecological practices (e.g., in India).

- **Barriers to the adoption of agroecology approaches.** The need for better understanding of the barriers to adopting agroecology approaches was raised by IFAD. On this point, Ibrahima Coulibaly (ROPPA) mentioned that simple agroecological techniques existed, such as the acacia albida-based agroforestry practices that could be replicated in other countries;

- **Artisanal fisheries drastically affected by climate change.** Entire communities had abandoned this activity because it was no longer profitable.

4. **Conclusions and recommendations**

The main recommendations adopted by the working group are detailed below.

**To farmers’ organizations:**

- FOs should continue to promote on-farm participatory approaches that emphasize agroecology through farmer-to-farmer training and farmer field schools; and they should encourage farmers to adopt climate-resilient approaches for food sovereignty;

- FOs should broaden their advocacy and lobbying work to raise awareness on the importance of shifting from industrial farming models to agroecological farming, using media such as radio, press conferences and TV, to share success stories with policy-makers and increase networking in countries;

- FOs should also advocate and lobby on risk coverage at policy level, such as crop insurance schemes, weather forecasting, relief packages, etc.

**To national governments**

- National governments should recognize the added value of agroecology, integrate consistent policies on climate change and agree to promote agroecology as an alternative, sustainable and climate-resilient way of producing food;

- National governments should also attract funding for climate change adaptation that promotes agroecology and organic farming systems.

**To IFAD**

- IFAD can play a key role in creating and nurturing forums for knowledge exchange and peer-to-peer learning, farmer field schools, investing in information communications technology to spread awareness, weather forecasting, market prices; replicating and scaling up tested models of integrated land and water management, and promoting on-farm agroprocessing and high-yield seed varieties;

- IFAD should do more to provide innovative funding and revolving funds to small farm enterprises;
IFAD can play a key role in promoting payment for environmental services in development projects, as a recognition of farmers’ contribution to environment conservation; and

IFAD should engage in transboundary programmes for pastoralism.

Group #3: Working together to support and implement the rights of women and youth in agricultural development: follow-up to the Special Session on Women in Agriculture (2010) and the Special Session on Youth in Agriculture (2012)

Chair / Moderator: Elizabeth Atangana (PROPAC)

FO speakers: Esther Penunia (AFA, Philippines), Sayra Ticay (ATC, Nicaragua), Serenia Senikavika Madigibul (PIFON, Pacific), Nery Caceres (ONAC, Paraguay)

1. Introduction

Objective. The working group’s aim was to discuss the follow-up and actions taken following FAFO 2010 Special Session on Women in Agriculture and FAFO 2012 Special Session on Youth in Agriculture. Participants would help identify good strategies and practices to support women and youth in agricultural development.

Questions. The main questions to be addressed by the working group included:

- What should be the place and role of women and youth in FOs, building on the experience of small-scale producer organizations? How to reinforce their leadership capacity?
- How to promote economic opportunities for women and young people?
- What can IFAD and FOs do together?

2. Farmer-organization speakers’ interventions

Following the opening of the session by the Chair, FO speakers provided a general overview, focusing particularly on the challenges and obstacles faced by young people and women in agriculture (e.g. few profitable opportunities offered by agricultural activities, which pushed young people to migrate away from rural areas; low involvement of youth in policy-making processes; few representation mechanisms for youth and women within FOs; difficult access to land and lack of public policies on land access for young people; difficult access to markets and financial services etc.).

Speakers also highlighted the need to support youth and women through capacity-building and training to improve and strengthen both their leadership skills and their technical capacities (e.g. in agricultural production, processing and marketing).

Nery Caceres (ONAC) informed participants that a family farming bill is currently going through the National Congress in Paraguay. In this context, it will be crucial to support dialogue between FOs and public institutions, to debate policy development and make sure it provides for instruments and mechanisms that enable youth to gain access to financial resources.
3. Progress in IFAD support to youth and women

Beatrice Gerli (IFAD Gender and Targeting Specialist) and Mattia Prayer Galletti (IFAD Lead Technical Specialist – Rural Development and Institutions) gave two presentations, on the progress made by IFAD in supporting the advancement of women and its engagement with youth in agricultural development, respectively.

**IFAD commitment to the advancement of women.** The speaker recalled the main outcomes and results of the 2010 FAFO Special Session on Women in Agriculture and noted that the Statement emanating from the session had helped set the frame for the current IFAD commitment towards rural women in FOs.

She emphasized that IFAD’s key commitment to supporting women in striving for equal voice and influence in rural institutions and organizations had been adopted at the corporate level through the IFAD Policy on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment issued in 2012. Moreover, some of key issues and requests highlighted in the Statement had become the cornerstone of several IFAD commitments and had helped to shape IFAD’s work with women in FOs. For example, positive results and progress had been achieved in terms of capacity building,13 access to land14 and financial services.15 Less progress had been made in terms of specific support to young women and the involvement of women and their organizations in the design, supervision and monitoring of IFAD programmes and projects.

The speaker also presented the main initiatives and actions launched by IFAD in response to the Statement, including: (i) the Rural Women’s Leadership Programme (RWLP) (2010-2012) which aimed to increase the responsiveness of national policies, programmes and institutions to the needs and potential of rural women farmers (in Madagascar, Nepal, the Philippines and Senegal); (ii) the Rural Women Leadership (2011-2014) grant, designed to extend and scale up the RWLP in Asia and the Pacific; (iii) a small regional grant for knowledge management and learning on the Gender Empowerment of Producer Rural Groups in East and Southern Africa (2013-2015); (iv) the promotion of household methodologies (since 2009) to reinforce women’s role and decision-making capacity within the household; and (v) the launch of an IFAD Gender Awards for projects to enhance women’s voices and leadership (since 2013).

Lastly, questions for discussion were proposed on key areas, particularly concerning: (i) the current validity of the issues referred to in the 2010 Statement, and/or the need to include new dimensions (e.g. women’s role in mitigating and adapting to climate change, entrepreneurship); (ii) IFAD working modalities with FOs; (iii) areas for improvement.

---

---

13 Since 2010, women have accounted for 76 per cent of 1.2 million people trained in business/entrepreneurship, 49 per cent of 3.5 million people trained in crop production practices and technologies, and 43 per cent of 2.9 million people trained in livestock activities.

14 Since 2010, 50 per cent of the 129 projects (115 loan and 14 grant projects) incorporating tenure security activities have included specific activities benefitting women.

15 Women accounted for 72 per cent of 19.1 million voluntary savers, and 59 per cent of 6.2 million active borrowers.
IFAD engagement with youth. The speaker’s presentation focused on key activities and projects launched by IFAD to address the requests and issues outlined in the 2012 Statement on Youth in Agriculture. In particular, he presented a database developed by IFAD to map its engagement with youth as a stable knowledge base that can be built upon in the future.

The database currently comprised 75 projects, including specific activities that have a youth focus, address youth issues, or include youth in the target group.

Initial findings showed that most of these projects did not have budget allocation for youth and that even in projects where youth was a key part of the target group, budget allocations were limited. In terms of thematic focus, the key areas of support identified included employment (64 per cent), capacity-building, education and vocational training (51 per cent), financial inclusion (32 per cent) and institutional strengthening (21 per cent).

The speaker concluded his presentation by emphasizing that while IFAD’s commitment to youth was increasing, regional progress was uneven. Monitoring indicators needed to be adjusted, to be able to measure resources allocated to youth more effectively.

4. Discussion

Working group participants proposed approaches, strategies and instruments to be supported, to enhance participation by women and young people in agricultural development and in FOs. The main contributions are summarized below:

- **Need to use a value-chain approach.** Stephen Muchiri, Chief Executive Officer of EAFF, stressed the need to stop depending on specific funds for women and youth but to use value-chain approaches, especially for young people, involving them in business-related activities through training and the use of technology, social media and mobile platforms;

- **Focus on training and capacity building.** FO representatives from Congo, Swaziland and Uganda stressed the importance of training and capacity-building for women and youth, including training on programme formulation and implementation, and also for fund raising;

- **The importance of knowledge-sharing.** FO representatives highlighted the need to invest in, and support, the sharing of knowledge and experiences among women and women’s associations/organizations. In addition, good practices and experiences should be capitalized on for learning and replication purposes;

- **Awareness-raising among men.** The need to work with men and raise their awareness on gender development issues and women’s leadership was also emphasized;

- **Policy engagement.** There was a broad consensus among participants on the need to engage in policy dialogue to develop an enabling environment for the strengthening of women and youth, and to advocate for effective mechanisms facilitating their access to financial resources.

IFAD CPMs attending the session also shared IFAD experiences in supporting women and youth participation. Glayson Ferrari dos Santos (CPM for Belize, El Salvador and Guatemala) described IFAD initiatives to support rural women’s economic empowerment in Central America (e.g. the regional programme Boosting Women’s Economic Opportunities in partnership with UN Women, the United
Nations joint programme on Accelerating Progress Toward the Economic Empowerment of Rural Women in Guatemala and the Rural Development Week in El Salvador). Philippe Remy (CPM for Mali) illustrated IFAD’s experience in Mali within the Rural Youth Vocational Training, Employment and Entrepreneurship Support Project (FIER) which aims to help young people find alternatives to migration from rural areas by providing capacity-building and training and by supporting their economic initiatives.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Working group participants emphasized that although the role of women and youth was crucial for food security, nutrition, poverty reduction and sustainable development, they still faced major challenges, particularly in terms of access to land and natural resources, participation in decision-making and access to financing.

It was also stressed that FOs had a key role to play in supporting full participation by women and youth in agricultural development, particularly by integrating them into the governance of FOs and by facilitating the exchange of information and knowledge of best practices and experiences for possible replication.

Based on the discussion, participants agreed on the following main points:

- IFAD should support capacity building among women and youth, particularly at the grassroots level, focusing on strengthening leadership by women and young people;
- IFAD should extend and multiply specific projects for women and youth, supporting integrated rural development projects;
- IFAD should support initiatives for women and youth at all levels, and increase investments particularly to incorporate women and youth more effectively in value chains;
- IFAD should also open up spaces enabling women and young people to participate in the design and implementation of IFAD-funded projects;
- Technical capacities among women and youth should be further strengthened, along with their access to productive assets and marketing processes, agriculture financing and value chains;
- Communication and sharing of knowledge on positive experiences and good practices should be supported for learning and replication purposes;
- Women and youth should be helped to participate in decision-making; and spaces for women and youth leadership should be created within FOs. Men should be encouraged to share the space.
Group #4: Preparing the Farmers’ Forum process for future challenges

Chair / Moderator: Djibo Bagna (ROPPA)
FO speakers: Ujjaini Halim (WFF) and Edgardo García (LVC, Nicaragua)

1. Introduction

Objective. The aim of the working group was to discuss key elements of change proposed for the FAFO process.

In particular, a proposal was made to articulate FAFO in four main spaces, as follows: (i) an autonomous space for small-scale producer organizations to exchange and develop their analyses and positions in preparation for the dialogue with IFAD; (ii) this autonomous space to be managed by the an Orientation Committee; (iii) a dialogue space open to small-scale producer organizations, IFAD and other stakeholders; (iv) this dialogue space to be managed by a steering committee with representatives from the Orientation Committee, IFAD and other requesting FOs according to modalities to be defined.

Questions. The main questions to be addressed by the working group included:

- To ensure both autonomous reflection by small-scale producer organizations and optimal dialogue between them, IFAD and other stakeholders, what should be the roles, responsibilities and modes of operation of each of the four proposed spaces and, hence, their make-up?
- How to decentralize the FAFO dialogue space to the regional and country levels?

2. FO speakers’ interventions

Following the opening of the working group by the Chair and a brief discussion on the agenda, FO speakers made introductory remarks. The following main points were raised in particular:

- The importance of the FAFO process as a dialogue space where FOs can make their voice heard internationally;
- The need to improve the country-level impact of the dialogue at the international level: the FAFO process must bridge the gap and address this disconnect;
- The importance of raising FAFO’s profile both at the national level and among smallholder farmers;
- The challenges faced by FOs in accessing and contacting IFAD at the country level;
3. Discussion

The working group featured lively discussion among the participants. The main interventions and points touched on are summarized below.

- **The FAFO as a bottom-up process.** IFAD recalled the key elements and principles that characterized FAFO (e.g. the bottom-up approach). It also recalled how the first FAFO cycle had resulted from a consultation process, although this could not be repeated for subsequent cycles because of issues relating to the budget, time and the heavy organizational process involved;

- **Facilitating the dialogue between FOs and governments at the national level.** In response to issues and questions raised by FOs concerning IFAD’s role in facilitating the dialogue between FOs and governments, IFAD recalled the nature of the organization and the environment in which it operates (an intergovernmental organization making loans to governments mainly, and thus financing public policies and programmes through governments). It clarified that it could only facilitate dialogue between governments and FOs in relation to its own processes and strategies; and it insisted on the importance of FOs being involved in COSOP design, since this was a key moment for dialogue with governments. While advocacy and lobbying with governments for greater recognition and involvement was one of the FOs’ key tasks and responsibilities, IFAD could help them become more effective;

- **The reorganization of the FAFO process.** A few proposals for reorganizing and delocalizing the FAFO process were put forward and discussed, including the following:
  - **National level.** Consultation processes at the national level are crucial for nurturing discussion at the regional and international levels. Dialogue should be a continuous process embedded in normal business and instruments/situations that are already available (e.g. COSOP formulation, design missions, spaces created/offered within grants);
  - **Regional level.** Regional consultations should be organized every four years in the five regions concerned, alternating with the global meeting. The next regional consultations should be organized in 2018. The IFAD annual regional planning workshops might be an opportunity for these consultations to take place;
  - **Global level.** The global meeting should be organized every four years, alternating with the regional consultations. The next global meeting should be convened in 2020. In terms of the venue, participants discussed the need to delocalize the Forum and bring it to a specific location to be determined. Nonetheless, this should be carefully thought out, because it would mean losing the unique feature of the global meeting in its being organized back-to-back with the IFAD Governing Council.
• **How to embed the consultation process at the national level.** FOs participating in MTCP and SFOAP (i.e. representatives from AFA, the All Nepal Peasants’ Federation (ANPFA), and CAPAD in Burundi) highlighted MTCP’s positive achievements in facilitating consultation processes at the national level through the national farmers’ forum platforms; and they stressed the importance of making use of these existing structures. Nonetheless, the issue of inclusiveness was raised by other participants (e.g. from WFF), who insisted on the need to include other organizations which were active in different countries although not involved in the programmes;

• **FAFO governance.** The proposal for the governance of the two spaces was presented and discussed. The main elements discussed included the following:
  - **Governance of the dialogue space.** IFAD clarified that while the governance of the autonomous space was a matter on which IFAD had no say, in the case of the dialogue space the key principles of openness and inclusiveness should be taken into account and implemented. Clear criteria for inclusion in the steering process should be specified, and a code of conduct agreed upon;
  - **Governance of the autonomous space.** Participants discussed the composition of the Orientation Committee and the corresponding admission criteria. Some of the participants (e.g. those from ROPPA) insisted that only organizations representing small-scale farmers and family farmers should be included, since large-scale farmers and their organizations already had several dialogue spaces and tools to engage in policy dialogue/influence. They also claimed that such an autonomous space should be protected; and they insisted that participation in the governance of the dialogue space should be open to all organizations wishing to join. In contrast, other participants (e.g. from SACAU and WFO) claimed that organizations with different memberships and constituencies should not be judged or discriminated against, and that other criteria for inclusion/exclusion should be clearly specified and agreed upon (e.g. transparency of the organization, membership-driven organizations etc.).

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The following conclusions and points were agreed on by participants.

• **FAFO articulation.** FAFO should be articulated around the dialogue space and the autonomous space;

• **The delocalization of processes:** (i) consultation processes at the national level should be a continuous process embedded in normal business and instruments/situations that are already available; (ii) regional consultations should be organized every four years in the five regions concerned, alternating with the global meeting. The next regional consultations should be organized in 2018. The IFAD annual regional planning workshops might be an opportunity for these consultations to take place; (iii) the global meeting should be organized every four years alternately with the regional consultations. The next global meeting should be convened in 2020 at a venue to be agreed upon.
• **Governance of the processes.** The autonomous space should be governed and steered by the current Orientation Committee. The dialogue space should be managed by a steering committee with representatives from the Orientation Committee, IFAD and other requesting FOs. The modalities and criteria for inclusion in the steering processes have to be agreed upon.

• **Financing the processes.** Although IFAD is willing to continue supporting the FAFO process, organizations should make efforts to raise funding for the regional and national consultation processes.
Regional Working Groups of the 2016 Farmers’ Forum
Regional Working Groups of the 2016 Farmers’ Forum

Five regional working groups were organized on February 16 to enable FOs and IFAD to discuss the status of the partnership and the way forward in the different regions in which IFAD operates. The outcomes and recommendations from the working groups would be included in the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO.

The main elements of the discussion, issues raised and recommendations made are summarized below.

Asia and the Pacific Working Group

**Introduction.** The session was chaired and opened by Kim Hoonae, Director of the Asia and the Pacific Division of IFAD (APR), and it was attended by FO representatives from the region, along with IFAD staff and partners.

The session discussed the key progress in the partnership, particularly under the Medium-Term Cooperation Programme – Phase 2 (MTCP2).

While recalling the launch of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Farmers’ Organizations Support Programme (AFOSP) at a meeting of ASEAN Ministers in September 2015, Kim Hoonae stressed the importance of the partnership with FOs, and IFAD’s willingness to continue supporting them. She also highlighted the key results achieved through MTCP2 and emphasized programme progress in the different subregions. Among key challenges to be addressed, she mentioned the need to connect MTCP2 activities more effectively with IFAD portfolios and agendas in the different countries.

A short introductory speech was also made by Thomas Heimgartner, Programme Manager at the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), who stressed the importance of the partnership between IFAD and SDC in supporting FOs in both Asia and Africa (e.g. within SFOAP).

**FO speakers’ interventions.** Speakers from AFA made two presentations, on the main results of the MTCP and on knowledge management within the programme, respectively.

---

16 Bilateral meetings were also organized between IFAD and interested farmer associations during the morning of 17 February.

17 Maria Elena Regabay, Senior Policy and Advocacy Officer, and Jun Virola, Knowledge Management Officer.
The key aspects discussed are summarized below.

- The programme has extended its outreach activities, and today supports 192 national FOs, 1,790 subnational FOs and over 12.9 million individual farmers;
- In terms of institutional strengthening the key programme approach is to provide training through farmer-to-farmer learning exchanges, combining farmers' indigenous knowledge with scientific innovation and focusing on improving agricultural productivity and gaining benefits from inclusive value chains; in addition, a membership profile is produced;
- Examples of successful experiences of engagement by FOs in the policy arena were shared. These included the experience of Nepalese FOs that were involved in the national agriculture development strategy planning process and the ten-year plan for the farming sector. Advocacy initiatives undertaken by FOs in Indonesia had resulted in the eradication of speculation in rice prices, controls on rice sale prices to protect consumers, a reduction in the rice imports, and the direct purchase of rice from local farmers;
- MTCP2 also supported initiatives to develop inclusive and sustainable FO linkages with value chains by raising awareness, forming commodity-based groups, turning associations into agricultural cooperatives, piloting initiatives on specific commodities and learning from the exchanges of experiences. For example, in Bangladesh the programme supported the development of a strong value chain based on seeds, with the aim of producing and marketing local seeds that are more resilient to climate change;
- In terms of knowledge management, several tools are used (e.g. websites, blogs, social media, printed materials) to share information about FO profiles, programme updates, activities, and results achieved at all levels. In addition, learning exchanges, knowledge fairs, regional and thematic learning and sharing workshops are organized.

