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This document was produced as a result of the "International Encounters on Family Farming and Research" held in Montpellier, June 1-3, 2014. The conference brought together three hundred participants from the different continents representing family farmers, policymakers, the private sector, as well as teachers and researchers.

Research agendas relating to family farming and the challenges it faces in the context of global change afoot were discussed. Addresses by policymakers such as the Ministers of Agriculture of France and Senegal (Stéphane Le Foll and Papa Seck), the European Commission-Deputy Director General of Agriculture and rural development (Monique Pariat) or IFAD President (Kanayo Nwanze) and by farmer representatives (WFO, La Via Campesina, WRF) were followed by lectures (Hans Herren, Gordon Conway, Marcela Villarreal, Marion Guillou, Robin Bourgeois) and discussions held in seven working groups (themes and details are available on the Encounters website).

EDITORS
Jean-Michel Sourisseau, CIRAD, France
Rémi Kahane, CIRAD, France
Pierre Fabre, CIRAD, France
Bernard Hubert, Agropolis International, France

ENGLISH REVISER
David Manley, France

LAYOUT
Olivier Plau, Agropolis Productions, France

FOR REFERENCE


© Agropolis International, 2015
# Family Farming & Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of contents</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTS FOR A SYNTHESIS</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of participants</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://l.agropolis.fr/encountersmontpellier](http://l.agropolis.fr/encountersmontpellier)
Foreword

The International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) was highly successful in attracting worldwide attention to family farming and placing it high on the list of government priorities. More than 500 national events and numerous regional and global events captured the attention of a broad range of stakeholders and catalysed a high level of political commitment. Awareness on the importance of family farming in world agriculture, its contributions to sustainable resource management, employment, territorial development and biodiversity conservation significantly increased. IYFF notably shed light on existing knowledge, identified knowledge gaps and also helped generate knowledge on key issues related to family farming and to the required policy agenda, with its national and regional specificities.

In particular, the International Encounters: Family Farming and Research meeting in Montpellier was instrumental in analyzing the main challenges faced by this type of agriculture and identifying research needs. This analysis was necessarily a reflection of agriculture today and its future. By bringing together researchers, farmers’ organizations, civil society organizations and decision makers, this International Encounters event highlighted the value of participatory research processes and the need for active participation of family farmers in all decisions that concern them to ensure the advancement of world agriculture.

Family farming is firmly embedded in FAO’s strategic framework, with concrete actions in each of its five strategic objectives and in its regional initiatives. Three out of 15 regional initiatives are focused on family farming, while most of the others address it indirectly. Family farming is being followed by FAO’s governing bodies and technical committees, while the Committee of Agriculture has a specific mandate regarding this issue. FAO’s Knowledge Platform on Family Farming will ensure continuous dialogue on policy and research. The results of the Montpellier International Encounters event are an important contribution to FAO’s work on evidence-based, context-specific policy formulation support. Continued research is indeed necessary to fuel policies that will keep family farming productive, relevant, innovative and able to fulfil farmers’ and consumers’ needs.

Marcela Villarreal, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Partnerships, Advocacy and Capacity Development, UN-FAO, Rome, Italy
My utmost appreciation goes to the organizers of the International Encounters: Family Farming and Research event for bringing together representatives of family farmers, civil society, the private sector, researchers, and policy makers from different parts of the world to discuss research needs and priorities relative to family farming.

This event was an important contribution to the 2014 International Year of Family Farming (IYFF). It generated plenty of ideas and information geared towards enhancing the innovation and research agenda in order to strengthen family farming and address various challenges at all levels, especially on the global front. The results of the event have also fuelled the work of the IYFF International Steering Committee (ISC), while bolstering the family farming campaign and reform efforts of many countries, including the Philippines where family farming is considered as a foundation of agriculture.

The proposed framework for research should be designed to support policy making to ensure the sustainable development of family farming by encouraging governments—in collaboration with relevant stakeholders—to provide an enabling environment, including adequate legislation, investment and participatory mechanisms for policy discussion and agricultural research. The research agenda should also further boost awareness and knowledge on the diversity and complexity of production and consumption systems in family farming, smallholder farming and fisheries, including the specific role of women and youth in different family farm models and their evolution.