Following the intervention by the AFA representatives, a short presentation was made by Ernst Lutz, an independent consultant, who described the main objectives, methodology and planning of the forthcoming (March-June 2016) mid-term review (MTR) of the Programme.

**Discussion.** The main elements discussed and points raised by participants in the working group are summarized below.

- **Need for FOs to switch from a project approach to a strategic/programmatic approach.** There was a suggestion for FOs to develop more strategic plans and sustainability plans to enable donors to support them and avoid financial management issues and the need to report to multiple donors;
- **Knowledge management.** The APR Director reported that IFAD wanted to revitalize its IFAD Asia knowledge management platform; and she called for joint efforts to foster knowledge management in the region. FOs asked for further investments from IFAD to translate knowledge management products into local languages, but IFAD considered this a national/local FO responsibility;
- **Availability of funds and mobilization of additional resources.** It was reported that funds from MTCP2 are distributed equally across national platforms without taking into account the size of some countries (mainly China and India). Moreover, growth in the membership of the national FO supported by MTCP2 in India (from 7 to 14 FO members) meant that insufficient funds were
available for each member. Benoît Thierry, IFAD’s MTCP2 Grant Manager, suggested finding a more appropriate setup for China and India. He also reminded participants that, as specified in the design of the programme document, FOs at all levels were responsible for raising additional funds, and further efforts should be made in that direction. He also invited FOs to establish more connections with IFAD-funded projects as a strategy to raise additional funds. On this point, FO representatives from Nepal emphasized their fund-raising activities both internally (through a cooperative they had established with 10,000 members) and from public resources (contributions from the government). Shamila Amil Mone, from INOFO (India) argued that all FOs needed to make additional efforts to reduce their reliance on external funding;

- **Complementary support from AgriCord/Farmers Fighting Poverty (FFP)/ASEAN.** Marlene Ramírez from the Asian Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (AsiaDHRRA), an “agri-agency” member of the AgriCord network, referred to the FFP programme being implemented in ASEAN countries as a component of the AFOSP. She highlighted the complementarities between the two programmes (FFP/ASEAN and MTCP2), and explained the programme’s approach in terms of mainly supporting local FOs with a focus on economic services. She also said that AsiaDHRRA was available to provide technical support to FOs in South Asia;

- **Partnership between IFAD and FOs at the country level.** FO representatives shared their experiences in terms of the main activities, collaborations and partnerships developed with IFAD (e.g. in the Philippines where IFAD and FOs had produced joint documents on knowledge management events in the IYFF; in Cambodia where the FNN was collaborating closely with IFAD and was represented on the technical working group on agriculture and water; and in Indonesia, where FOs were represented at the IFAD regional workshop held in Bali in 2015). In addition, possibilities for further strengthening the partnership in Indonesia were emphasized, particularly in relation to a new IFAD-funded project whose geographical outreach matches the geographical coverage of FOs supported by MTCP2. In the case of Sri Lanka, Hubert Boirard (IFAD, CPM) acknowledged the important work done by the Movement for Land and Agricultural Reform (MONLAR) on land issues, and their outstanding policy achievement in obtaining a ban on the use of glyphosate in that country. Lastly, Yolando Arban (IFAD Country Programme Officer – CPO – for the Philippines) recommended FOs to reinforce their engagement with the private sector (e.g. GlowCorp).

**Conclusions and recommendations.** Based on the discussion, the following recommendations and suggestions for follow-up were agreed upon:

- CPMs and CPOs should be kept apprised of the MTR missions/schedule to enable them to engage in the process;
- IFAD should invest in mass communication (e.g. radio);
- The MTR should enter into discussion with all stakeholders to find a more appropriate setup for China and India;
- IFAD should invest further in the region and expand MTCP support to Mongolia;
- Following the example of Viet Nam, collaboration frameworks between IFAD and FOs for collaboration at the country level should be systematized;
The positive experience of FO involvement in technical working groups in Cambodia should be expanded to other countries;
- FOs in South Asia should strengthen fund-raising efforts with regional bodies/donors and explore a potential partnership with AgriCord;
- FOs should also strengthen efforts to develop sustainable schemes and thus reduce their reliance on external funding.

East and Southern Africa Working Group

Introduction. The working group’s discussion was led by Robson Mutandi, Country Director (Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa) in the East and Southern Africa Division (ESA) of IFAD, and included participation by representatives from FOs, IFAD staff and partners.

Following a round of presentations, ESA Director Sana Jatta gave an introductory presentation on the main developments, achievements and challenges in respect of the FO-IFAD partnership. He firstly highlighted the partnership’s main achievements including: (i) the enhanced flow of information and exchanges between farmer networks in the ESA region (e.g. in-country consultations, as occurred during the design of the United Republic of Tanzania Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme); (ii) the active involvement of FOs in a number of IFAD-supported programmes and projects (e.g. Support to Farmers’ Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project (AROPA) in Madagascar); (iii) the recognition of FOs as key actors in IFAD programmes and projects, and the commitment by IFAD management and staff to improve the partnership; (iv) the support provided through SFOAP, which had succeeded in strengthening regional networks and enabled them to engage in policy dialogue.

In terms of challenges, Sana Jatta referred both to external factors (e.g. political patronage and political instability in some countries and divisions/fragmentations between farmers and producers’ organizations), and to endogenous ones (e.g. limited dialogue mechanisms and unclear channels of communication between IFAD and FOs, as well as between regional networks downwards to farmers’ groups at lower levels; and a lack of a strategic approach for knowledge management).

He also posed a number questions to be addressed during the discussion, such as: What role should FOs play in project implementation? What are the challenges and opportunities for engagement in policy dialogue? And what is IFAD’s role of as facilitator/broker? Which tools should be used (e.g. direct financing, structured consultations) to strengthen the partnership? How can FOs facilitate impact on the ground for sustainable rural transformation? And how can their contribution to rural transformation be measured?

He concluded his intervention by recalling the main characteristics needed of FOs for IFAD to partner with them (e.g. particularly in terms of accountability, good governance, degree of representation of smallholder farmers).

Discussion. The working group featured lively discussion among participants. The main interventions and points touched on are summarized below.

- Strong and representative organizations in the region. FO representatives (e.g. from EAFF, and SACAU) pointed out that the organizations they represent are...
legitimate institutions with governance instruments that guide their actions. They added that all national members of the networks are recognized organizations with their own constitutions and elected leadership. They also claimed that, while in some cases dialogue with organizations at the grassroots level might be challenging, they are long-standing institutions composed of farmers and they ask IFAD to work with and through them;

- **Relevance of SFOAP and linkages with national investments.** Many FO representatives (e.g. from Burundi, Kenya, Mozambique and Uganda) stressed the importance of the support received through SFOAP and the outstanding results achieved through the programme in the structuring of the farmers’ movements, FO professionalization, engagement in policy dialogue and the development of business activities. Nonetheless, both IFAD and the FO representatives noted the need to connect SFOAP-supported country-level initiatives more closely with IFAD investments. Lack of information sharing was identified as biggest challenge. This led to a wider reflection on the overall challenges faced both by FOs and by IFAD staff in terms of mutual knowledge and information exchange;

- **Improving communication and dialogue at the country level.** Participants agreed that communication, mutual knowledge and information sharing at the national level should be improved. FO representatives (e.g. from Burundi, Kenya, Lesotho and Mozambique,) claimed that it was sometimes difficult to engage in dialogue with IFAD and obtain information on planned and on-going activities. Annick Sezibera (CAPAD, Burundi) also pointed out that changes in the composition of the IFAD teams could sometimes reset all previous work and affect its continuity and undermine the progress achieved. IFAD staff responded that efforts were needed on both sides to share information about supported, ongoing and planned activities. Roberto Longo (IFAD) identified organization profiling as crucial. He recalled that some regional FOs supported member profiling or had done so in the past, and that such initiatives should be taken further. Alessandro Marini, (IFAD, Country Director in Uganda) stressed that IFAD and FOs needed to engage in a more continuous and structured dialogue at the national level, and he recommended that participants consider a more permanent forum for continuous exchange;

- **Mainstreaming the role of FOs in the IFAD lending portfolio.** Benito Odala Eliasi, Capacity Building Advisor of SACAU, pointed out that organizations had evolved, and today they were providing services that has previously only been delivered by governments. They therefore needed adequate support. Regular and consistent support, as given to governments, would enable them to have an impact in terms of reducing poverty levels in rural areas. Francisco Pichon (IFAD, Country Director in Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania) further stressed that grant resources were a very small part of IFAD support, and thought was needed on how to mainstream the role of FOs in IFAD’s lending portfolio. He recalled that, in the United Republic of Tanzania, IFAD was partnering with the Agriculture Non-State Actors Forum (ANSAF), a member-led forum involving organizations from different sectors. He argued that this type of structure made it easier for FOs to participate in project implementation;

- **Building on successful experiences.** Successful experiences of FO engagement in IFAD activities at all levels were cited by several participants (e.g. the Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme – Climate-Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods
Window [KCEP-CRAL], where the Cereal Growers Associations was identified as an IFAD strategic partner). Nonetheless, when projects were being designed, due diligence processes and careful scrutiny of possible partner organizations were also needed. Also, the good experience of the AROPA project was further emphasized by Roberto Longo (IFAD), noting that the key element enabling IFAD to work with FOs was the subsidiarity among the different layers of FOs;

- **Inclusiveness and reaching the grassroots.** Mohlalefi Moteane, President of the Lesotho National Farmers’ Union (LENAFU) stated that if IFAD recognized the importance of FOs and wanted to intervene through them at the national level, it should engage with existing organizations rather than creating new ones that would collapse when IFAD support was discontinued. On that point, Tom Anyonge (IFAD, Lead Technical Specialist – Institutions and Organisations) claimed that in some cases the grassroots organizations visited were not even aware of the existence of national FOs. He stressed that IFAD projects could help to attract potential members, and thought should be given to how SFOAP could make sure the supported organizations were inclusive of local village organizations that were being created or supported by IFAD-funded projects;

- **Farmer-organization involvement in COSOP formulation.** While acknowledging the importance of FOs being involved in COSOP formulation, IFAD was asked to consult not only local organizations but also national ones with a wider global vision on farmers’ issues in the country and concrete proposals to address them;

- **Facilitating impact on the ground:** Editrudith Lukanga (WFF) underscored the importance of structuring FOs at the national level, and she asked IFAD to increase its support to enable national organizations to do more to facilitate structuring activities at the local level.

**Follow-up, recommendations and closing.** Sana Jatta (IFAD) brought the session to a close by stating that IFAD saw FOs as a resource to address the needs of smallholders, urging both IFAD and FOs to take steps to accommodate to each others’ needs.

The main recommendations and conclusions of the discussion are summarized below.

- More information is needed on how IFAD country and regional offices operate and the programmes they implement; and further efforts should be made by FOs to share information with IFAD (e.g. on their constituency and activities);

- IFAD Country Offices (ICOs) and national FOs should engage in a more permanent and structured dialogue. Opportunities for such a dialogue might be the meetings of the Country Programme Management Team (CPMT) (national level) and the divisional annual regional planning workshops (regional level). A permanent dialogue of this type would enable IFAD and FOs to improve mutual knowledge and the develop synergies; and it would help to turn potential partnership into a reality.

- IFAD-supported programmes should add value to the strategies and activities that FOs are implementing;

- As IFAD’s main portfolio is on-lending, FOs are also interested in programmes that provide a financial package at below-commercial rates, which could unlock farmers’ entrepreneurship potential and enable FOs to be seen as possible partners in the implementation of IFAD-funded projects;
• IFAD should find innovative ways of engaging FOs more effectively and channel more resources to FOs at the national and regional levels;

• IFAD and FOs should discuss how a substantial financial envelope and technical support can be directly channelled from IFAD to FOs, as is done with governments. Support consistently delivered in that way would create sustainability, retain capacity and skills, generate a lasting impact and avert conflicts during implementation;

• A knowledge-management learning platform should be developed to share information on different experiences (e.g. SFOAP), tools (mapping/database), approaches, activities, partnerships, and on how national dialogue platforms work in different countries.

Latin America and the Caribbean Working Group

Introduction. The Working Group was chaired by Paolo Silveri, CPM for Brazil from the Latin America and the Caribbean Division (LAC) of IFAD; and it was attended by FO representatives, along with IFAD staff and partners. Paolo Silveri welcomed participants and gave a short presentation on IFAD’s organizational structure in the region, including the four subregional offices: (i) Mexico and Central America, based in Guatemala City; (ii) Andes (Plurinational State of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), with head office in Lima; (iii) MERCOSUR (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay), headquartered in Rome; (iv) the Caribbean, also based in Rome.

FO speakers’ interventions. Following introductory remarks from the Chair, two FO speakers (Fernando López from COPROFAM (Uruguay) and Edgardo García from ATC (Nicaragua) gave an introductory presentation on the results of the FAFO Autonomous Assessment of the Farmers’ Forum Process and the results of the related workshop held in Managua in December 2015. In particular, they stressed the need to establish different dialogue channels with IFAD, not only at the global but also at the local level, and to improve FO participation in the formulation and implementation of IFAD strategies and projects.

Edgardo García also highlighted the need to raise the profile of relevant experiences, such as the Zero Hunger programme in Nicaragua, which delivers a “productive food bond” to many of the country’s families. This has strengthened food production in Nicaragua and helped revive the economy. He also stressed the need for programmes to support smallholder farmers’ access to markets and their involvement in value chains; and he urged IFAD to support this kind of initiative. Lastly, the relevance of agroecology and the need to share successful experiences in this area (e.g. the experience of Cuba) were also emphasized: exchanges and learning opportunities should be facilitated, and IFAD could play a role in this.

Discussion. The Working Group featured lively discussion among IFAD staff and FO representatives. The main issues and elements discussed are summarized below.

• Importance of the dialogue at the national level. The main outcomes from the Autonomous Assessment in the region were recalled, particularly the need to strengthen the partnership and dialogue at the national level. FO representatives also stressed the importance of sharing both good and bad practices and experiences in the dialogue;
• **Public procurement from smallholders.** FO representatives emphasized the importance of initiatives that support public procurement from smallholder farmers, and the results achieved with this. Brazil’s experience was singled out as an initiative to be further supported and extended to other countries.

• **Mechanisms for access to financing and direct financing to FOs.** FO representatives (e.g. from Federación Nicagruense de Pescadores Artesanales – FENICPESCA, Nicaragua) asked IFAD to keep them better informed on its funding mechanisms. Other participants (e.g. from Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Honduras and Paraguay) complained about the limited access to public funds for FOs, and pointed out that in some cases governments were unwilling to engage with and support small-scale producers and family farmers. The case of Chile, where FOs had no space in the policy arena, was also discussed. Participants emphasized the importance of IFAD directly working with FOs at the national level, thus making sure it targeted and reached small-scale farmers and their organizations. On this point, Ladislao Rubio (IFAD CPM for the Dominican Republic, Guyana and Nicaragua) recalled that, as lending was the main IFAD financing mechanism, thought should be given on how to reach FOs, strengthen mechanisms for exchange and dialogue, and how to develop ways of ensuring that support translated into projects that met the needs of producers. FOs should take full advantage of dialogue spaces that already existed (e.g. REAF) to advocate with governments and have family farming issues and priorities integrated into national governments’ agendas and programmes;

• **Mechanisms for exchange of experiences.** The lack of access to mechanisms for exchanging experiences between countries was pointed out by other participants;

• **Agroecology as a tool to address climate change.** Participants emphasized the importance of fighting against transnational corporations, working to protect natural resources, and agroecology to face climate change;

• **Supporting youth.** Issues faced by youth in agriculture were discussed (e.g. access to land, resources, markets and financial services). The importance of helping young people to fully participate in the life of their communities and engage in economic activities as a way to combat rural migration was also stressed;

**Follow up and recommendations.** Based on the discussion, the following was proposed and suggested by FOs:

• The dialogue between IFAD and governments should be maintained and reinforced;

• Good practices in the partnership with IFAD existed and should be used as basis for exchange and dialogue with IFAD;

• FOs from the region should articulate communication between them more effectively, to ensure the sharing of good practices for mutual strengthening; IFAD should support such processes;

• Rural youth and FO representatives should be supported in capacity-building and training, particularly to improve their advocacy skills and political influence;

• Cuba’s experience in producing healthy food for the world through the good management of natural resources should be considered for replication;
IFAD should clarify the way it operates to engage more effectively in dialogue at all levels;

FOs should engage with governments directly to make their voice heard and thus influence government agendas;

Key focus of interventions: (i) in the Caribbean and Nicaragua – supporting the household economy and increasing public investments in production; (ii) in the MERCOSUR region – supporting family-farming representation in the policy arena at all levels, and improving dialogue with IFAD and governments to make sure family farming and smallholder farmers’ priorities are included in their agendas and programmes; (iii) in Central America – the establishment of a national committee including FOs and the private sector, and strengthening of the dialogue with IFAD at the national level.

Conclusions. The Chair highlighted the associative movement in the region as a strength, and noted that it had progressed strongly compared to other regions. In this context, the REAF had done much to promote dialogue between FOs and governments, and this course should be continued.

Near East and North Africa Working Group

Introduction. The meeting was chaired by Khalida Bouzar, Director of the Near East, North Africa and Europe Division (NEN) of IFAD; and it drew participation from FO representatives, partners, and IFAD staff responsible for the institution’s portfolios in Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia.

Khalida Bouzar briefly presented the IFAD portfolio and described activities in the North African region; and she updated participants on the recent opening of an IFAD office in Morocco. In the case of Algeria, she mentioned that while between the 1990s and 2000 IFAD had a large portfolio in the country (e.g. focusing on artisanal fisheries and integrated development plans), since 2005 the Government of Algeria had decided to use its budget surplus to pay off most of its external debt. As a result, Algeria had prepaid the balance due on IFAD loans. Today, the collaboration between IFAD and Algeria was mainly implemented through regional grants (e.g. through the Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique d’Algérie (INRAA). In terms of the partnership with FOs, she mentioned that IFAD worked specifically with cooperatives, market associations and women’s groups in all countries of the region apart from Algeria, where the operational relations with FOs were still at an initial stage (although IFAD was willing to reinforce them through the regional instrument).

Discussion. The Chair offered the floor for FO representatives to engage in discussion with IFAD and ask specific questions. FO representatives presented their organizations and the role they played in their respective countries. The main points discussed are summarized below.

- **Support to pastoralists and livestock breeders.** Said Fagouri from ANOC (Morocco) referred to a successful FAO-financed project, which supported the conservation of an endangered sheep breed in Morocco and Algeria; and she called on IFAD to support the National Gene Bank in Tunisia to progress further with this initiative. He also mentioned that the transhumance law in Morocco prevents pastoralists from moving freely in
the different zones, and requires them to request authorization. Pastoralists are treated as foreigners and do not have access to basic services (e.g. education, health). As this is a major issue for them, Said Fagouri called on IFAD to take problems like these into account when designing projects to support pastoralists;

- **IFAD-FO partnership in Tunisia.** Abdelmajid Ezzar, President of the *Union Tunisienne de l’ Agriculture* (UTAP) and President of the *Union Maghrébine et Nord Africaine des Agriculteurs* (UMNAGRI), outlined the key issues faced by the regional FO, particularly concerning sources of financing. He also described UTAP as an organization created in 1950, with 300,000 members in the agricultural sector and 60,000 from the fisheries sector, organized in 240 local units on the ground and 24 sectoral federations. The speaker noted that, against this backdrop, while UTAP has good relations with the Government, relations with IFAD are basically confined to FO participation in some meetings in the context of IFAD-funded projects. He called on IFAD to ensure UTAP is represented on all of the steering committees of IFAD-funded projects. Patrick Herlant (IFAD CPM in Tunisia) stressed that IFAD is working with UTAP in the Agropastoral Value Chains Project in the Governorate of Médenine; and he highlighted the importance of working with FOs, particularly at the local level, during the forthcoming design mission (April) for an IFAD-funded project in the Governorate of Siliana. Ghoudi Zine (IFAD Focal Point in Tunisia) added that collaboration within projects needed to be stronger and more substantial. He stated that UTAP could play an important role; but, for this to be possible, the institutional capacity of the organizations needed strengthening, particularly at the local level;

- **Support for communication among FOs.** Other FO representatives (e.g. from the *Union Nationale des Paysans Algériens* – UNPA) stressed the communication issues faced by organizations (e.g. in terms of funding and capacities) and the support needed in that area. IFAD clarified that although specific programmes on FO communication do not exist within IFAD, FOs should request this type of support through their governments;

- **Capacity-building for FOs.** FO representatives called on IFAD to support their organizations in terms of capacity building (e.g. UTAP) and the training of trainers. On this point, IFAD emphasized that FO training and capacity-building is one of the pillars of IFAD action; and this is done mainly through investments in the countries or through regional initiatives. Since IFAD works with governments, FOs should lobby their respective governments to make their voices, and particularly their needs, heard. In response to the request by FO representatives for direct support to vocational academic education in the universities, IFAD said that this was not IFAD practice;

- **Access to IFAD funding.** FO representatives also asked IFAD to clarify how they could directly access IFAD financing. On this point, IFAD identified the grant window as the place to obtain direct financing; and it briefly described the IFAD grant financing mechanism;

- **Getting in touch with IFAD.** Other participants suggested IFAD should be represented in the regional networks to strengthen the collaboration. On this point, IFAD clarified that the Fund has no representation mechanisms in organizations. Instead, it maintains its presence in the different countries
through the IFAD CPMs and CPOs. FO representatives were encouraged to contact them and engage in dialogue directly;

- **Initiatives supported by Formation Pour l’Epanouissement et le Renouveau de la Terre (FERT) under SFOAP.** The representative from the FERT agri-agency briefly described the main initiatives it was supporting in the region with SFOAP financing.

**Follow up, recommendations and conclusions.** Based on the discussion, the main requests from FOs included the need to: (i) support FOs in capacity-building and communication; (ii) strengthen collaboration and dialogue with IFAD at the national level; (iii) increase support to FOs through direct financing based on a recognition of the region’s agropastoral potential and its technical and financial needs; (iv) strengthen support for pastoralists and livestock breeders.

The following main points for follow-up were adopted:

- The support provided to livestock breeders and pastoralists in Algeria is a fundamental in aspect of the partnership with INRAA, and possibilities for collaboration could be explored within that context;
- IFAD took note of UTAP’s request to be represented on all steering committees of IFAD-funded projects;
- IFAD will share, for information purposes, a sample of projects submitted to it to compete for funding through the grant window;
- IFAD and FOs should engage in dialogue at the national level. FOs should get in touch with CPMs and CPOs in their respective countries.
- FOs should strengthen their dialogue with governments to make their voices heard, particularly concerning their needs;
- IFAD and FOs should get in touch to collaborate/consult on the forthcoming IFAD design mission in Tunisia (Governorate of Siliana).

**West and Central Africa Working Group**

**Introduction.** The session was opened and chaired by Djibo Bagna (ROPPA) and attended by representatives from FOs and IFAD staff.

The Chair summarized the main outputs of the previous days and outlined the working group’s objectives as follows: (i) to review the recommendations arising from the Autonomous Assessment of the Farmers’ Forum Process, particularly concerning the African region in order to propose suggestions for the way forward; (ii) to discuss existing partnerships and potential initiatives to be supported (e.g. within the context of the GAFSP Missing Middle Initiative); and (iii) to review the main outcomes of the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders.

Following the introduction from the Chair, initial remarks were made by other participants.

Idesbald Reinout Jan Van Der Does De Willebois, Director of the West and Central Africa Division (WCA) of IFAD, noted that although the global meeting was a great
opportunity for exchange, the main challenge to be addressed remained how to connect FOs and their members at the national level with IFAD operational portfolios in the different countries. He recalled that IFAD was not an implementing agency and that projects were actually government projects. This made it essential to discuss on how FOs could be integrated. In particular, good experiences (e.g. in Guinea, Mali and Niger) should be shared for the purpose of replication in other countries, where cooperation was less developed.

Dodo Boureima, Permanent Secretary of RBM summarized the main outcomes of the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders, in terms of the challenges identified and what was expected from IFAD – particularly the recognition of pastoralism as a sustainable production system and the need for investments that are adapted to the reality of pastoralists and livestock breeders.

Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC) called on IFAD to reinforce its presence in Central Africa and expressed the wish that the on-going IFAD decentralization process would also involve Central African countries. She also stressed the need to support women and youth through specific instruments (e.g. by setting up dedicated funding windows or launching projects specifically targeted on youth and gender).

The recommendations from the Autonomous Assessment concerning the African region were also read as a basis for the discussion.

Discussion. The main elements from the discussion are summarized below.

- **Linking investments at the national level with regional programmes.** Participants agreed that regional programmes, such as SFOAP, should be more closely linked with national investments. The example of the NACOFAG was brought to the participants’ attention by Mahamadou Fayinkeh, who mentioned that SFOAP support had enabled the organization to be reinforced, professionalized and integrated into the market by adapting its walnut production to market standards. He also argued that once organizations were strengthened they should be involved in the design, implementation and management of IFAD-funded projects. On this point Philippe Remy (IFAD CPM for Mali and Mauritania) added that sometimes there was lack of information on activities supported by SFOAP and that making the connection should be the responsibility of both IFAD and FOs;

- **Instability of the partnership.** Hortense Dolores Kinkodila Tombo, President of the *Women’s College – National Association of Peasant Farmer Organizations of the Congo* (CNOP-Congo) claimed that changes in the composition of IFAD teams in the countries could sometimes put all past efforts back to reset, thereby affecting the continuity of the collaboration, and blocking process that was under way;

- **How to translate FAFO recommendations into actions at the national level.** While welcoming the on-going IFAD decentralization process, participants agreed that issues relating to communication and information sharing between IFAD and FOs were affecting the partnership, particularly at the national level. They also discussed possibilities for IFAD and FOs to engage in dialogue at the national and regional levels. Some participants (e.g. from Senegal) proposed the creation of a national platform, to include IFAD and other development partners for regular exchanges. On this point, Philippe Remy (IFAD) said that FAFO intended to look at improvements in the partnership between IFAD and FOs. Rather than organizing a national forum, FOs should have a presence in
the CPMT, which was the best discussion framework at the national level. He also proposed to use WCA’s annual regional planning workshop to regularly engage in dialogue with FOs. A side meeting might be organized on that occasion to discuss with CPMs, project managers, and governments and learn from experiences. Representatives from regional FOs and selected national ones could join the meeting to enrich the discussion. He said that WCA could commit and engage with FOs to organize such a meeting, although further exchanges would be needed to define organizational issues. Lastly, Philippe Remy informed participants of the pipeline of projects/COSOPs that IFAD would be presenting in the coming years by country, to provide FOs with key information to discuss with IFAD how to interact and enter into partnership.

- **Relevance of regional networks.** The relevance of regional FOs, as an instrument to gain regional and continental space for discussing farmers’ needs and issues, was stressed by participants (e.g. from Senegal).

- **Improving FO participation in IFAD funded-projects.** Based on IFAD’s operational mechanisms of financing governments through loans, IFAD staff (e.g. CPMs for Guinea and Senegal) stressed the importance of FOs partnering their respective governments to influence public policies that affect smallholder farmers and their organizations. In particular, Luyaku Nsimpasi (IFAD CPM for Benin, Cabo Verde and Senegal) argued that FOs needed to dialogue with governments to demonstrate their value added in enabling governments to achieve their objectives more effectively. If this dialogue worked well, it might facilitate FO participation in COSOP design and project implementation. He added that another key element in fostering the partnership with IFAD was the capacity of FOs to deliver economic services to their members, and the relevance of the services provided. On these points, Djibo Bagna (ROPPA) recognized the difficulty of integrating FOs if the dialogue with governments was not developed; but he argued that IFAD could facilitate the process (e.g. by asking CPMs to inform all stakeholders in the countries, including governments, by reporting back on FAFO recommendations);

- **IFAD support for youth and gender.** Khadidja Doucoure, Regional Gender Coordinator of IFAD in Senegal responded to concerns raised by Elisabeth Atangana by describing how IFAD targeted and worked with gender and youth. She explained that developing projects that focused on gender alone was not one of IFAD’s principles of intervention. Instead, IFAD develops projects in which it applies quotas and takes youth and gender issues into account e.g. by targeting value chains that are important for women. She also referred to the grant instrument (e.g. the RWLP to support women’s leadership in FOs);

- **Need to improve the quality of the partnership and donor coordination.** Saliou Ndiaye (Association Sénégalaise pour la Promotion du Développement par la Base – ASPRODEB) noted that FOs were spreading in Western Africa, where they were developing knowledge, capacity and skills to become essential and indispensable actors. Nonetheless, for this to be possible they needed to be better organized and structured to make the most of their richness and capacities; and that required differentiated and adapted support. He pointed out that donors in the countries often did not coordinate their interventions (e.g. the World Bank gives gradually decreasing subsidies while IFAD asks farmers to cofinance at the start), and they often provided support in the same areas. This did not help FOs’ efforts to become financially and technically autonomous.
Philippe Remy (IFAD) added that the paradigm of FOs needing capacity-building and IFAD providing funds and support is obsolete; and that the FAFO principle is that FOs needed IFAD just as IFAD needed FOs – their knowledge of the value chains, of the context, of issues and the challenges faced by farmers;

- **Expanding good experiences.** Foulématou Camara, President of the ROPPA Women’s College called on IFAD to extend the partnership it had developed with FOs within the PNAAFA to other countries, based on the positive impacts of the project;

- **Supporting pastoralists and livestock breeders.** Dodo Boureima (RBM), stated that, although the recognition of pastoralists and livestock breeders and having them participating in FAFO was a big step, partnership between their organizations and IFAD at the country level was poorly developed. He also mentioned that projects should take pastoralists’ and livestock breeders’ concerns into account and adapt the support given to their realities. Ousman Shehou, President of the **Concertation Nationale des Organisations Paysannes de la République de Centrafricaine (CNOP-CAF)**, also insisted on the need to support the structuring of national organizations of pastoralists to integrate regional networks such as the PROPAC;

- **The Missing Middle Initiative of GAFSP.** Marco Camagni (IFAD Senior Technical Specialist – Rural Markets and Enterprise Development) made a brief presentation of the opportunities offered by the GAFSP Missing Middle Initiative. Through this pilot initiative, US$16 million were earmarked to support FOs worldwide, to connect them with the market. FOs could submit a proposal indicating the international organization they would partner with for technical support, up to the end of March. Further clarification was requested by participants in terms of the calendar, templates and guidance. Djibo Bagna reported that US$4 million had been earmarked for Africa and that the idea was to come up with one project proposal per region to avoid segmentation and the scattering of funds. He also said that the ROPPA would circulate a note giving details on how to present the proposals.
Follow up, recommendations and conclusions. The main recommendations and conclusions from the discussion are summarized below:

- IFAD should give greater recognition to pastoralism as a sustainable production system to be supported in IFAD projects and programmes through appropriate investments that take cross-border issues into account;
- IFAD should consider facilitating better coordination with other financial partners to make sure that projects activities in the same area of intervention are mutually consistent;
- IFAD should establish a mechanism to allow continuity in its partnership with FOs beyond the CPMs’ willingness to collaborate;
- IFAD and FOs should organize national consultations through CPMTs, and regional consultations through the divisional annual regional planning meetings. There should be further discussion on organizational issues (e.g. participants, agenda etc.);
- IFAD should provide additional support for FO structuring;
- FOs should strengthen and focus on the provision of economic services to ensure sustainability and independence;
- IFAD and FOs should improve the connection between investment projects and SFOAP-supported initiatives;
- IFAD will be the FOs’ partner institution for participating in the call for proposals under the GAFSP Missing Middle Initiative. ROPPA would shortly circulate a note to African FOs explaining the selection criteria and application modalities.
Final Statement of the 2016 Farmers’ Forum
Final Statement of the Farmers’ Forum
and discussion with IFAD Management
and Governors

The Statement of the 2016 global meeting of the Farmers’ Forum (see box 3) was read out by Ujjaini Halim (WFF) during the final Plenary Session of FAFO, in the presence of FO delegates, IFAD Management and the representatives of IFAD Member States from Belgium, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Brazil, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Italy, Lesotho, Madagascar, Netherlands, Panama, Philippines, Switzerland, Uganda, United States, Zimbabwe and the EU.

A short version of the same Statement was also endorsed, read and delivered to the IFAD Governing Council by Elizabeth Mpofu on February 19.18

Box 3. Summary of the statement delivered to the Governing Council of Ifad on 18 February

Dear members of the Governing Council, dear president of IFAD, dear participants to the 2016 Governing Council,

We, delegates of the 6th Global Meeting of the Farmers’ Forum want to bring you the following statement.

The special Session on Pastoralism underlined that pastoralism is the main livelihood on marginal agricultural land. We call upon IFAD to take a pastoralist-centered approach to policy guidance as well as to investments and to reinforce institutional capacities of pastoralist organizations.

Based on an autonomous evaluation and the discussions in the Farmers Forum we invite you to support the implementation of the following recommendations:

A qualitative evolution is needed to ensure a more effective dialogue between smallholder organizations and IFAD. It is agreed that the Global Meeting of the Farmers Forum will take place every 4 years with 5 Regional Fora in between, in order to decentralize the process. The establishment of regional and national spaces that respect the principles of the governance and processes of the Global Farmers’ Forum should be supported. Along side the dialogue process with IFAD, small-scale producers’ organizations will continue to organize their autonomous space.

Strengthen support for further analysis of the country programs and develop strategies on a case-by-case basis regarding how to achieve adequate participation of small holder, family farming organizations. This includes the mobilization of resources to support their participation.

---

18 The summary of the Statement delivered to the Governing Council is also available in annex 7.
The increase, expansion and further strengthening of specific programs for women, youth, small scale fishers, pastoralists and livestock breeders (as recommended in past special sessions of the Farmers Forum); as well as of programs that build the capacities of smallholders such as SFOAP and MTCP.

Support the strengthening of small holder initiatives around agro-ecological food production and control over local seeds and local livestock breeds as a key approach and an appropriate response to climate change.

Strengthen initiatives that promote secured access to natural resources and agrarian reform, as well as efforts to stop and prevent grabbing of lands from smallholders and pastoralists, by supporting the effective implementation at national levels of the land tenure guidelines (VGGT) and the follow up of ICARRD.

Continue to support the implementation of the Guidelines on Small Scale Fisheries and to adopt them in IFAD bodies as stated in the Farmers Forum 2014.

Support the development of value chains by small holders themselves through processing and marketing of their own produce, and reduce their dependence and increase their benefits from industrial value chains and markets by ensuring adequate investment.

We encourage IFAD to strengthen synergies with other agencies, especially FAO and develop further support for the implementation of decisions by the UN Committee on World Food Security.

We encourage IFAD to support other initiatives important for small scale producers, such the Treaty on rights abuses by multinationals and a UN Declaration for the Rights of Peasants in the UN Human Rights Council.

We expect concerned governments to implement the appropriate measures in order to ensure the autonomous and effective participation of small holder organizations in the Farmers’ Forum process, in IFAD-supported projects and programs on agriculture and food.

Organizations of smallholders, family farmers in the Farmers Forum, the large majority of them commits to continue the process of strengthening the different spaces, inclusive nature and effectiveness of the Farmers Forum as well as our autonomous space. We commit to follow, together with IFAD, the implementation of recommendations as reflected in this statement to the Governing Council of IFAD.

Adolfo Brizzi (Director of IFAD’s Policy and Technical Advisory Division – PTA), who chaired the session, then gave the floor to Périn Saint-Ange, IFAD Associate Vice-President, Programme Managemet Department, for preliminary remarks. Périn Saint-Ange expressed his appreciation of FAFO’s commitment to smallholders; and he stressed that this commitment was also at the core of IFAD operations. He also recognized the importance of the challenges highlighted by FOs in the Statement and said that IFAD identified very strongly with the need to address them. He concluded by recalling the on-going IFAD decentralization process and invited FOs to visit IFAD offices in their respective countries, to discuss with IFAD staff and share their issues. By doing this, FOs would enable IFAD to be much more responsive and engaged, and to be well-positioned to make the investments needed for the sustainable transformation of smallholder agriculture worldwide and ensure greater impact on the ground.
Michel Mordasini, Vice-President of IFAD, continued IFAD’s response to the Statement of the Farmers’ Forum. He thanked the participants for giving IFAD the opportunity to react and comment on the Statement on behalf of IFAD Management. He acknowledged the extremely substantive and far-reaching interactions over the previous days, which had also been followed by many staff through the webcast. He praised the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders for providing important policy and operational messages, and he emphasized that these contributions would be central to IFAD’s commitment to prepare a new guidance note on pastoralism and development. He stated that “this is FAFO policy-influencing capacity”.

In relation to the Statement, he detected a strong convergence and alignment of views with IFAD on several of the points raised: the crucial role played by small-scale rural producers in global food security, poverty reduction and sustainable agricultural development; the serious persistent constraints and challenges faced by smallholder farmers and rural producers; the view, shared by FOs and IFAD, on the need for a strong strategic vision and greater investment to achieve inclusive and sustainable rural transformation with a special focus on small-scale farmers and producers.

He underscored how much IFAD shared the assessment of what FAFO had contributed over the past 10 years. FAFO had established itself as a very important platform for dialogue and exchange of knowledge and experience. In fact, it had often enriched the discussion of IFAD strategic and operational directions. The Forum had also actively promoted and helped intensify the collaboration between IFAD and FOs at the regional and country levels. Today, FOs were involved in the design of more than 80 per cent of the new IFAD country strategies, and the quality of that involvement had improved dramatically. The Forum “can also take part of the credit for this achievement”.