These International Encounters proceedings document the main ideas and concrete experiences and lessons derived from the event. They also provide a useful framework for future discussions and for improving research practices and governance, thus promoting the interests and enhancing the situation of family farmers worldwide, even beyond 2014.

*Mabuhay!*

**Lupiño Lazaro Jr.**  
Chairman, International Steering Committee,  
2014 International Year of Family Farming  
and Deputy Permanent Representative,  
Embassy of the Philippines, Rome, Italy
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Introduction

The United Nations decision to proclaim 2014 as the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) was the result of a long engagement process that began in 2008 in response to the food riots and large-scale land-grabbing phenomena under way. The intention of the political and civil society stakeholders who campaigned for this declaration and then led and coordinated the celebration—especially the World Rural Forum—was to promote this form of production and to be involved in drawing up and implementing public policies devoted specifically to this issue. The Government of the Philippines brought this issue to the forefront by issuing an International Year proposal to the United Nations.

The aim of this IYFF initiative was to highlight the need for family farms to meet the challenges of food security, natural resource management, employment, rural development and social cohesion. In all of these areas, family farming must be appraised by comparison with other forms of production. Large-scale agribusiness represents capitalistic forms of production involving a concentration of production resources and standardisation of practices and whose sustainability is sometimes questionable. Family farming is characterised by tight links between the family and farm, and therefore by working relationships with the domestic sphere, while having specific goals that are not solely focused on the remuneration of production capital holders.

Family farming has been highly advocated. The IYFF, facilitated by FAO and supported by IFAD, was a huge success, as illustrated by the many national and sub-regional initiatives devoted to this issue (www.fao.org/family-farming-2014/events/past-events/en). Farmers and their organizations, NGOs and policy makers in industrialised and so-called developing countries took this opportunity to boost awareness, discuss, inform and propose support.

However, this advocacy for family farming raises many questions and is controversial with respect to what it represents—especially on how family farming is defined and on the extent of its contribution to sustainable development—as well as to the public policies that have been put forward regarding this issue. The IYFF was marked by these questions and controversies.

Research could not be absent from these celebrations and debates. Firstly, because it provides framework and conceptual elements that enlighten and fuel discussions, questions and controversies on forms of production and their role in development. Secondly, because research itself is questioned regarding its strategic choices, practices and usefulness for family farming.

At the launching of IYFF, Agropolis International and the institutions it represents (particularly CIRAD, INRA, IRD and Montpellier SupAgro), along with WRF, CGIAR and GFAR, thus proposed to organize an event devoted to research. FAO, IFAD and the French Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Agriculture, Food and Forestry were asked to provide support and place this event in the official agenda for 2014.

The “International Encounters: Family Farming & Research” event was held from 1 to 3 June in Montpellier (France) with the aim of sharing information and analyses on the state and dynamics of family farming worldwide, as well as assessing their contribution to major challenges in the future, so as to question and enrich research agendas. This was the main event in 2014 where the role of research regarding family farming was investigated.
Introduction

To fulfil these ambitious objectives, it was essential to broaden the discussion well beyond the research community in order to hear the voices of farmers, NGOs, extension service representatives and policy makers. The World Rural Forum—the IYFF coordinator for civil society—was thus highly involved in organizing the International Encounters, with civil society organizations also providing substantial support.

An original format was designed to best meet complex objectives. It combined policy messages and high-level knowledge inputs in the form of plenary sessions, concept documents and workshops, with the latter being the core of the event and the main source of recommendations (see the annexed International Encounters programme).

Overall, 250 people from 68 countries on five continents participated in the International Encounters event: farmers’ representatives, policy makers, NGO leaders and researchers. Over 450 people attended the inaugural conference and roundtable.

Seven workshops were set up on the basis of proven participation methods, combining open discussions in linguistic subgroups (English, French and Spanish) and pooling of the observations in the form of graphs and presentations. For each workshop, the results were entrusted to and coordinated and presented by a multi-institutional team responsible for drawing up a preliminary framework document previously sent to all participants, which outlined and oriented the thematic focus. This team—assisted by a facilitator—then ensured the active participation of all the different stakeholders who attended the workshops. The team also produced an ex post report that included a brief summary of the shared conclusions and detailed proposals regarding questions and potential avenues of research to enhance research governance on each specific workshop theme.