He noted that the Statement also encouraged IFAD to continue and enhance efforts and initiatives on several important issues (e.g. the economic empowerment of women, creating more opportunities for rural youth, adapting to climate change, supporting local entrepreneurship in value-chain operations, generating additional synergies with other Rome-based agencies and the CFS). He stressed that IFAD was involved on all of those fronts and that the FAFO message was welcomed as motivation to do more and better.
As for the future of the Farmers' Forum and the new cycles being proposed, Michel Mordasini said that IFAD Management very much welcomed the proposal, which could bring FAFO closer to the countries, to IFAD-funded operations and to direct dialogue with governments. Such a development could also attract even greater interest among IFAD members and donors. He stressed that highly successful regional programmes, like SFOAP and MTCP, provided a solid basis to learn from. But a new arrangement for FAFO needed careful thought to make it happen, and it might require specific financing. He confirmed that IFAD stood ready to assist, but, at the same time, FOs should also mobilize to raise the additional support and resources for the regional meetings in due course.

The Vice-President welcomed the reconfirmation of FAFO’s full allegiance to the principle of inclusiveness, and he emphasized that IFAD fully supported the proposed opening of the Steering Committee to new members. He hoped that this would include a representative from pastoralist organizations and also from the WFO and the INOFO.

As regards the FAFO autonomous space, Michel Mordasini highlighted the value this could bring to the dialogue; but he made clear that “IFAD will not take position as regards the organization, composition and the management of such an autonomous space”.

Lastly, he welcomed the fact that the Statement called on governments to implement more enabling policies and investments for the sustainable development of rural areas and smallholder family farming.

He concluded his remarks by saying that IFAD was very grateful for “this very rich outcome and for a Statement with many important dimensions” and he looked forward to the next 10 years of the partnership.

Following IFAD’s official response, the Chair opened the floor for discussion.

The IFAD Governor for Ethiopia said that his delegation greatly appreciated the Farmers’ Forum because, in Africa generally and in Ethiopia in particular, most the population consisted of smallholder farmers. He also welcomed the emphasis placed on pastoralism, which provided the livelihood of a large part of rural population. He also raised a question concerning the FAFO constituency.
In reply, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) clarified that the Farmers' Forum constituency had been defined in 2005, when the process had been launched. The core FAFO constituency comprised all the global and regional networks of small farmers and rural producers in their diversity (including organizations of small fishers, pastoralists and livestock breeders). He added that FAFO and the Indigenous Peoples' Forum were two dialogue platforms at IFAD with a very broad constituency of rural people.

Pio Wennubst, IFAD Governor for Switzerland congratulated the Farmers' Forum on its 10th anniversary, and what it has achieved in that time. He referred to the opportunities presented by the governments’ agreement on a common agenda on sustainable development that included certain goals that were a possible vehicle for FOs’ work. Such an agenda presented a great opportunity to make the system change and become more sustainable.

Djibo Bagna (ROPPA), speaking on behalf of the FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee, thanked IFAD Governors and Board Representatives and said that their significant presence “shows that what we do start to have an impact”. He also recalled that the rationale for the decentralization of the Farmers’ Forum process was linked to the need to get closer to where challenges are. He expressed the willingness of FOs to bring more information to the Governing Council to help Board Representatives to take informed decisions.

Willem Olthof (Head of Section, Delegation of the EU to the United Nations Agencies in Rome) noted with pleasure that SFOAP and MTCP were up and running; and he said that FAFO was an excellent tool for exchanging views. He then made two observations: firstly, that the Statement failed to refer to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030) and that farmers’ reactions would have been very interesting; secondly, he asked IFAD to clarify its position in terms of implementing the VGGTs and to what extent they are being internalized in its operations.

On the first point, Esther Penunia (AFA) confirmed FOs’ engagement and contribution to the Agenda 2030 and hoped that IFAD would support them in engaging with governments at the national level to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals to the benefit of their millions of members. On the second point, Michel Mordasini (IFAD) reassured Willem Olthof that the issues of access to land and land rights were very central to IFAD’s mandate and operations.

Ambassador Pierfrancesco Sacco, (Italian Permanent Mission to the United Nations Agencies in Rome) underscored the importance Italy attaches to IFAD’s work; and he briefly referred to the visit by the President of the
Italian Republic to the opening ceremony of IFAD Governing Council on Wednesday. He emphasized “(...) this is a strong demonstration of the support that Italy, as host country and primary contributor to IFAD, attaches to IFAD’s excellent work (...)

Several FO representatives (e.g. from AFA, SACAU, INOFO, WFO, WAMIP, SeyFA and Bangladesh Krishok Federatio – BKF) thanked IFAD for its commitment to support smallholders, and highlighted the FAFO dialogue space as an important opportunity to share knowledge between peers and give voice to the needs of farmers with a view to influencing policy agendas at all levels. Moreover, representatives from AFA, PROPAC and LENAFU underscored the importance of regional programmes in supporting FO capacity-building, such as SFOAP and MTCP; and they thanked IFAD and partners (i.e. the EU, SDC and AFD) for their participation in these programmes and invited them to further engage with FOs under these initiatives.

Other FO representatives (e.g. from Cambodia and the Dominican Republic) called on IFAD to increase direct support to FOs, or to provide loans directly to them with low or zero interest rates, to enable them to invest in agriculture and gain returns from their investments.

Representatives from WFO and PIFON also welcomed the proposed changes in FAFO governance, particularly the opening up of the Steering Committee to new organizations; and they stressed the need for common rules to guide FAFO in the coming years.

Mr Badrul Alam (Bangladesh Krishok Federation BKF) at the closing session of the 2016 FAFO
“We hope that IFAD will continue with his support to farmers all over the world”
Looking to the future, Jean-Philippe Audinet (IFAD) stressed the need to structure the dialogue and discussion with Representatives of IFAD Member States in greater detail, to give them time to prepare and react to the Statement. He went on to say that “(...) this interface is the only one where we have an informal setting where members of IFAD, country representatives and leaders of FOs of the world can exchange all together very directly”.

Michel Mordasini (IFAD) offered some final thoughts. He said that participants had benefited tremendously over the last few days, from substantive, rich and constructive interactions in the true spirit of the Farmers’ Forum, focusing on the shared goal of placing smallholder farmers, fishers, livestock breeders at the centre of global food security and sustainable rural transformation. He said that FAFO had delivered important messages through the Special Session on Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders, which IFAD acknowledged with thanks. He emphasized that FOs were crucial partners for IFAD, and the relation with them would remain at the core of IFAD business model.

He thanked the Governments of France, Italy and Switzerland for their generous financial support to the 2016 FAFO, and also thanked the EU for its substantial support to SFOAP and MTCP.

He closed the sixth global meeting of FAFO by noting that much work remained to be done to further strengthen the partnership and ensure that, together, IFAD and FOs could deliver more and better results for the rural poor.
Box 4. Statement of the 2016 Global Meeting of the Farmers’ Forum – Towards consolidation of an inclusive and structured dialogue with IFAD to sustainably increase food production by smallholder producers

We, the delegates of the sixth Global Meeting of the Farmers’ Forum, representing networks of organisations of family farmers, livestock breeders and pastoralists, fisher folks and fish workers, artisans, organic farmers and other smallholder producers, from Africa, Asia, the Americas, the Pacific and Europe, have adopted this statement.

The crucial role played by smallholder producers and the fact that they account for over 70 per cent of the world’s food (FAO, 2013) has been confirmed. However, smallholder producers continue to suffer from a generalised crisis, unleashed by the liberalisation of markets, the increasing predominance of multinational companies, land-grabbing, the destruction of local seed systems, the promotion of GMO-seeds, climate change, and the absence of adequate public policies that strengthen food production by smallholder producers in many countries. These phenomena have caused poverty and marginalisation and have activated migration, since people from rural areas, above all, are denied decent livelihoods in their home countries.

This context highlights, once again, the potential and the relevance of IFAD’s vision and role, to achieve an inclusive and sustainable transition in rural areas focusing particularly on small-scale producers.

Since its creation in 2005 the Farmers Forum process has proved itself to be a useful instrument for consolidating the dialogue and the collaboration between IFAD and the small-scale producers’ organizations. In celebrating the Forum’s 10th anniversary we reaffirm and build on the principles on which it was founded.

Both the autonomous evaluation undertaken by the small-scale producer organizations and the internal analysis of IFAD indicate the need for a qualitative evolution to ensure a more effective dialogue between smallholder producer organizations and IFAD, to influence the operations of IFAD in the countries.

Special Session on Pastoralism and Livestock Breeders

On the 12th of February the Special Session with Pastoralists and Livestock Breeders took place as part of the Farmers’ Forum process. Pastoralism is the main livelihood in marginal agricultural land and provides multiple ecosystem services and social benefits. Pastoralists, though, suffer from lack of recognition and unfavorable policies that affect crucial aspects of livestock mobility and communal land access. We call upon IFAD to start a pastoralist policy guiding tailored approaches and investments as well as reinforce institutional capacities of pastoralist organizations. IFAD is called upon to promote the inclusion of pastoralist and extensive livestock breeder organizations at different stages of its working model, to cater for the cross-border dimension of pastoralism, support gender balance and inclusion, security and tenure of pastoralist communal land and the governance of natural resources, particularly cross-border movement, mobility and conflict. Global and regional alliances of pastoralists and extensive livestock breeders should be included and actively participate in the articulation and whole process of the Farmers’ Forum.

Thematic issues

Many major issues have been widely debated by delegates in plenary sessions, working groups regional meetings: seeds, land, markets, agroecology and climate, the forum’s functioning, participation of women and youth, smallholders and markets.

The main outcomes of the thematic working groups are as follows:

Which markets work for smallholders?

The main source of food consumed in our countries are territorial, informal markets, from local to regional, situated in rural, peri-urban and urban settings. Despite their importance for food security and small-scale producers’ livelihoods they are not included in data collection systems, with negative impacts on the quality of the evidence base for public policies. These markets suffer from a series of constraints. In order to support the development of territorial markets the Farmers’ Forum recommends that governments, along with IFAD, regional institutions and United Nations agencies, in collaboration with small-scale producers’ organizations, take the following measures: establish data collection systems on territorial markets, develop appropriate credit systems, invest in appropriate infrastructure, support associations of small-scale producers directed to improving their access to territorial markets, develop hygienic and sanitary public policies adapted to small-scale food producers and territorial markets.
Women and youth
An opportunity was given to women (in 2010) and to youth (in 2012) to speak in Special Sessions of the Farmers’ Forum. Important declarations, recommendations and commitments were adopted. Yet, the fact remains that the actions, size and extent of action taken remain very modest. Participants recommend that small-scale producers’ organizations:
- Strengthen communication and information about actions taken involving women and young people in order to capitalize on successes and replicate them;
- Integrate women and youth in the governance of smallholder producer organizations and encourage men to leave them space.
They urge IFAD to support capacity-building at the grassroots level, extend and multiply specific projects for women and youth, supporting integrated rural development projects.

Smallholder producers and climate change
Agroecological approaches should be encouraged to address the challenges of climate change. There are various obstacles to encouraging the adoption of these approaches. To overcome these, it is necessary to adopt a holistic approach to addressing agriculture. This includes strengthening the capacity of small-scale agroecological producers’ organizations in various areas and linking them to markets that benefit them and to value chains of their choosing. In addition, there is a need to have a vision, including economic justification, for the adoption of agroecological approaches. IFAD should support the autonomous agroecological training and communications initiatives undertaken by small-scale producers’ organizations. It is also recommended to encourage policy coherence regarding agroecological approaches between IFAD, FAO and governments.

Future of the Farmers’ Forum process
The working group discussed the frequency of the global FAFO event and it was agreed that it would take place every four years (next one in 2020) with five regional Forums in between, starting in 2018.
The importance of decentralization or – better – building the Farmers’ Forum process up from the base, was fully supported. Similar processes at regional and national level are crucial.
The Steering Committee will continue to manage the FAFO dialogue process, and the adhesion of new members in the committee is agreed consensual criteria. Small-scale producer organizations will continue to organize their autonomous space and decide autonomously on participation.

Recommendations
In the light of the above the smallholder producer organizations invite IFAD to support the implementation of the recommendations from the autonomous evaluation as well as the results of the debates in the Farmers’ Forum regarding the following issues:

(A) An improvement of the governance of the Forum: supporting its functioning through the following aspects:

1. An autonomous space that will be called the “Farmers’ Forum – Autonomous Small-Scale Producer Space” and is open to small-scale producer organizations from different constituencies including indigenous peoples. In this space, small-scale producers will prepare for the dialogue with IFAD through analysis, evaluation and discussion. This space will be managed by the Orientation Committee and its composition will be autonomously defined.

2. The “Farmers Forum – Dialogue Space” which will be open to small-scale food producer organizations, to IFAD and other producer organizations. This dialogue space will be managed by the Steering Committee composed of the members of the Orientation Committee, representatives of IFAD and representatives of other newly joining producer organizations.

3. The establishment of regional and national spaces that respect the principles of the governance and processes of the global FAFO should be supported, building on existing mechanisms.

4. The international Farmers’ Forum event will take place every four years. The seventh international Farmers’ Forum will take place in 2020. In between the international Farmers’ Forum, regional forums will be organized.

5. Clearly define the vision of the Forum, clearly targeting small-scale family farming (including all constituencies) and highlighting agroecology as one of the principles among others.

6. Strengthen active and participatory role of youth and women in the Forum process at all levels, guaranteeing equality and the goal to achieve a participation of 50 per cent women and 30 per cent youth.
(B) Strengthening IFAD support for policy dialogues and implementation and the relevance of its operations in the countries by focusing on the following:

1. Develop further analysis of the country programs and develop strategies on a case-by-case basis regarding how to achieve adequate participation of small-scale food producer organizations.
2. Develop guidelines for IFAD staff regarding the participation of small-scale food producers in the design, formulation, implementation and evaluation of country programmes, as well as participation in dialogue processes at the national, regional and international levels.
3. Systematically communicate the recommendations of the Forum to IFAD staff at all levels.
4. Mobilize resources to support the participation of small-scale food producers in the design, implementation and evaluation of COSOPs and specific projects and national, regional investment plans.
5. The continuation of specific programmes for women, youth, small-scale fisheries, pastoralism and small-scale livestock as well as programmes to strengthen the capacities of small-scale producers, as in SFOAP and MTCP.
6. Support to the strengthening of small-scale food producer initiatives around agroecological food production and control over local seeds and local livestock breeds as a key approach and an appropriate response to climate change.
7. Strengthen initiatives that aim to stop and prevent land-grabbing and to establish agrarian reforms in favour of the landless and small-scale producers, and support follow-up to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD).
8. Support the effective implementation at national level of the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGTs), to secure access to nature resources and avoid that pastoralist lands are grabbed to establish national parks and protected areas, denying customary rights as is the case in many countries.
9. Continue to support the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries.
10. The development of value chains by smallholders themselves through processes of transformation and marketing of their own produce in such a way they keep control. Small-scale food producers engaged in industrial value chains should be supported to reduce their dependence and increase the benefits themselves.

(C) Support ongoing autonomous capacity for follow-up, analysis and evaluation at all levels

Autonomous capacity by small-scale food producers will allow a more effective implementation of FAFO recommendations and contribute to the scaling-up of demonstrated positive experiences within the framework of the collaboration between IFAD and the small-scale food producer organizations and the relevant departments of public administrations regarding the implementation of projects.

We encourage IFAD to strengthen synergies with other agencies, especially FAO (i.e. on the Pastoralist Knowledge Hub, agroecology issues) and develop further support to the implementation of CFS decisions including effective follow-up by national governments and the participation of small-scale food producer organisations, and to support other important initiatives for small-scale food producers, such as the steps taken by the United Nations Human Rights Council to draft a treaty on rights abuses by multinationals and a United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Peasants.

We expect governments concerned to implement appropriate measures

- To ensure the autonomous and effective participation of small-scale food producer organisations in the Farmers’ Forum process, in IFAD-supported projects and programmes on agriculture and food.
- To create finance mechanisms and appropriate investments to support and increase the contributions of small holders to food sovereignty, food and nutritional security, poverty reduction and the creation of jobs.

Small-scale food producer organisations commit to:

- Launch a process to strengthen the different spaces in the Farmers’ Forum in view of strengthening the autonomy for small-scale producers, its inclusive nature and its effectiveness.
- Follow-up on the implementation of recommendations and decisions taken at the Forum, together with IFAD, through regional and national networks, and periodically make an autonomous evaluation of the Forum process.
Post Farmers' Forum Committee and follow up actions
Post Farmers' Forum Committee and follow up actions

Post Farmers’ Forum Steering Committee. The members of the Farmers’ Forum Steering Committee met on February 17 to take operational decisions following the indications of the 2016 Farmers’ Forum Statement and the IFAD’s response to it.

First issue was the operationalization of new 4-year FAFO cycle. The FAFO Steering Committee reiterated that next global meeting of the FAFO will be organized in 2020 and that regional FAFO meetings will take place between 2017 and 2018. In this regard, it was decided that appointed leaders19 of the FAFO Steering Committee in each region will, together with IFAD, start setting up Regional Steering Committees and organizing regional FAFO meetings between 2017 and 2018.

Second issue on the agenda was the updating of the FAFO Consensus document. The document was adopted in 2005 and the Steering Committee agreed on few amendments ten years following its adoption, to take into account some of the elements of the 2016 FAFO Statement (see box 5 for the updated FAFO Consensus Document).

Third issue was the approval of the Steering Committee to invite three additional organizations as members of the FAFO Global Steering Committee: the World Farmers’ Organization (WFO), the Intercontinental Network of Organic Farmers Organisations (INOFO), and the World Alliance of Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP) as an organization representative of pastoralists and livestock breeders. It was decided that invitations would be sent to these organizations highlighting clear criteria to be met for joining the FAFO Steering Committee.

---

19 Djibo Bagna for Western and Central Africa; Theo de Jaeger and Elisabeth Mpofu for Eastern and Southern Africa and for Northern Africa; Fernando Lopez and Edgardo Garcia for Latin America and the Caribbean; Ujjaini Halim, Esther Penunia Banzuela and Herman Kumara Wijethunge for Asia and the Pacific.
Box 5: 2005: The Farmers Forum Consensus

The participants share IFAD’s fundamental objective of overcoming rural poverty through the economic, social and political empowerment of rural poor people themselves and their organizations.

They agree with and support the overall project of creating a Farmers’ Forum for consultations and dialogue on ways to “enable the rural poor to overcome poverty” and on IFAD operations.

The Farmers’ Forum is:
- an ongoing, bottom-up, process – not a periodic event – spanning IFAD-supported operations on the ground and policy dialogue;
- a tripartite process involving farmers’ organizations, governments and IFAD;
- a space for consultation and dialogue focused on rural poverty reduction and the centrality of smallholders and family farming development in this process;
- an instrument for accountability of development effectiveness, in particular in the area of empowerment of rural poor people and their organizations; and
- an interface between pro-poor rural development interventions and the process of enhancing the capacity of farmers’ and rural producers’ organizations (including organizations of artisanal fishers, pastoralists and landless workers and indigenous peoples).

The Farmers’ Forum:
- is guided by the principles of inclusiveness, pluralism, openness and flexibility;
- is built on existing fora where possible, avoiding duplication in these cases; and
- respects existing organizations and creating new spaces where needed; and
- is a joint dialogue platform steered – at global and regional levels – by joint and inclusive Steering Committees of representative membership-driven producers organizations and IFAD. Steering Committees have clear mandate, rules of procedures and code of conduct. The Farmers Forum process also includes autonomous spaces for consultation and preparation among producers’ organizations before meeting with IFAD.

Conditions
- The forum process starts with national-level consultations that feed into regional or sub-regional meetings. The latter shape the content of, and participation in, the Farmers’ Forum at IFAD’s Governing Council.
- The forum process should feed into IFAD’s governing bodies.
- The forum’s success depends on IFAD’s capacity to enhance country-level consultation with farmers’ organizations and contribute to their capacity-building needs.
- Participants recommend, in particular, institutionalizing engagement with farmers’ organizations in key IFAD operational processes (projects, and country and regional strategies).

---

(1) From the Concluding Statement of the Workshop “Towards a Farmers Forum at IFAD’s Governing Council”. Rome, February 2005, endorsed by IFAD and 34 representatives of Farmers Organizations from all continents, including the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP), La Via Campesina (LVC) and Reseau des Organisations Paysannes et Producteurs Agricoles de l’Afrique de l’Ouest (ROPPA).
(2) The second part of this defining point on “the centrality of smallholder and family farming development in this process” has been added by decision of the FAFO Steering Committee in February 2016 at the sixth global meeting of the FAFO.
(3) Initial reference to indigenous peoples in this list was withdrawn in February 2016 following the creation in 2012 – at the request of Indigenous Peoples Organizations - of an Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD.
(4) This entire paragraph was added by decision of the FAFO Steering Committee in February 2016 at the sixth global meeting of the FAFO.
**Follow up actions.** Invitation letters were sent by IFAD on behalf of all Steering Committee members and confirmation letters were received by INOFO on March 3, 2016, by WFO on March 31, 2016, while for WAMIP its membership to the FAFO Steering Committee is pending since reply is yet to be provided by WAMIP to the conditions<sup>20</sup> included in the invitation letter.

As a result the **organizations member of the Farmers' Forum Global Steering Committee in 2016** are the following:

- Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development (AFA); [www.asianfarmers.org](http://www.asianfarmers.org)
- Confederación de Organizaciones de Productores Familiares (COPROFAM)
- Intercontinental Network of Organic Farmers Organisations (INOFO); [www.inofo.org](http://www.inofo.org)
- La Via Campesina (LVC); [www.viacampesina.org](http://www.viacampesina.org)
- PanAfrican Farmers’ Organization (PAFO); [www.pafo-africa.org](http://www.pafo-africa.org)
- Réseau des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs de l'Afrique de l'Ouest (ROPPA); [www.roppa-afrigue.org](http://www.roppa-afrigue.org)
- World Farmers’ Organization (WFO); [www.wfo-oma.com](http://www.wfo-oma.com)
- World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fish Workers (WFF); [www.worldfisherforum.org](http://www.worldfisherforum.org)
- World Forum of Fisher Peoples (WFFP); [www.worldfishers.org](http://www.worldfishers.org)
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); [www.ifad.org](http://www.ifad.org)

---

<sup>20</sup> Conditions attached to the invitation letter to WAMIP were: (1) communication and disclosure of the list of national organizations member of WAMIP; (2) confirmation that national organizations member of WAMIP are membership-based and membership-driven producers’ organizations legally recognized in their country; (3) communication of the status of WAMIP, of the report of its last General Assembly and of the composition of its elected Governing Body; (4) written confirmation of WAMIP adherence to the 2005 Farmers Forum Consensus.
Side Events of the 2016 Farmers’ Forum
A series of side events were organized by IFAD, FOs and other partners on February 18 and 19, as described below.

The main elements discussed and issues addressed during the side events are summarized in the following section of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date, time and venue</th>
<th>Organizers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up on the 2014 Special Session on Small-Scale Fisheries</td>
<td>17 February, 9:00 – 10:30 hrs Meeting Room C600</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFOAP and MTCP knowledge-sharing event</td>
<td>17 February, 9:00 – 13:00 hrs Meeting Room C500</td>
<td>AFA, LVC and PAFO in partnership with IFAD and SDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD knowledge management tools to improve the partnership with FOs</td>
<td>17 February, 16:00 – 18:00 hrs Meeting Room C600</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience of Italian Cooperatives and the development of</td>
<td>18 February, 9:00 – 10:45 hrs Italian Conference Room</td>
<td>Coopermondo, Fedagri Confcooperative (Alliance of Italian Cooperatives) and IFAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships with FOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 – A new scenario for Latin America and the Caribbean: risks</td>
<td>18 February, 9:00 – 10:45 hrs Meeting Room C500</td>
<td>Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), COPROFAM, the IFAD MERCOSUR Programme, the Latin American Centre for Human Economy (CLAEH) and Corporación PBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and challenges for strengthening the progress of distinct policies in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The steps ahead for FAFO</td>
<td>18 February, 9:00 – 10:45 hrs Meeting Room C600</td>
<td>FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYFF +10: Strengthening common action in favour of family arming</td>
<td>18 February, 14:00 – 15:30 hrs Oval Conference Room</td>
<td>WRF, AFA, COPROFAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after the IYFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory guarantee systems (PGSs) and their potential to</td>
<td>18 February, 14:00 – 15:30 hrs Meeting Room C500</td>
<td>INOFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitate market access, livelihood improvement and social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings from the FAFO thematic working groups</td>
<td>18 February, 14.00 – 15.30 hrs Meeting Room C600</td>
<td>FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee of the Farmers’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to the future: farmers re-envisioning the value and role of</td>
<td>18 February, 15.30 – 17.00 hrs Oval Conference Room</td>
<td>AFA, COPROFAM, EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA and the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural research for development and innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activities of FOs: recent initiatives, approaches for</td>
<td>18 February, 15:30 – 17:00 hrs Meeting Room C500</td>
<td>AgriCord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support, complementarities between national and local organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA Africa): promoting local food</td>
<td>18 February, 15:30 – 17:00 hrs Meeting Room C600</td>
<td>WFP (World Food Programme) and FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procurement to link smallholder producers to institutional markets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the role of farmers’ organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up on the 2014 Special Session on Small-Scale Fisheries

Organized by: IFAD

Introduction and objectives of the side event. The side event aimed to provide a space to discuss the follow-up and actions taken after FAFO 2014 Special Session on Small-Scale Fisheries (SSFs), exchange information and experiences between IFAD and small-scale fisheries organizations (SSFOs), and propose new recommendations for continued cooperation.

Agenda

- Overview of IFAD activities in small-scale fisheries;
- Presentations by SSFO representatives;
- Open discussion;
- Conclusion and closure.

Main interventions. The side event was opened and chaired by Editrudith Lukanga (WFF, United Republic of Tanzania). In her welcoming remarks, she praised IFAD for the support provided to enable grassroots organizations to participate in the development and implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries (SSF Guidelines). She commended IFAD for its commitment to SSFs and emphasized SSFO’s desire to maintain the cooperation.

Richard Abila (IFAD Senior Technical Specialist – Fisheries and Aquaculture) described IFAD’s experience and activities in supporting fisheries and aquaculture. He briefly highlighted key challenges identified in the sector, particularly relating to the degraded resource environment, difficult work places, climate change, sociocultural constraints, technological and market issues and rural finance constraints. He pointed out that fisheries and aquaculture were attracting increased attention in IFAD as a way of addressing poverty and food security, as shown by the rising trend in IFAD’s approval of loans and grants for fisheries and aquaculture. Richard Abila also considered IFAD’s involvement with small island developing states, giving examples of different projects as well as the main aspects to be improved (e.g. the need for projects that are better targeted to the needs of communities; more engagement at the policy level; closer linkages between ICOs and SSFOs, more effective capacity-building/development and financial services).

Antonio Onorati (President of Centro Internazionale Crocevia and international focal point of the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty – IPC) made a short presentation on the new IFAD grant Capacity Building for Implementation of the International Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small Scale Fisheries, which will support fishers’ organizations (i.e. WFF, WFFP and the International Collective in Support of Fish Workers – ICSF) to: (i) raise awareness of the SSF Guidelines

---

21 A total of 68 loans and 12 grants have been approved since 1990; and 22 loans and nine grants are currently being implemented. The IFAD divisions that invested most in fisheries and aquaculture are APR (44 per cent), followed by ESA (26 per cent) and WCA (15 per cent). The projects themes mentioned include: resource management systems; fishery value chain infrastructure and services; aquaculture and mariculture systems; capacity in fishery institutions and organizations; policy reform processes; financial inclusion (saving/loan initiatives; matching grants; revolving fund); rural/coastal infrastructure; environment and climate adaptation/resilience (adaptation strategies; mangrove afforestation); emergency/disaster response.
among small-scale fishery workers, their communities and organizations, and to mobilize support for their implementation; (ii) initiate capacity-building programmes for the fishers' organizations and position them as key actors in implementing the SSF Guidelines; (iii) identify priorities and a process to develop indicators and criteria for monitoring implementation of the SSF Guidelines; (iv) enhance the skills and capacity of WFFP and WFF member organizations and other SSF workers' organizations, to be able to play a more effective role in national, regional and international policy dialogue and decision-making processes.

Ujjaini Halim (WFF) further highlighted the increasing challenges faced by small-scale fishers and stressed that they were not adequately recognized – women fishers in particular. The key challenges included the lack of baseline data for the design and monitoring of programmes, unfair competition for resources, the effects of climate change and the lack of policy consistency. She noted that IFAD had implemented many of the recommendations from the 2014 FAFO Special Session (e.g. the launch of a grant in support of SSFOs), although achieving good relationships with local governments remained a problem. She added that the partnership between SSFOs and IFAD should focus on: (i) strengthening SSFO linkages with value chains, with a special focus on women (gender-sensitive markets); (ii) supporting SSFO capacity-building; (iii) providing support for SSFO policy engagement; (iv) paying attention to climate change, especially to improve disaster preparedness; (v) ensuring the availability of more financial support; and (vi) ensuring better linkages with IFAD at the country level.

Herman Kumara (WFFP) gave a presentation on the priorities and expectations of SSFOs. In particular, he underscored the importance of supporting them in terms of capacity-building for implementing the SSF Guidelines. He also recommended IFAD to provide support to: (i) protect the rights of SSF communities in neglected and marginalized inland water bodies; (ii) provide assistance for leadership development among women leaders; (iii) facilitate the integration of fishery organizations in IFAD-supported programmes (e.g. MTCP) and in the design of IFAD strategies; (iv) ensure the traditional customary rights of SSFs are respected by supporting SSFO involvement in policy dialogue at the national level.

**Discussion.** Following the introductory remarks, the speaker opened the floor to participants. A summary of the recommendations of 2014 FAFO Special Session was read to facilitate the discussion and assess the extent to which these had been implemented. The main points raised by participants are summarized below.

- **Implementation of the recommendations by IFAD and the limited dialogue with governments.** SSFO representatives agreed that most of the recommendations to IFAD had been implemented and the commitments had been respected. However, although some positive results were achieved (e.g. particularly in Central America), dialogue between the SSFOs and national governments was still limited;

- **SSF Guidelines and VGTT as a guide for the design of projects in support of SSF.** SSFO representatives pointed out that SSF Guidelines and VGTT should be used as the main guiding instruments for government engagement in all SSF-related projects;
• **Access to resources.** It was further noted that securing access to land, water, productive resources and prior consultations with communities remained issues in most regions;

• **Achievement of results within IFAD-funded projects.** Participants observed that in some IFAD projects interventions were not achieving the expected results in terms of the benefits for SSFs. It was suggested that IFAD could improve targeting by involving SSFO more effectively in the design of IFAD-supported projects and to consider mechanisms for channelling financial support directly through organizations.

**Conclusion and closure.** Based on the discussion the following was agreed:

• IFAD and SSFOs should strengthen their collaboration based on the recognition of the role played by SSFs for food security and poverty reduction and the role played by IFAD in promoting local participation;

• SSFOs should be more effectively engaged in the design of IFAD strategies and projects;

• IFAD should facilitate SSFO participation in regional and national workshops and meetings to improve the dialogue with IFAD and governments at the country level;

• IFAD should pay particular attention to the importance for small-scale fishers of having secure access to land, water, productive resources, and the need to be involved in interventions and decisions affecting their livelihood. Prior consultations with SSFOs should be held and promoted when fishery-related projects were being designed;

• IFAD should support SSFOs in fully implementing the SSF Guidelines, particularly in relation to capacity-building and access to technical and financial resources;

• IFAD should promote the development and strengthening of SSF linkages with markets, paying particular attention to gender, climate change and other cross-cutting issues;

• The use of SSF Guidelines and VGGT should be promoted at all levels. Also, IFAD's Governing Bodies should adopt them as the key guiding tools for engaging in SSF-related projects.

---

**SFOAP and MTCP knowledge-sharing event**

**Organized by:** AFA, LVC and PAFO, in partnership with IFAD and SDC

**Introduction.** One of the main requests from FOs and specific outputs of FAFO was the 2009 launch of capacity-building programmes, supporting FOs through direct financing, such as the MTCP in Asia and the Pacific and SFOAP. These two programmes, which are now in their second phase, are implemented by, for and with FOs, supervised by IFAD and funded by IFAD, SDC, EU (both programmes) and AFD (SFOAP only).
The programmes are organized around three main components: institutional and organizational strengthening, policy engagement and the provision of economic services. The promotion of exchanges and lessons learned between African and Asia-Pacific FOS on good practices, as well as challenges related to programme implementation, are also supported by the programmes.

**Objectives of the side event.** The objective of the side event was to facilitate communication, networking and exchanges among FOS from the two regions to learn lessons on programme implementation and management as well as general issues of relevance for FOS. In particular, the event aimed to: (i) share information and documents related to FOS’ activities and experiences within the two programmes; and (ii) agree on a roadmap for learning between FOS from the two regions.

**Main interventions.** Thomas Heimgartner (SDC) made a few introductory remarks on the two programmes, emphasizing that SFOAP and MTCP should not be considered as projects but as elements of a broader strategy.

Following this, the first part of the meeting was devoted to the presentation of programme experiences and results achieved in the two regions.

Mainza Mugoya (Policy Officer at EAFF) and Keshab Khadka (South Asia Coordinator at ANPFA) gave two presentations on policy engagement initiatives at the national level in their respective regions, leading to specific results benefiting smallholder farmers (e.g. in terms of taxation). Value-chain development initiatives were also shared by Smita Bhatnagar (SEWA, India) and Nathanael Buka Mupungu, Secretary General of *Confédération Paysanne du Congo* (COPACO) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, respectively, as summarized below.

- **The experience of the Rudi Multi Trading Company Limited.** Based on the identified challenges faced by smallholders (e.g. low production capacity, exploitation by middleman due to lack of organization and market access, high debt levels, lack of working capital and technology, lack of awareness of production and market access), Rudi was created by SEWA as an agribusiness initiative to promote the economic empowerment of women smallholder farmers, and provide quality products at affordable prices. Rudi is a for-profit organization with share capital owned by local farmers’ groups. It procures directly from farmers, and rural women producer groups are responsible for processing, and also for marketing and sales. Achievements include the following: (i) 15,000 farmers were able to access direct market linkages to obtain prices that were 20-30 per cent higher than those offered locally by traders; (ii) 400 processors are obtaining regular employment and earning INR 5,000-10,000 per month; (iii) 3,000 “rudibens” (distributors and dealers) are earning INR 5,000-25,000 per month through sales and marketing; (iv) sales turnover in 13 years was INR 48 crores (US$ 7 million), with 90 per cent of the proceeds going to farmers and rural communities as income.

- **The “One farmer, one dollar” campaign.** COPACO was engaged in a five-year campaign to: (i) promote the empowerment and sustainability of COPACO and its member FOS; (ii) set up a guarantee fund; (iii) open a national farmers’ bank, Caisse Nationale de Crédit Agricole Paysanne; (iv) mobilize US$ 17.5 million by 2030; (v) provide sustainable economic services to FO members. The campaign was coordinated and managed by several committees and
Several initiatives were put in place to achieve the expected results, including the decision to impose a levy of 1 per cent on FO members’ agricultural income (the Panier du Paysan), organization of the annual Day of the Caisse Agricole Paysanne and COPACO week. Preliminary outcomes of the campaign include the following: (i) about 1,608 million farmers were contacted by the campaign. Of these, 372,000 mobilized US$1 per year, 292,000 raised US$12 per year, and 452 mobilized US$5 per month; (ii) eight local farmers’ banks are open and operational; (iii) 35 village committees to mobilize local savings are operational; (iv) a blocked bank account has been opened.

**Discussion.** Participants engaged in a lively discussion contributing several questions and inputs. The main elements of the discussion are summarized below.

- **Importance of the private sector.** The need to consider the private sector as an important player to fill existing gaps was highlighted by EAFF representatives;

- **Lessons learned.** EAFF announced the signing of a South-South protocol with partners in India. This might be a good opportunity for EAFF to visit the SEWA/Rudi initiative;

- **The RUDI SMS system.** Participants showed particular interest in the RUDI SMS price information system. Additional information was provided on this tool, which works at a very decentralized level;

- **The COPACO campaign.** Questions were also asked of COPACO, particularly relating to the modalities that will ensure the funds raised through the campaign are managed in a transparent and sustainable way. The representative from the Ligue des Organisations des Femmes Paysannes du Congo (LOFEPACO) also asked whether the campaign was open to non-COPACO members. The reply from COPACO was positive, since LOFEPACO has a partnership agreement with it.

- **Access to credit.** FO representatives pointed out that setting up local saving and loan banks managed by FOs was very challenging and required specific capacities and professional skills.

**Main recommendations and conclusions.** Based on the discussion, participants agreed on the need to take this peer-to-peer exchange and learning process further. In particular, the following suggestions were made:

- Regional consultations will be organized within the new FAFO setup. These might be effective spaces for FOs to exchange experiences;

- The organization of the side event revealed great interest among FOs in sharing knowledge. More exchanges in the field should be organized in the future;

- Knowledge management hubs and capacities should be strengthened to promote the exchange of experiences based on the interests and requests of FOs;

- Exchanges should be promoted mainly on value-chain development, particularly involving young farmers and the use of technologies (e.g. for processing products);
IFAD also recommended FOs involved in SFOAP to include an exchange visit in their annual work plans and budgets. A commodity could be chosen annually in each region, and a related experience identified within MTCP-supported FOs. The learning route methodology could be used to guide the process, including the development of innovation plans by the participants, for implementation in the countries of origin.