These proceedings showcase the wealth of collective exchanges and proposals put forward during this collective 3-day International Encounters event. Reports of the seven workshops are first presented. This is followed by two summary reports. The first is a brief formal summary of the plenary session points of agreement and the overall proposals. The second highlights the general and cross-cutting implications which should help to provide an overall framework for research agendas and to gain greater insight into family farming and its dynamics, while enhancing contributions to their public policy support. The English version of this summary was presented at the FAO Global Dialogue on Family Farming meeting held on 27-28 October 2014 in Rome. These proceedings finally include a summary of the results of a questionnaire sent to participants by the FRM team regarding the International Encounters event, along with a list of participants.
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Workshop 1
Family farming in a spatial or territorial context

Karen Brooks (USA), Alioune Fall (Senegal), John Beer (Costa Rica), Hakim Baliraine (Uganda), Roberto Cittadini (Argentina), Thomas Price (USA)

The recommendations generated from this workshop are organized around the following four focus topics: (1) Farm size and implications for farming operations and territorial transformations; (2) Land tenure and implications for technical dynamism and resource use; (3) Family farms as contributors to management and sustainability of shared landscapes; and (4) Organizational and institutional issues associated with the spatial and territorialized context of family farming.
Farm size and implications for farming operations and territorial transformations

Setting the scene

- The geographical position and characteristics of land (topography, physical and biological resources, hydrology and soils, etc.) are fundamental to farms. The farm setting also involves a network of physical, economic and social spatial relations within specific, and often idiosyncratic, territorial contexts.

- Family farms are typically, but not always, small. FAO states that 72% of family farms are less than 1 ha and 84% less than 2 ha. Available technical innovations are not equally accessible, applicable or adaptable to farms of varying sizes and resources.

- The term ‘family farm’ is often used synonymously with ‘small farm’, which creates confusion. On family farms, family members provide most of the labour, including management, and own most of the assets. The farm size is limited by labour and capital constraints, varying according to the availability and costs of labour, capital and land, as well as the governing institutions. Historically, family farms have shown advantages regarding labour use and mobilisation, demonstrating great flexibility, while benefiting from off-farm resources from family members as needed. Farm sizes are changing, as in much of the world farms are simultaneously and gradually getting larger and smaller. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the number of medium size or larger (>5 ha) farms is increasing, whereas small farms are decreasing in size through partitioning and fragmentation within families. In India, the overall medium size of farms is regularly decreasing, while in USA, the number of very large and very small farms is increasing.

- The phenomenon of fragmentation of landholdings within families threatens the viability and sustainability of family farming systems.

- Farm size is not the only factor determining viability, as other factors include access to markets, value added to production and products, and proximity to urban and urbanizing areas and rural services.

- The multifunctional roles of family farms are crucial, including the environmental and social services provided. These roles are in a spatial context within distinct social, institutional and thus geographical territories.
Research: priorities, methods and governance

Building on the points discussed, participants called for further research to monitor changes in family farming so as to be able to inform policy- and decision-makers at the country level. Debates were focused on the following questions:

- How is farm size changing at country and local levels? What are the drivers of change in different regions? How do these changes in farm size affect the physical and social characteristics, management and governance of rural landscapes?

- How are the changing age compositions of families and career decisions of young people affecting farm size and farming operations? What does this imply for the viability and effectiveness of the family farm as an organizational form?

- How can new technologies be tailored to the scale and composition of family farms? How does the availability or unavailability of innovations play a role in the determination of farm size?

- There is a critical lack of data on the distribution and dynamics of spatial interrelations between family farms and large agroindustrial farms that rely on hired labour and mechanization, often in addition to high input use to ensure large-scale production of a few crops for the wider marketplace. How can research and development address the interrelations and fulfill the respective needs of these forms of agriculture? Are there models for research and advisory services able to enhance the complementarity of such farm types and ensure that they will be equally favoured by public and private research?
Land tenure and implications for technical dynamism and resource use

Setting the scene

• Access to and use of land and other resources are a major issue for family farming.

• The spatial configuration of family farms partly depends on the landholding opportunities and constraints for family units. Various rules about whether and how households and individuals within them can access land affect decisions about investment, choice of technology and marketing channels.