**IFAD knowledge management tools to improve the partnership with FOs**

**Organized by:** IFAD

**Introduction.** The 2014 global meeting of FAFO gave pride of place to discussion and debate on specific issues reflecting the current and future state of affairs in the FO-IFAD partnership.

The FO representatives have reiterated their interest in receiving more information on IFAD’s activities related to FOs at all levels. From the IFAD staff perspective, however, it is often a challenge to identify the existing FOs that are active in IFAD-targeted countries, their networks and possibly their activities/areas of intervention. Moreover, additional guidance was needed within IFAD to design projects in support of farmer organizations and with their participation.

Consequently, IFAD has made an effort to address and respond to identified issues and needs. In particular, the following two knowledge management tools were developed: (i) websites on the partnership between IFAD and FOs; and (ii) a toolkit for practitioners on how to engage with FOs for more effective smallholder development.

**Objectives of the side event.**

- To share two newly developed tools to improve the partnership with FOs;
- To obtain the views of FOs and their input to help improve the tools, focusing particularly on the website.

**Main interventions.** The side event was opened by Valeria Galletti, Independent Consultant at IFAD, involved in the development of the two instruments. She gave a presentation on the main objectives, contents and structure of the two knowledge management tools developed by IFAD. The main elements from the presentation are summarized below.

- **Toolkit for practitioners on how to engage with FOs for more effective smallholder development.** As part of IFAD’s corporate effort to develop practical hands-on “how to do” notes, the toolkit was developed to provide guidance on more effective engagement in sustainable partnerships with FOs.
within IFAD-funded projects, considering FOs as relevant partners rather than mere beneficiaries. The toolkit focuses on projects supporting the development of FOs and their capacity to provide economic services that are relevant to their members and to strengthen connections between poor smallholders and market opportunities. This is the result of a systematization of the different modalities and strategies used by IFAD to enter into partnership with FOs, for the purpose of knowledge sharing and possible replication/adaptation. The toolkit also provides practical tools and modules to address identified issues. In particular, the following key objectives are addressed and instruments proposed: (i) to gain a better understanding of the FOs that exist in the targeted area, and their strengths and weaknesses, through mapping and profiling; (ii) to gain an understanding of the type of support that a project can foster to improve FOs’ capacity to provide economic services by supporting their design of a business plan (to identify a medium-term target for economic profitability) or their choice of a relevant business model; (iii) to improve the design of a project’s institutional set-up, based on the organizations’ capacities by considering experiences in IFAD-funded projects in the different regions.

- **Websites on the partnership between IFAD and FOs.** The structure and contents of the website were presented to participants online. The website contains information on both IFAD and FOs. In the case of IFAD, the website describes the institution’s strategies and instruments for engaging in partnership with FOs at all levels (e.g. within FAFO, through global and regional grants, through the design and implementation of IFAD-supported projects etc.); the main trends of the partnership (globally and regionally); and it contains information on IFAD portfolios in the different countries (including the key contacts). The section of the website devoted to FOs (yet to be completed) will contain a profiling of existing/active FOs in the different countries, based on a simplified profiling template that has been developed. This should enable IFAD staff to easily obtain information on the FOs that are active in a given country, the composition of their membership, and their main areas of intervention and the services they provide. The idea is for these profiles to be developed by IFAD based on existing resources and/or material available online or/and based on FOs shared information. IFAD is in fact planning to generate an interactive system enabling FOs to submit information through a template, for IFAD to screen and elaborate further. Nonetheless, the criteria for FOs to be included in the website need to be defined.

**Discussion.** The discussion was led by Valeria Galletti with support and input from Fanny Grandval (Independent Consultant for IFAD), who also contributed to the development of the instruments. Participants engaged in the discussion by sharing relevant comments and inputs for to improve the tools. The main elements discussed and points raised are summarized below.

- **Target audience of the toolkit.** Participants requested clarification on the toolkit’s target audience. They were told that it had been developed to support IFAD staff and consultants engaged in the design and implementation of IFAD-funded projects, in support, and/or with the participation of FOs;

- **Information requested on the profiling template and inclusion of FOs.** Concerns were raised about the detail of the information included in the
profiling template developed for the website. Excessively detailed information in the template might deter small FOs with limited capacities from completing it, thereby making the information collected less reliable. One suggestion was to keep the minimum data that all FOs would be able to provide and turn the profile into a type of directory of FOs (e.g. including name and main contacts). Nonetheless, this was not considered a good alternative because it would be contrary to the purpose of the FO-dedicated website, which is to enable IFAD staff wishing to design a project in a given country to easily obtain basic information on the FOs, their main activities, services and partners, and their constituency. IFAD consultants also stressed that it was unrealistic to think that national pages on FOs would encompass all FOs existing worldwide. Instead, the website should be seen as a work in progress; and an effort will be made to be as complete and inclusive as possible of the main FOs operating in IFAD-target countries;

- **Use of available material.** Participants involved in implementing the MTCP shared their experiences and the challenges faced in profiling FOs in MTCP-covered countries – mainly owing to the substantial diversity that exists among FOs in terms of structuring and maturity. AgriCord also shared their activities in that area. The importance of taking full advantage of material already developed was stressed by participants;

- **Aggregation of the information and analysis.** A question was raised on the possible risks involved in developing aggregated analysis of collected data (e.g. representatives from SACAU). On this point the consultants clarified that there was no sense in consolidating and analysing the information;

- **Sensitive information.** Representatives from SACAU also shared their experience with the development of their members database and suggested paying attention to sensitive information (e.g. their members were not comfortable sharing information on the percentage of membership fees in the organizations' budgets);

- **Updating of information on the website.** Many FO representatives (e.g. from the Syndicat de Défense des Intérêts Paysans (SYDIP) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo) asked how to keep the information in the published profiles up to date. A proposal was made for FOs to update the information through the site on a regular basis (every 15 days). Nonetheless, Valeria Galletti pointed out that this was not effective and not really necessary. In fact, the idea of the profiling would be to have a simple presentation record on FOs that would not need to be updated so often.

**Recommendation and conclusions.** The side event was brought to a close, with the following main take-aways:

- The toolkit should contain a list of references/resource persons/organizations including their contact details;
- The websites devoted to FOs should indicate the date on which the profile was developed/last updated;
- More pictures should be included on the website;
- AFA should share their profiling template for possible integration/adaptation;
- Where available, already developed profiles/materials should be used in the website;
• IFAD will consider developing instruments to enable regular updating of the profiling templates (e.g. by creating time-bound alerts to be sent to FOs that have submitted information to IFAD).

The experience of Italian Cooperatives and the development of partnerships with FOs

Organized by: Coopermondo, Fedagri Confcooperative (Alliance of Italian Cooperatives) and IFAD.

Introduction. With over 130 years’ experience in the Italian socioeconomic context, Italian cooperatives have gained a crucial role in the domestic economy and currently contribute around 8 per cent of the country's gross domestic product).

In the last 10 years, Italian cooperatives have intensified their support for developing countries. In 2008-2012 they contributed to over 100 international cooperation projects and invested more than EUR 60 million to strengthen counterpart organizations operating in various economic sectors in developing countries.22

At the international level, in the resolution adopted at the third International Conference on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, July 2015) the United Nations General Assembly called upon relevant agencies to further coordinate and collaborate to strengthen efforts to “enhance food security and nutrition and focus our efforts on smallholders and women farmers, as well as on agricultural cooperatives and farmers' networks” by improving access to markets, enabling domestic and international environments and strengthening collaboration across the many initiatives (e.g. the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme – CAADP).

The experience of Italian cooperatives can make a significant contribution to this global agenda and to the growth of cooperatives in developing countries, by sharing their knowledge and business practices, and by showcasing how partnerships with other chain stakeholders and rural financial services can be effectively developed.

Within this context, the partnership between public, private and international organizations could prove effective. Starting in 2015, the Permanent Mission of Italy to the United Nations Agencies in Rome has kick-started a dialogue between IFAD, Coopermondo and Fedagri-Confcooperative to develop a win-win partnership in support of FOs already cooperating with IFAD.

Objectives of the side event. The main objectives of the side event include the following:

- Learn about the experience of Italian cooperatives in the agrifood and rural financial service sectors;
- Draw practical lessons from the experience of Italian cooperatives that could

---

22 See Cooperatives in Development (https://coopseurope.coop/development), a project and online portal funded by Coopermondo-Confcooperative on behalf of CooperativesEurope. In 2014, Italian cooperatives were officially recognized as non-profit actors by the new law on Italian development cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.
be of interest to FOs for business development.

**Detailed Agenda and speakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Pierfrancesco Sacco, (Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations agencies in Rome),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolfo Brizzi (IFAD), Roberto Longo (IFAD),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:25</td>
<td>The experience of Italian cooperatives in the rice value chain</td>
<td>Giorgio Mercuri (President Fedagri-Confcooperative), Silvano Saviolo (President Associazione Riscoltori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piemontesi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25 – 9:35</td>
<td>The experience of Italian cooperatives in the dairy value chain</td>
<td>Cesare Baldrighi (President Consorzio Tutela Grana Padano)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35 – 9:45</td>
<td>The experience of Coopermondo with international development projects</td>
<td>Danilo Salerno (Director Coopermondo – NGO of Confcooperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 9:55</td>
<td>The role of cooperative finance in international development</td>
<td>Ignace Gustave Bikoula (Federcasse - Italian Federation of Co-Operative Banks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:55 – 10:25</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:25 – 10:30</td>
<td>Conclusion and closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main interventions.** The side event was opened by Ambassador Pierfrancesco Sacco and Adolfo Brizzi (Director of PTA, IFAD) and moderated by Roberto Longo (IFAD). Speakers stressed the importance of the cooperative movement in Europe (e.g. in terms of revenue produced, employment created and provision of inputs) and the importance of sharing their successes and failures during their long history. The Italian model was presented as very similar to the cooperative models in developing countries, in terms of loyalty to the family farming base, thus being of interest for the purpose of lessons learned.

**Speakers** (from left): Danilo Salerno (Coopermondo), Giorgio Mercuri (Fedagri-Confcooperative), Silvano Saviolo (Italian Associazione Riscoltori Piemontesi), Ambassador Sacco, Adolfo Brizzi (IFAD), Cesare Baldrighi (Consorzio Grana Padano)

Ambassador Sacco also focused on Italian strategies and approaches in terms of cooperation, emphasizing the concept of "co-development" (developing together) as a key approach for Italy to engage in international development. He also expressed his pride at Italy being the third largest donor in IFAD’s 10th replenishment, and the fact that it hosts United Nations agencies such as IFAD, FAO and the WFP.

Giorgio Mercuri from the **Fedagri-Confcooperative** highlighted the importance of the Italian cooperatives model’s ability to add value to products while supporting economic and social development at the territorial level. With more than 130 years’ experience, small and large cooperatives in fact play a complementary role (e.g.
preserving and maintaining territorial presence and facilitating exports, respectively); and they contribute to economic development in the territories they operate in.

Silvano Saviolo described the experience of the Italian Association of Rice Producers (Associazione Risicoltori Piemontesi), created in 1981 with the inclusion of 20 farm enterprises to address the structural deficiencies in the supply and marketing of rice, and to encourage producers to participate in agricultural programming. The association now has 170 members and provides the following services, among others:

- **Compensating for market deficiencies.** The rice sector is characterized by strong fluctuations which make programming/planning a challenge. To address this issue, the association stores members’ production in silos, and gradually releases it onto markets to ensure price stability. It also compensates for market deficiencies by guaranteeing payments to producers (members are paid an advance of EUR 25 per ton) and by providing insurance covering up to 95 per cent of foreseen/expected production;
- **Technical services.** The association provides support to their members by providing them with key services such as market analysis and the sharing of price-related information, the provision of technical assistance for marketing, and laboratory analysis to determine product quality;
- **Involvement in European-financed projects.** The association is involved in EU supported projects and initiatives such as “La strada del riso” to promote the rice product and territories;
- **Looking to the future.** The association developed a project to collect the large volume of processing waste to be sold to industries and used as biomass for energy production.

The experience of Italian cooperatives in the dairy value chain was described by Cesare Baldrighi. In particular, the main characteristics of the Consorzio Tutela Grana Padano (Consortium for the protection of the Grana Padano cheese) were presented as follows:

- The consortium is the largest in Italy;
- The value of the product is enhanced by the EU “protected designation of origin” (PDO) scheme, which recognizes the Grana Padano cheese brand and properties that are significantly determined by the geographical environment, including natural and human factors;
- The consortium controls all production processes, and is independent from the processing industry, which is crucial for greater autonomy of production and marketing;
- The consortium encompasses 130 cheese factories producing over 4.8 million cheeses (185,000 tons approximately), of which 37 per cent is exported.

The experience of Coopermondo with international development projects was described by Danilo Salerno. Coopermondo is the Association for International Development Cooperation created by the Confederation of Italian Cooperatives, representing nine national federations in various sectors (agriculture, housing, credit, consumption, fisheries, culture, tourism and sport, labour, solidarity and health-care), and encompassing 20,000 cooperatives with over 3.2 million
members. It is organized in 110 territorial units throughout Italy. Founded in 2007, Coopermondo aims at fostering the social and mutual nature of the Italian cooperatives through international actions and projects.

In terms of activities, Coopermondo focuses on: (i) supporting enabling environments for the development and strengthening of cooperatives (e.g. by supporting legal reforms for the creation and development of cooperatives); (ii) providing training (e.g. for institutional strengthening and capacity-building in cooperatives); (iii) providing technical assistance (e.g. to improve production or market linkages). Coopermondo’s approach is based on: (i) developing small projects in close collaboration and partnership with all stakeholders; (ii) engaging in public-private partnerships to strengthen cooperatives, create businesses and foster social inclusion, encourage access and permanency in the markets, increase and distribute income equally and facilitate access to credit for territorial development. Examples were also shared from projects supported in Colombia, Sierra Leone and Togo.

The role of cooperative finance in international development was briefly presented by Ignace Gustave Bikoula (Federcasse), showcasing the examples of Ecuador and Togo, where a platform for medium/long-term financing was set up to respond to financing needs by providing credit and grants.

Discussion. There was lively discussion with broad participation. FO representatives from Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Paraguay, Togo and Uganda briefly presented key issues and the bottlenecks experienced by cooperatives in their respective countries (e.g. in terms of marketing, laws and policies regulating cooperatives, the need for technical assistance, access to financing and microcredit, transportation etc.); and they also expressed their interest in building a new partnership to address these problems with Italian entities in the sector. Lany Rebagay from AFA informed participants of a new learning route on agricultural cooperatives that was about to start in South East Asian countries. Following the route, good practices in the management of cooperatives would be identified, based on which innovative plans would be developed. The best plans would be rewarded, and AFA is looking for sponsors to support their implementation.

Closing. In his closing remarks, Adolfo Brizzi (IFAD) referred to a key challenge for cooperatives development, consisting in scaling-up while maintaining social cohesion and trust. The public-private-producer partnership model was suggested as a helpful tool to build sustainable institutions. Ambassador Sacco closed the side event by expressing the hope that the imminent signing of a letter of intent between IFAD and Coopermondo to support cooperatives would translate into practical engagement by both parties, to the benefit of agriculture and rural producers.
2016 – A new scenario for Latin America and the Caribbean: risks and challenges for strengthening the progress of distinct policies on family farming.

Organized by: Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR), COPROFAM, the IFAD MERCOSUR Programme, CLAEH and Corporación PBA.

Introduction. The last decade has witnessed the recognition and strengthening of family farming in terms of public and political visibility, and the consolidation of a set of differentiated public policies for family farming development and investment in the region. Initiatives supported by family farming organizations such as COPROFAM, including their involvement in policy dialogue, certainly contributed to these achievements. Nowadays family farming is recognized as a socioeconomic category needing targeted public policies, and as fundamental to the growth of regional economies and territories. This is reflected in the importance and priority that family farming has acquired in agencies such as FAO, IFAD, the World Bank and the Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA).

Nonetheless, 2015 saw the start of a gradual shift in the overall regional context. New trends (e.g. related to political changes or political trade-offs in the governmental leadership of the countries involved; shifts in the focus of social and development policies; changes in relation to countries’ openness to trade and an increased focus on economic integration and partnerships between trade blocs) could undoubtedly affect the pace of economic growth and thus the availability of fiscal and budgetary resources for continued investment in rural development and family farming.

At the same time, there are other unique scenarios in the region which are of great political interest for family farming and its development opportunities, including: (i) the implementation of a new policy on rural development and family farming for the Colombian countryside within the framework of the Havana Peace Accords (HPA); and (ii) the strategy on food and nutritional security for the region being promoted by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), based on supply and trade complementation among family farmers.

Objectives of the side event. The side event aimed to provide a space for reflection on the role that family FOs in Latin America and the Caribbean can play in this new context, by building upon institutional progress and achievements in terms of public policies and instruments for the development of family farming (e.g. as experienced through policy dialogue platforms such as REAF). The event also aimed to discuss new spaces and possibilities for IFAD to support family farming as a driver of rural development.

In particular, the side event aimed to:

- Take stock of progress and achievements in terms of the development of public policies on family farming between 2003 and 2015, with the presentation of country case studies (Argentina, Brazil and Peru); and discuss challenges in addressing new contexts;
- Discuss challenges faced in developing the Colombian countryside in a post-conflict scenario based on the HPA and the role of family farming in the
Comprehensive Rural Reform process, which is being applied as one of the principles of the agreement;

- Propose a new generation of public policies on family farming that considers climate change, generational succession, the settlement of young people, new technologies and opportunities, associations and cooperative movements and market positioning for family farming, technical assistance and rural extension.

Detailed Agenda and Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td>Presentation of case studies illustrating progress and challenges in differentiated public policies on family farming over the past 12 years (2004/2015) in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Peru.</td>
<td>Álvaro Ramos (Director IFAD MERCOSUR CLAEH Programme), Carlos Mermot (Technical Assistant IFAD MERCOSUR CLAEH Programme), Santiago Perry (Director Corporación PBA Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:30</td>
<td>Analysis and position of the Federación Agraria Argentina (Federación Agraria Argentina) (FAA) on the case of Argentina.</td>
<td>Marisa Boschetti (Director FAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 9:45</td>
<td>Analysis and position of the Brazilian National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG) on the case of Brazil.</td>
<td>Video recorded in Brazil from Alberto Broch, President CONTAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 10:00</td>
<td>Analysis and position of the Peruvian Campesino Confederation (CCP) on the case of Peru.</td>
<td>Elga Angulo (CCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Analysis and position of Colombian family farmers’ social organizations on the case of Colombia.</td>
<td>Ricaurte Becerra (“El Común” Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:45</td>
<td>Discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:00</td>
<td>Closure by the Executive Secretary of COPROFAM.</td>
<td>Fernando López (Executive Director COPROFAM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main interventions. The side event was opened and chaired by Fernando López (COPROFAM). FO speakers were invited to present their experiences.

Marisa Boschetti (FAA) shared the experience of Argentina, where REAF had triggered major changes to the benefit of family farming. The National Forum on Family Farming, the Secretary for Family Farming and Rural Development and the UCAR (Unidad para el Cambio Rural) were created to enable FOs to engage in policy dialogue. In addition, institutional changes in the country further enabled the development of public policies on family farming, the allocation of large budgets to support family farming and the development of several instruments to address the needs of family farmers (e.g. microcredit and revolving funds, technical assistance, and the establishment of specific budget lines for agroclimatic regions). Despite achievements, the December 2014 law on family farming has not yet been regulated, so farmers cannot really benefit from it.

Alberto Broch (CONTAG) described the major challenges being experienced in Brazil such as the severe economic and political crisis that is limiting the development and implementation of public policies on family farming and risks setting back the progress already achieved. He emphasized that greater effort is required to consolidate the achievements.

The case of Colombia was presented by Ricaurte Becerra (“El Común” – Association of Peasant Farmer Organizations of Colombia), focusing on the challenges experienced in consolidating and implementing the Havana Peace
Accords (HPA), which are bringing major changes to the country, particularly in terms of the recognition of family farming as a driving force for the economy through institutions and the process of land redistribution.

Elga Angulo (CCP) described the process that led to the drafting of a law to promote small-scale farming in 2015 (Ley de promoción de desarrollo de la pequeña agricultura). This legislation had enabled the Government to adopt a strategy for 2015-2021, which included key elements on family farming. Nonetheless, the law remained unregulated.

**Discussion.** The main elements discussed by participants included the following:

- **The need for regulations.** The leaders of the family farming organizations attending the event unanimously insisted on the importance of engaging in dialogue with governments on the urgent need for regulation and implementation of the laws and policy strategies adopted by the parliaments of the different countries. Budgetary allocations for family farming established by national laws cannot materialize without regulations and the development of specific instruments;

- **Other key issues to be addressed by policies.** To preserve the achievements of the last fifteen years in relation to public institutional frameworks and policies, family farming organizations within and beyond COPROFAM should engage in discussion with governments on key issues, such as: product value added, partnership with the private sector in agribusiness and trade, linkages with inclusive value chains, participation in decision-making for strategic investments on public goods and services (e.g. rural roads, electrification, telecommunications, stockpiles), the development of agroecological production and mitigation of the effects of climate change;

- **Implementation of the Act for the Historical Reparation of Family Farming in Argentina.** In the case of Argentina, representatives from FAA reiterated the need to implement the Act for the Historical Reparation of Family Farming, a key tool enabling family farmers to: (i) halt the concentration of production; and (ii) generate equal opportunities, equitable land distribution, rural population settlement, a better quality of life, and the production of high-quality foodstuffs.

**Main recommendations and conclusions.** The policy dialogue in which family farming organizations have engaged throughout this 15-year process, is a challenging activity needing continuous adaptation to changing contexts. The action of social organizations should always push the boundaries of methodological innovation, to facilitate participation and dialogue to develop a new generation of public policies for family farming.

For this to be possible, an effort should be made to: (i) take full advantage of information and communications technologies to close the gap between the top-tier and grassroots levels within family farming organizations; (ii) facilitate the South-South sharing of knowledge and experiences; (iii) take full advantage of existing dialogue platforms at all levels to strengthen the dialogue with governments/institutions; (iv) support capacity-building and training (e.g. in advocacy) to enable technical staff and leaders to face the new challenges of rural development.
The steps ahead for FAFO

Organized by: FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee

Introduction. Following a series of consultations, discussions and working groups, the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO was endorsed by participants. The need for decentralization was identified as a key element for restructuring the FAFO process.

Objective of the side event. The objective of the side event was to discuss the main implications and outcomes of the 2016 FAFO Statement, not only in relation to the reorganization of FAFO process, but also in terms of main themes of focus and interest for FOs at the global, national and local levels.

Discussion. Main points discussed include the following:

- **The regional consultation process.** The 2016 FAFO Statement mentions that the FAFO global meeting will be convened every four years with regional forums in between. Participants discussed the next steps to be taken to ensure the organization and coordination of these regional consultations and to address related issues (e.g. in terms of anchoring the process in diverse continents). A proposal was made to consult with FOs in the regions concerned, and to set up regional Steering Committee structures. As a first step, a list of regional FOs should be prepared;

- **Issues/themes of interest for FOs in the regional forums.** Priority issues mentioned included: (i) soils and sciences with links between farmers and research; (ii) seeds, food sovereignty against transgenic seeds; (iii) price observatories; (iv) markets, particularly territorial ones; (v) smallholders’ participation in policy dialogue;

- **Membership of the FAFO Steering Committee.** Organizers reported that IFAD is drafting a letter to confirm its acceptance of FOs’ request for a seat on the Steering Committee. The letter would be circulated amongst FAFO Steering Committee members for validation in 24 hours;

- **Inclusion of indigenous people in FAFO.** Although FOs and indigenous peoples cannot be compartmentalized, a dialogue process between IFAD and indigenous organizations already exists. A suggestion was made to link the two initiatives more effectively, especially at the decentralized level;

- **Communication amongst FAFO delegates between FAFO global meetings.** Participants were reminded that FAFO is not an event but a process. The importance of improving communication between global meetings was stressed and options discussed (e.g. use of e-mail or website tools).

Main recommendations. The following recommendations were made to IFAD and FOs. **Recommendations to IFAD:** (i) upload the Final Statement of the 2016 FAFO to the IFAD website; (ii) send soft copies of the Statement to all participants. **Recommendations to FOs:**  (i) start identifying all regional FOs that are active in the different regions, for contact and consultation on setting up a regional Steering Committee for the preparation of regional consultations; (ii) identify priority themes per region; (iii) engage in further policy dialogue with governments.
IYFF+10: Strengthening common action in favour of family farming after the IYFF

Organized by: WRF, AFA, COPROFAM

Introduction. Since IYFF-2014, family farming has acquired global resonance. The promotion of family farming has been recognized as an effective vehicle for reducing poverty and guaranteeing food access for both rural and urban populations. Public policies in favour of family farming are fundamental for achieving sustainable agricultural development.

Building on the achievements of IYFF-2014 and based on the Brasilia Manifesto, the global campaign in favour of family farming, peasants, artisanal fishers, pastoralists and indigenous people was extended for a further 10 years. The aim of the IYFF+10 is to continue improving public policies in support of family farming by working with national family farming committees, developing guidelines for the promotion of family farming, and improving the relationship between research centres and family farming organizations.

This side event is fully aligned with IFAD’s strategic objectives, and IFAD has been a key player in promoting and facilitating the implementation of both the IYFF and IYFF+10.

Objectives of the side event.
• To help strengthen the dialogue among FOs, governments, United Nations organizations and other stakeholders, in keeping with the spirit of IYFF-2014 and IYFF+10;
• To continue engaging more farmers’ groups in the IYFF+10 process, strengthening their dialogue with governments and international organizations to influence the political agenda, laws and programmes;
• To contribute to successful implementation of the project “Beyond IYFF 2014: support to National Committees for Family Farming”.

Detailed Agenda and speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 14:10</td>
<td>Opening ideas and presentations</td>
<td>Álvaro Ramos (Director IFAD MERCOSUR CLAEH Programme), Auxtín Ortiz (Director General of WRF), Fernando López (Executive Director COPROFAM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10 – 15:00</td>
<td>Key paths for achieving better public policies at the country and region levels</td>
<td>Mahamadou Fayinkeh (Representative of NACOFAG and member of the board of ROPPA), Francisco Sarmento (Community of Portuguese Language Countries – CPLP), Esther Penunia (General Secretary of AFA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 15:25</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25 – 15:30</td>
<td>Final recommendations and conclusions</td>
<td>Djibo Bagna (ROPPA), Lupino Lazaro (Agriculture Attaché of the Philippine Embassy in Rome).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main interventions and discussion. Auxtín Ortiz (WRF) highlighted the results achieved in favour of family farming through YIFF 2014, including 14 legislative or budgetary changes achieved, and another 29 similar processes under way. Examples include improvement of the land and seeds law in The Gambia, budget increases for family farming in Burkina Faso, Nepal and Slovakia, and the launch of the first programme in favour of family farming in Colombia. In addition, some
international organizations have adapted their structures and objectives to better serve family farming (e.g. the FAO Committee on Agriculture, which included family farming in all of its five strategic objectives).

The speaker stressed that after a successful IYFF-2014 it was deemed essential to ensure continuity and enable the campaign to continue producing results. With this in view, in November 2014 family farming organizations from the five continents signed the “Brasilia Manifesto”, calling for another 10 years to extend the campaign. The IYFF+10 maintains the same goal of improving policies for family farming, and it prioritizes youth and women in family farming. The main strategies and activities foreseen include: (i) the development of guidelines for the promotion of family farming; (ii) support for the National Committees; and (iii) the improvement of the connection between research centres and family farming organizations; (iv) advocacy for the declaration of the “Decade of Family Farming” by the United Nations General Assembly. Within this context, IFAD has approved a three-year project to support National Family Farming Committees, which will set up a challenge fund to finance proposals from the national committees.

The importance of raising the profile of family farming and the relevance of the activities being supported with collaboration with IFAD within the REAF was further emphasized by Fernando López (COPROFAM). Moreover, the declaration of a Decade of Family Farming could be a useful way to regain momentum and increase policy initiatives in the MERCOSUR region and address the current economic challenges and changes in government leaderships.

Francisco Sarmento described the main strategies and activities of the CPLP in terms of the support to family farming. The CPLP has a food security and nutrition strategy, including a family farming pillar; and it created a Food and Nutrition Security Council (CONSAN) as a ministerial and multi-actor platform, which coordinates policies and programmes developed in the area of food and nutritional security and advises the conference of CPLP Heads of State and Governments. Family farmers have a formal participatory role in CONSAN, which enables them to present specific proposals and recommendations. CONSAN declared its support for the IYFF+10 initiative, called for a Decade in Favour of Family Farming, and backed the procedure for formulating guidelines to promote family farming in CPLP states. A final report is expected to be submitted for approval to the Working Party on Family Farming on 15 April 2016 and to the Council for Food and Nutrition Security in July 2016.

Mahamadou Fayinkeh (ROPFA) described the performance and work of the National Family Farming Committee in The Gambia, which is led by NACOFAG and made up of 18 organizations, including representatives from FOs, NGOs, research centres and the government. In 2014, the committee succeeded in achieving major reforms in the law on land and seeds in that country. Recently, the Government officially recognized the committee as an important platform for policy dialogue on family-farming issues by signing a Memorandum of Understanding.

Participants attending the meeting contributed to the discussion, focusing particularly on the need to share information and experiences from successful cases and the relevance of drawing lessons learned and assessing the results achieved in 2014. Speakers from the National Committee in Madagascar, Philippines and Senegal complemented the presentation by sharing their experiences.
Esther Penunia (AFA) also underlined their commitment to supporting IYFF+10 and the main themes to be addressed by policies and programmes during the campaign: (i) access to land, and control over natural resources; (ii) sustainable and resilient agriculture; (iii) access to markets; (iv) the marginalization of women farmers; (v) governance.

Follow-up and closing. Mahamadou Fayinkeh, Esther Penunia and Lupino Lazaro highlighted the importance of supporting IYFF+10 using an inspiring metaphor: the IYFF-2014 is a baby that now has to be raised and supported during its growth.

---

**Participatory guarantee systems (PGSs) and their potential to facilitate market access, livelihood improvement and social capital**

Organized by: INOFO

**Introduction.** Participatory guarantee systems (PGSs) are locally targeted quality assurance systems. They certify producers based on active stakeholder participation and are built on trust, social networks and knowledge exchange. Whereas third-party certification is based on impersonal inspection of conformity with production rules, mainly for export markets, PGSs facilitate discussions among peers and advisors on all aspects of the food system, thus enabling producers to take more responsibility for supplying sustainably produced food to domestic markets. As a result, PGSs are ranked among the most effective and promising tools for developing local markets for organically produced food.

As of 2015, there were 123 functioning PGS initiatives and another 110 currently under development. These are spread over 72 countries and are being adapted to local contexts on all continents. Because of their focus on adaptation to local agroecological, social, economic and institutional conditions, PGSs have shown themselves to be a practical alternative to third-party certification for small-scale or family farming and processing. PGS is increasingly adopted also as a pro-poor development tool to facilitate other smallholder production activities. A global comparative study conducted by the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM) in 2014 concluded that PGSs have the potential to make a significant contribution to reducing food insecurity and improving nutrition. Additionally, an FAO study found PGSs to be one of three institutional innovations that can provide incentives for the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices – thus contributing to the resilience of smallholder production systems and the development of local food systems.

**Objectives of the side event.** The side event aimed to provide a vehicle to showcase smallholder-friendly solutions oriented towards local, domestic or regional markets, and to enable INOFO to display its institutional development since the start of the IFAD supported capacity-building programme. The main objectives of the side event were to:

---

23 IFOAM 2014: Global comparative study on interactions between traditional social processes and Participatory Guarantee Systems.
- Highlight some key benefits of PGSs for farmers, particularly in terms of: (i) enhanced domestic market access and better incomes; (ii) cost savings; (iii) better management of natural resources; (iv) increased autonomy and stronger social networks; and (v) enhanced food security;

- Identify areas for future collaboration and provide guidance to the key intermediaries that can link sustainable practices to markets.

**Detailed Agenda and speakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00 –</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Andre Leu (President of IFOAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:05 –</td>
<td>Country experiences with PGSs in Philippines, Brazil and Uganda</td>
<td>Lucille Ortiz (MASIPAG – Philippines); Marcelo Passos (Associação para o Desenvolvimento da Agroecologia – AOPA, Brazil); Julie Matovu (Fresh Veggies PGS – Uganda); Allison Loconto (FAO and Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique – INRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50 –</td>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Conclusions and closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main interventions.** Andre Leu, President of IFOAM – Organics International, opened the side event with a presentation on IFOAM and INOFO. He highlighted the importance of INOFO’s work as an autonomous structure with the main purpose of building a network between organic FOs within local, national and continental regions. He also reported that IFOAM is actively promoting PGSs as a way of enabling the smallest-scale farmers to gain access to markets. PGS is in fact a cost-effective tool controlled by farmers and it empowers them to take control of their marketing and sales.

Following this introductory presentation, PGS experiences in different countries were shared, as summarized below.

- **PGS as a strategy for rural development: the MASIPAG experience in the Philippines.** The experience of MASIPAG was shared by Lucille Ortiz, Secretary of INOFO and member of MASIPAG, a farmer-led network of people’s organizations, NGOs and scientists. She presented the MASIPAG Farmers’ Guarantee System (MFGS), which was formed with funding from IFOAM (e.g. the family of standards). The system was intended to help farmers achieve sustainable food self-sufficiency, maintain control over the sales of their products, improve the quality and integrity of products and ensure good relationships with consumers to serve the local market. The experience was successful and it has grown rapidly throughout the region. It provided an effective low-cost guarantee for small-scale farmers, enabled them to share responsibilities and benefits with traders along the value chain and to increase their income. Currently, MASIPAG farmers’ expertise on organic agriculture and MFGS is recognized by the local government. MASIPAG, together with other organic practitioners and advocates (NGOs, farmers’ groups, consumers), is lobbying for PGS to be recognized as a certification system;

- **PGS: Achievements and challenges in Brazil.** Marcelo Passos shared the experience of AOPA, an association of farmers making up the Red Ecovida network. He contextualized why it was necessary for an organic farming organization in Brazil to emerge and develop a local guarantee system; and
he spoke of the many farmers who had died from poisoning, forcing them to organize and change their farming practices. Since 2009 AOPA has been operating within government supply programmes, especially for school meals. Marcelo Passos also described the challenges of creating a local market in a city of 16 million people, such as São Paulo, and how supportive relationships with governments officials were achieved;

- **PGS as a tool to create a local market for organic food in Uganda.** Julie Matovu (Fresh Veggies Uganda) described the experience of Fresh Veggies PGS, which started in 2011 to create a local market for organic food in Uganda. The organization began activities with one community-based group in the Wakiso District and five members. In collaboration with the National Organic Agricultural Movement of Uganda (NOGAMU), Fresh Veggies developed standards and today it is active in other outlying urban areas, covering 200 smallholder producers, of whom 80 per cent are women. The main challenge experienced stems from the inaccessibility of organic seeds (which are purchased from the Netherlands);

- **PGS as an innovative approach for linking sustainable and agroecological production to markets in developing countries.** Allison Loconto described the main elements of the FAO research on PGS, which analyses 15 experiences with PGS to assess linkages between sustainable practices and sustainable markets at the local level. She also outlined how the PGS approach works (i.e. starting with partnerships among farmers, consumers and intermediaries, using local and national knowledge and harmonized international organic standards, focusing on an alternative form of certification based on free or low-cost peer review and farmer-led experimentation and creating new local markets. The main lessons learned from the PGS approach were the following: (i) lack of national legislation has provided private actors with time to gain legitimacy. There are however legal challenges that can arise with the use of “organic” labels if PGS is not recognized at the national level; (ii) continuous capacity-building is fundamental; (iii) cost reduction is an important motivation for developing PGS, but reliance on volunteers does not take time costs into account; (iv) smallholder inclusion in the value chain is crucial and it increases trust; (v) shifting roles and sharing responsibilities among producers, consumers, researchers, intermediaries and public officials, favours reciprocity over solidarity. Allison Loconto closed her remarks with a number of recommendations, including the need to promote interactive learning to create and spread knowledge, to strengthen farmers’ capabilities in strategic market negotiation, and to support communication and relationships of trust between farmers, intermediaries and consumers.

**Discussion.** Participants in the side event also shared agroecology practices in different countries (e.g. issues in the Philippines and Uganda to import organic seeds).

Moisés Osorno (APAGOLF, Honduras) reported that, in Nicaragua and in El Salvador, native species that have traditionally been fished are disappearing, and he stressed the importance of having a guarantee system to safeguard their efforts. On this point, Allison Loconto reported on an aquaponics project in Benin, in which non-traditional fish were raised in rice beds; and projects were being developed to meet similar challenges in Asia. Piero Confaloniera (LVC and Terra Nuova)
described experience in Peru in developing certification for an aquaculture project. Andre Leu also told Moisés Osorno about the possibility of using and adapting IFOAM’s wild harvested product standards.

A final question was raised on the need for labelling as a guarantee that products are not chemically grown. Andre Leu clarified that as long as the consumer does not buy directly from the producer, then the product needs to be certified to protect the integrity of the market. However, when the consumer buys directly from the farmer, a certification was not needed.

**Conclusion and closure.** The meeting was closed by stressing the importance and value of PGSs.

### Findings from the FAFO thematic working groups

**Organized by:** FOs representatives of the FAFO Steering Committee

**Introduction and objectives.** The objective of this side event was to present and discuss the main outcomes and findings from the three thematic working groups organized during the 2016 FAFO global meeting – on smallholders and markets, agroecology, and gender and youth, respectively.

**Main interventions.** The side event was chaired and moderated by Nora McKeon (Terra Nuova), who invited FO speakers to recapitulate the main outcomes from the working groups as summarized below.