• Discrimination regarding gender, age, caste and other social categories decreases productivity and earnings. Uncertainty of tenure reduces private investment of households in their land. Families lacking recognised tenure, in a setting of increased demand for land and other resources, are vulnerable to dispossession and exclusion. Poorly defined property rights combined with population pressure and weather shocks erode social capital and foster conflict.

• Consolidation of farms within families is an option to overcome the disadvantages of the often small scale of family farming units. Efficiency and higher returns on labour and investment in family farms partly offset the economic limitations due to size.

• The scope of land tenure covers various forms of land use, such as pastoral and range management and access to other resources, including water and vegetation.

• Legal and administrative systems are stumbling blocks to continuity and viability—the values and modes of incorporation and adaptation to current contexts of ancestral resource-access systems are overlooked. In this regard, there is also a need to have a less reductionistic approach to land given its central social value and position regarding livelihoods.

• There is often a significant gap between texts, the adoption of new texts or administrative measures, and effective implementation through formal and informal means at local and country levels.

• Multistakeholder solutions—including family farmers, local authorities and other stakeholders—to address land tenure at the local level include recognition of customary rights and regulations and of platforms to regulate land and resource use.

Research: priorities, methods and governance

• What conditions are necessary for recognition and effective implementation of local land and resources rights? How can customary land law and use rights be legitimized and incorporated into national legal systems?

• What mechanisms work best to give local people access to land when demand from outside the community (national or foreign) is high?

• How does land tenure law and practice influence the impact of agriculture on landscapes and the environment?
• What is the empirical evidence of landholding by women and marginalized groups? How can women’s rights to land and resources be recognised and formalized? How can joint titling with the spouse and family or community property arrangements affect women? What are the advantages and disadvantages of individual titling?

• What are the known experiences regarding intergenerational transfer of land? Are there intraregional similarities and local and national differences? What mechanisms work well for intergenerational transfer of land, including those that resolve blockages and conflicts? Does the absence of mechanisms for intergenerational transfer of assets hamper family farm viability and productivity?

Family farms as contributors to management and sustainability of shared landscapes

Setting the scene

• Farmers frequently change elements and types of land use within their farm. At a larger territorial scale, certain crops or cropping systems may disappear completely or be dramatically transformed for various reasons.

• Farmers may adopt a variety of strategies for the management of environmental and other services as they function at different scales, e.g. pollination control on farms, biological pest control between farms, water resources within watersheds and landscapes, carbon emissions and carbon sequestration nationally or even globally.

• Trade-offs between environmental services and productivity on family farms is a key issue for research and policy making, while taking the territorial context in which these services occur into consideration. Trade-off calculations are site-specific in relation to local conditions, management, specific services, and to larger spatial and national frameworks (including economic, social, political and cultural dynamics).

• Family farming has an important and underestimated relationship with urbanization. The process positively and negatively impacts the sustainability of family farms through the development of periurban areas for agriculture and direct linkages to urban areas within families through outmigration, remittances and input of other resources, diversification of activities within areas, e.g. (agro-)tourism and building of family homes or other infrastructures.
Research questions

- How can family farming be valued and recognised through professionalization and acknowledgement of the contribution of the profession to public goods?
- How can taking specific spatial and territorial contexts into account support innovations in techniques and forms of organization?
- The combination of these dynamics affects ecosystem services derived from a given territory. The decision-making process (drivers of change, criteria used, thresholds, etc.) implemented by land-use managers, including farmers, is a key research area. What policy levers are available to influence these decisions? One might be payment for environmental services (PES). More research is needed to determine how to set up PES schemes (or even alternative certification schemes that could be used to achieve the same result) and how they succeed (or not!) in influencing farmers’ land use and livelihoods. How much to pay, when to pay, how long to continue payments, and how these and other questions are affected by the socioeconomic characteristics of different groups of farmers in the same territory, are all important questions.