- **Smallholders and markets – Presentation by Nadjirou Sall, (ROPPA).** Evidence shows that most food consumed in the global south is channeled through local markets on which very little data exists. Participants in the working group identified key aspects for improvement and issues to be addressed to enable smallholders to connect with markets more effectively; and they agreed on the following: (i) there is need to overcome the lack of data available on territorial markets; (ii) support is needed for the development and strengthening of infrastructures; (iii) priority should be given to local, national, regional, rural and urban markets; (iv) smallholder farmers should be supported to improve the quantity and quality of their production; (v) access to credit should be strengthened, especially for women; (vi) public policies and regulations should be better adapted to the needs and reality of territorial markets.

- **Agroecology – presentation by Badrul Alam (BKF).** The working group on agroecology discussed how agroecological approaches can help address the climate change crisis. It identified obstacles to its broader adoption and discussed ways in which IFAD and governments can help overcome them and support initiatives by smallholder organizations. Agroecology is a model to be preserved and promoted, based on the recognition of its resource conservation function (land, fisheries, forests and wildlife) and its production system, which is sustainable and adapts to the conservation of these resources.
• Gender and youth. Presentation by Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC). The main outcomes from the 2010 and 2012 Special Sessions, on Gender and Youth respectively, were summarized; and the constraints on the implementation of the recommendations from the sessions were highlighted. The role played by women and youth in terms of food security and nutrition was underlined and the main recommendations from the working group were summarized, focusing on the need to ensure the representation of youth and women in FOs by setting quotas, and to support the inclusion of women and young people in the value chain.

Back to the future: farmers re-envisaging the value and role of agricultural research for development and innovation

Organized by: AFA, COPROFAM, EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA and GFAR

Introduction. Research on food and agriculture can deliver remarkable benefits for farmers and consumers. Farmers themselves are researchers, since they systematically experiment, test, adapt, invent and discover new modes of production, processing, managing resources and transforming landscapes. As farmer-scientists, they can partner with academic and research institutions outside their communities, combining different forms of innovation to improve livelihoods and society as a whole.

This requires research institutions and agrifood scientists to be more accountable to farmers. National and international institutions often put taxpayers, not farmers, at the heart of defining and evaluating their roles and their delivery of results. New organizational mechanisms and new ways of thinking require farmers to have a direct stake in control of the resources used for research, and power in the decisions required. In short, the value and role of agricultural research for development and innovation need to be re-envisioned, reshaped and reorganized.

To capture the diversity and opportunities open to farmers, a foresight approach allows them to envisage possible futures for rural areas, rural communities and smallholder and family farmers. Rather than focusing on today, tomorrow or the next few years, the foresight approach projects possible changes over decades and their likely alternative outcomes. It thus encompasses processes, possibilities and partners well beyond the conventional; and it breaks out of single-track, narrowly focused ways of thinking and planning. As a practice, foresight can, indeed must, be a joint effort between farmers and others, including the research community at their service and at the service of their futures.

Smallholder farmers have a holistic, long-term way of acting and thinking about farming, landscapes, institutions and markets. This is inherent, inevitable really, in the way smallholders run and sustain family enterprises over decades, and across generations, as the foundation of rural communities. They incorporate, network and link their knowledge and innovations among a range of actors and institutions: agricultural workers, other small businesses within agrifood value chains, artisans and craftspersons, local government and service agents, and even researchers.
Objectives of the side event

- Describe new ways of working under a foresight approach which makes it possible to envisage possible futures for rural areas, rural communities and smallholder/family farmers;
- Emphasize the importance of putting farmers at the centre of research and innovation processes, rather than at the end of them;
- Highlight ways in which such an approach can benefit IFAD loan and grant processes and add the value of innovation to a wide range of agendas in agriculture, food and rural development.

Main interventions. Speakers stressed the importance of:

- Farmers and researchers working together, truly collaborating in the conception, conduct, evaluation and applications of research;
- The need to meet pledges for investment in research, as a fundamental contribution to the viability of farming and farmers;
- The importance of putting special emphasis on applied research at the service of family farming, not only “smallholder” farming;
- The value and growth of programmes in support of multistakeholder, multisectoral research (with the Euro-African example of the Platform for African European Partnership on Agricultural Research for Development – PAEPARD I and II, used to illustrate such approaches with concrete results that benefit farmers directly);
- The value of building up regional, national and local capacities in foresight, to develop collaborative, farmer-led visions for possible futures, and then drawing on these results to define the policies and resources needed to arrive at those futures (examples for Central Africa, Asia and North Africa and the Near East were described);
- The long history of discourse around “farmer-centred” approaches that have failed to be put into practice owing to the sectoral, specialized nature of research, and the degree to which the contemporary governance of research is drawing in farmers as participants in decision-making on research planning and funding.

Discussion. From the floor, participants proposed the following:

- Build on research networks devoted to family farming, to implement the IYFF-2014 Declaration towards accomplishing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030;
- Build on examples cited and mechanisms to implement multidisciplinary and multisectoral programmes for farmers and farming that cut across governmental agencies and institutional differences;
- Note the importance of including the various dimensions of the private sector, especially led by farmers and at the national level;
- Build on evidence obtained on the value, impacts and returns of smallholder farming, for example in relation to IYFF, and contemporary work on the nature and promotion of agricultural innovation;
- Scale up innovations such as the recognition of farmer research and the quality of their innovations, experiments, and intergenerational, collective intellectual property.

**Conclusions, recommendations and follow-up.** There was a call for IFAD to turn farmers' views and participation into support for agricultural research on innovation and rural development. IFAD can help its Member States' governments address citizens' aspirations – particularly in rural communities – by making public research more accountable to farmers and demand-driven.

---

**Economic activities of FOs: recent initiatives, approaches for support, complementarities between national and local organizations**

**Organized by:** AgriCord

**Introduction:** Farmers Fighting Poverty (FFP) was developed to formalize farmer-to-farmer mechanisms of support to professional producer organizations applied by agri-agencies. Support is given to FOs rather than individual farmers. It strengthens FOs to provide better and more wide-ranging services to their members. This is done with the overarching aim of improving democracy and equality, while also reducing poverty and increasing food security. FFP operates as a multi-donor mechanism, managed by AgriCord.

Complementary to FFP, in both Asia and Africa, regional programmes (SFOAP in Africa and MTCP in Asia) are supporting regional and national FOs. These regional programmes support strategic interventions defined by regional and national FOs. Despite the good results achieved by the FOs supported by FFP, SFOAP and MTCP, and despite the intended strategy for scaling-up by improving FO autonomy, the complementarities between the interventions at the local, national and regional levels remain largely unmapped and seemingly under-valued. Questions can be asked on how subsidiarity amongst FOs is effectively put into practice and how these complementary efforts can develop more and more win-win practices and approaches in support to FOs.

**Objectives of the side event.** The main objectives of the side event were to ensure that FOs in the FAFO process and in FFP, SFOAP and MTCP2:

- Are informed on the FOs' priorities within FFP in general, and on a number of recent and innovative cases of FO economic development in Asia and Africa with FFP support;
- Can give guidance on the FOs' view of subsidiarity and complementarities between local FO levels and higher FO levels in terms of economic activities;
- Can suggest ways to catalyze complementarities between local and higher level FOs, to scale-up farmer-led economic activities of FOs.

**Main interventions and discussion.** The main elements discussed are summarized below.

*Complementarities and subsidiarity:* How does AgriCord ensure that its support for economic activities targets the most appropriate level of FOs to deliver economic activities?
services to farmers – i.e. FOs below the national platform level? What is the role of national and regional levels of FOs for economic services (e.g. ROPPA)?

AgriCord supports projects proposed by FOs themselves, after validation of their proposals by its Project Committee. This makes sure the collaboration with national platforms focuses on policy and advocacy issues, knowledge management and institutional partnerships, whereas projects on actual economic operations and transactions are situated at the local or subnational levels.

FOs are facilitated by agri-agencies in a long-term process; and they are also advised by FO leaders and experts worldwide. They can draw on the best advice on complex intersectoral issues, such as trade, value chains, finance and the role of FOs in this matter. FFP statistics show that the level of supported FOs concurs with the type of activities supported: 74 per cent of projects are farmer-led economic activities and about 75 per cent of projects are support local or subnational FOs.

The two case studies presented (a farmer-led marketing enterprise called GlowCorp in the Philippines; and a farmer-led seed production in Benin, The Gambia and Senegal) illustrated the freedom that grassroots farmer groups have to decide on their form of organization, in line with their priorities and the country context. At the same time, the role of national FOs focuses on bringing various groups and associations together to share lessons learned for replication and up-scaling. It also concerns the facilitation of linkages with public-sector authorities, agricultural research and other partners, and the provision of technical assistance to farmers.

Support approaches provided by AgriCord: How to address young FOs which have not yet developed economic services? Can FOs ask AgriCord to work more on processing activities of women and youth in particular?

AgriCord provides support through exchanges between FOs, which often provide innovative ideas on the economic possibilities for FOs; and also peer support on organizational strengthening and development. FFP support is comprehensive, ensuring the FO’s organizational capacities, inclusiveness and management skills are strengthened in parallel with the development of their economic activities.

As AgriCord provides support to requests submitted by FOs, a focus on any given theme or area of work is defined by the content of these requests. Upon request, agri-agencies are open to developing their support for transformation, value added and marketing activities led by women and young farmers and their organizations.
Legal status and organizational model of economic FOs. Does AgriCord develop models of the type of FO structures that are needed for economic services? What were the preconditions related to the legal form of GlowCorps?

AgriCord does not impose organizational models, or try to offer a one-size-fits-all solution for the form of economic service provision. This is always chosen by the FO; and it depends on the country context and on the service or activity targeted by the FO. However, AgriCord offers possibilities for knowledge-sharing among members and partners. This is piloted by the OneForumsIl initiative, where one or more agri-agencies provide knowledge management services to the rest of the network and FO partners according to their specialization.

The freedom of organization in the Philippines, as well as the comprehensive approaches supporting the farmers’ economic initiatives enabled the national FO PAKISAMA to use GlowCorps as its commercial arm. The agri-agencies active in the Philippines (AsiaDHRRA, Agriterra, Trias, Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires CSA, We Effect) were invited by PAKISAMA to participate and accompany the cooperatives in their exchanges with the Cooperative Development Authority, to draft the road map towards the “federation building” of agri-cooperatives.

Economic services of FOs and markets. Which market is envisioned for FO produced seeds in a context where subsidized seeds are cheaper? What is the vision of the supported FO beyond support projects, given the international trade and policy environment that often poses constraints for small farmer?

FOs are supported in their lobbying and advocacy capacities by FFP. Their own visions are respected and FFP doesn’t interfere in the preparation of their visions. Instead, exchanges between FO, also on lobbying and advocacy, are facilitated. In Western Africa, the regional regulatory framework governing the seeds market was the subject of harmonization efforts for years. Today, a common framework for certified seeds exists. National and regional FO networks are in a key position for lobbying and advocacy for the development of the regulatory framework. Mahamadou Fayinkeh, the President of NACOFAG, provided evidence of the role of the national platform in the seed markets in The Gambia with support from ASPRODEB.

Recommendations and follow up. Participants in the working group agreed on the following main recommendations.

For AgriCord:

- Continue to invest in the economic services of FOs within a long-term process, focusing on activities that can particularly improve market access for women and youth;
- Structure and systematize best practices on subsidiarity/complementarity between different levels of FOs and integrate them in the work of AgriCord’s Project Committee;
- Improve knowledge management between agri-agencies and share lessons with partners (e.g. IFAD and FOs);
- Increase facilitation of the exchange between FOs, identifying best advisors on marketing issues and on policy and advocacy for conducive economic environments and adapted finance for economic services/initiatives of FOs;
For MTCP2 and SFOAP:

- Respect principles of subsidiarity between the different levels of FOs for optimized impact.
- Support increased synergies with FFP supported economic initiatives of FOs.

**Conclusions.** Impressive results were achieved by FOs in different contexts. The combination of support activities can facilitate the actual integration of local and subnational cooperatives and FOs in markets, and result in development of sustainable economic activities that outlive support projects.

Several levels of FOs have a role to play in providing economic services to farmers. Complementarities and subsidiarity between these levels must be clear, but the roles of the different levels of organization can differ according to commodities, phases of value-chain development, legal forms of different levels of FOs and the country context. Farmer organizations are best placed to advise each other on these complex issues.

---

**Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA Africa): promoting local food procurement to link smallholder producers to institutional markets: the role of farmers’ organizations**

**Organized by:** WFP and FAO

**Introduction.** The Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA Africa) programme is a joint initiative being implemented by WFP, FAO, the Brazilian Government and the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID), initiated in February 2012. PAA Africa aims to promote food and nutritional security and income generation for smallholder farmers through local food purchase initiatives in five sub-Saharan African countries: Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal.

PAA Africa combines local purchase schemes for school feeding and social protection on three levels: policy, programing and implementation, combining knowledge and operational components. Over the course of four years’ implementation, WFP and FAO have been working with FOs, and local and regional governments. This collaboration supported the development of context-tailored models of local food procurement from smallholder farmers, which contributed to an increase of crop production and timely delivery of nutritious school meals.

---

**Phase I (February 2012 – December 2013)**

During the first implementation phase, PAA Africa supplied 130,000 students in 420 schools with locally produced food. This increased the productivity rate of 5,516 family farmers by an average rate of 114 percent, allowing an average of 37 percent of the food they produce to enter the markets.

---

**Phase II (January 2014 – June 2016)**

The second phase of PAA Africa has been supporting 11,300 farmers and 158,000 students. The programme has reinforced field operations, promoted learning and sharing activities along with developing a monitoring and evaluation component.
Objectives of the side event.

- To present PAA Africa and the concept of institutional procurement;
- To strengthen the awareness on the role of FOs in local food procurement and food value chains;
- To increase the participation, voice and recognition of FOs in the local food procurement process.

Detailed Agenda and Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:30 –</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Marek Poznanski, Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (CSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:50 –</td>
<td>Presentation of the PAA Africa experience in the five African countries</td>
<td>Francesco Slaviero, Programme Coordinator (WFP), Israel Klug, Programme Coordinator (FAO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15 –</td>
<td>The role of FOs on local food aggregation, processing and procurement</td>
<td>Lany Rebagay (AFA), Annick Sezibera (CAPAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main interventions. The side event was opened and led by Marek Poznanski (CSA Belgium) who began the discussion. He noted that there was a high level of interest among FOs to connect family farmers to local food procurement opportunities. Institutional purchase is therefore a very interesting tool for family farmers who often struggle to find stable markets for their products. He reported that with support from CSA Belgium, two meetings had been organized on that topic in Rwanda (December 2015) and Philippines (November 2015).

Connecting to local food procurement initiatives is important not only to provide market opportunities for smallholders, but also for top-tier FOs to engage in policy dialogue with governments for the inclusion of local procurement as an instrument for smallholders to improve market access.

Following the introduction, Luana Swensson (FAO) gave a presentation to define the concept of institutional procurement and outline the main benefits and challenges. Public procurement enables governments to get food for schools, army, and food security storage, while institutional procurement refers to other players that are procuring food such as the WFP or the private sector. Several benefits can be obtained by directing institutional demand for food to local smallholder producers, such as a reduction in risk by giving smallholders large and predictable sources demand, incentives for smallholders to improve the quality of their product, the improvement of food systems, an increase/stabilization in smallholder’s incomes and reduction of poverty. Nonetheless, there are challenges that also need to be addressed (e.g. bureaucratic procedures to be followed, issues in terms of logistics, adaptation of buying procedures, quantity and quality of the supply, logistics for storage);

Francesco Slaviero, PAA coordinator at WFP, presented the PAA Africa. The programme is being implemented by WFP and FAO and funded by DFID and the Brazilian government in five pilot countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger and Senegal) with the objectives of: (i) helping to ensure food security and nutrition; (ii) providing methodologies, expertise, operational instruments for the implementation of sustainable agriculture and food procurement programmes; (iii)
supporting FOs and increasing civil society participation to foster joint action (public policy, dialogue); and (iv) providing support and stimulating direct cooperation between African countries and Brazilian farmers’ organizations (South-South Cooperation).

PAA Africa works at three levels of the food system (programming, implementation and policy) and supports FOs by providing: (i) capacity development in support in aggregation, storage, processing and delivery of food (ii) support in management to create stronger market linkages across value chains; (iii) support in gaining access to credit for agricultural investment. The example of Ethiopia was brought to the participants’ attention.

The speaker also reported that the programme is reaching the end of its second phase and will soon enter a “scaling-up phase” for the period 2016-2019. A seminar is being planned for May 2016 to discuss programme scaling-up.

FOs experiences in institutional food procurement were further shared as summarized below.

- **CAPAD in Burundi.** Annick Sezibera (CAPAD) briefly presented CAPAD’s experience in terms of public procurement, as the organization engaged with WFP to provide technical support to grassroots cooperatives and involved in a regional dynamic in the Great Lakes region focused on institutional procurement programmes. She highlighted the main challenges preventing small FOs from being involved in public procurement (e.g. high levels of professionalization required, minimum production levels, capacity to mobilize funding and storage investments, high quality of products required). The role of FOs in facilitating access to institutional markets both in terms of policy engagement (e.g. influencing legal frameworks for the participation of small farmers and their FOs in institutional markets) and in the provision of technical support (e.g. capacity-building for grassroots FOs in negotiating access to credit, contract negotiations, facilitating the understanding and respect of the buyers’ specifications) were further outlined. Finally, she emphasized that the rationale for engaging with national FOs in institutional food procurement initiatives mainly related to sustainability, FOs’ relationships of solidarity with their members, and the possibility to link the achievements to other market opportunities.

- **PAKISAMA and AFA in the Philippine Anti-Hunger and Poverty (PAHP) Programme.** Lany Rebagay (AFA) briefly presented the PAHP and highlighted the role of FOs in the institutional purchase of food. She mentioned that FOs can advocate for a good law on institutional procurement and can be involved in budget for institutional purchase through a bottom-up budgeting process. They can also support members both in terms of knowledge management and in technical support.

**Discussion and closing.** The main elements discussed during the side event are summarized below.

- **Modus operandi of public purchase for food products support programmes.** The experience of the Cooperativa Agropecuária Familiar de Canudos, Uauá e Curaçá (COPERCUC) family farming cooperative in Brazil was briefly described. FAO representatives added that a specific feature of the Brazilian experience was that many different models had been piloted, demonstrating that the role of FOs was crucial and could certainly influence the success of
one model over another. In general, it was emphasized that the modus operandi had to be adapted to the local context and a comprehensive analysis of the context needed to be carried out;

- **Conditions and limits on public procurement programmes** were also mentioned by participants. It was emphasized that capacity-building for producers and their FOs was crucial to the success of such programmes;

- **Scaling-up PAA Africa.** It was clarified that PAA Africa was a small project with a small budget. The scaling-up phase aimed to trial other public procurement modalities in the same countries and to transfer knowledge to the policy-making level;

- **How to involve top-tier FOs more effectively in the scaling-up.** All participants recognized that apex FOs should be involved in the process of moving from pilot to policies. It was stressed that, under PAA Africa, national FOs were generally invited to international seminars and workshops, although the intention now was to promote dialogue between FOs and governments for institutional food procurement programmes.
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