Organizational and institutional issues associated with the spatial and territorialized context of family farming

Setting the scene

- Family farms are often effective production units. However, they interact with different types of off-farm stakeholders and they need to join forces to ensure effective collective representation within markets so as to enhance their position in trade, transactions and political processes. Family farming—like all modes of production and social organization—should thus be supported by specific public policies so that its voice and position will be taken into account upstream in value chains and at territorial and country levels.
- Family farmers can overcome problems of lack of coordination, scale and comparative advantage by coming together in organizations or cooperatives. Joint action and collective arrangements offer advantages regarding input supply, availability of processing and other equipment, natural resource management and enhanced market access through aggregated storage and transport, while ensuring a stronger voice and negotiating positions within markets. Collective arrangements take advantage of strategies favouring small-scale farms. They provide public goods contributing to rural development, build local solidarity and enhance social links between people.
- Local authorities and government agencies typically need to develop their capacities with respect to management and governance of land and other resources. These capacities complement collaborative mechanisms for family farmers to exercise rights to land and natural resources.
- Government has a fundamental role as mediator among stakeholders in a common territory. This role includes convening relevant local institutions, social groups and stakeholders, and facilitating access to financial and other resources needed for local investment and development.
Research: priorities, methods and governance

- What are the aims of family farmers’ organizations with regard to influencing agriculture and territorial (land-use planning) policies? How can they advocate and better influence conditions in favour of family farmers at the local level with authorities, government agencies and other stakeholders?

- What are the mechanisms for coordination and enhanced collaboration among family farmers and stakeholders from other sectors that share and use common territories?

- What is required for family farmers to have their land and resource rights recognised and exercised in practice?

- What forms of organization are best suited for the delivery of services currently required by family farmers? How are organizations structured and regulated in order to be accountable to members and provide the incentives to conduct effective operations for their members?

- Farmers’ organizations and cooperatives have traditionally been active on marketing issues. What is their role in the management of environmental services, including land use and landscape sustainability? How can this be determined, assessed and replicated?

- Farmers’ organizations have traditionally been active in building solidarity and developing social capital. What is their role in maintaining rural livelihoods and how?

- How can family farmers and local authorities improve inter-relations and mutually support one another to enhance livelihoods, maintain rural landscapes and environmental services while sustaining rural society?
Workshop 2

Family farming facing the challenges of agroecological intensification

Bernard Triomphe (France), Jens Andersson (Zimbabwe), Eric Scopel (France), Mwatina Juma (Tanzania)

The recommendations issued from this workshop do not pretend to give an exhaustive account of this challenge. They are organized in four sections: Setting the scene, Pathways to agroecological intensification (AEI), Building family farmers’ capacity to innovate around AEI and, Old and new fields of research for supporting family farmers’ transition to agricultural intensification.
Family farming facing the challenges of agroecological intensification

Bernard Triomphe (France), Jens Andersson (Zimbabwe), Eric Scopel (France), Mwatina Juma (Tanzania)

Setting the scene

Family farmers worldwide can improve their livelihoods by producing more to ensure their own food security and by reaching out to markets to increase their farm incomes. Thus they also contribute to addressing the increasing local, national and global demand for food resulting from global population growth. Yet, with mounting pressure on land, biodiversity, natural resources and family labour, family farmers need to intensify their production while simultaneously producing in an environmentally friendly manner. In addition, family farmers are pressured to deliver a host of other ecosystem services to society in general, while contributing to meeting challenges regarding climate change, rapid urbanization and globalization, etc.

Family farmers, especially in developing countries, are often hampered by low and erratic rainfall, low quality land, poor infrastructure and low access to services (credit and technical support) and inputs. Their working conditions, collective organization and bargaining power regarding government and the private sector are also often poor. Family farmers could potentially take advantage of numerous opportunities, such as improved marketing resulting from improvements in physical infrastructure (e.g. paved roads), ICTs, or increased urban consumer demand for diversified and high-quality agricultural products. The challenges, constraints and opportunities are highly site-specific, and this specificity cannot be overemphasized, as it shapes what farmers can or cannot do in terms of changing their current production systems and practices.
In many places, conventional ‘Green Revolution’-type intensification pathways (based on access to improved seeds, irrigation, chemical fertilizer, mechanization, advisory services and credit) are still out of reach for numerous family farmers, despite having received substantial support from public and private stakeholders up to now. Their farms are still often reliant on manual or animal power and low levels of external inputs. In addition, the negative environmental and social impacts often associated with such intensification pathways may not make them desirable options to pursue, especially not at a time when increasingly stringent regulations with respect to quality and potential environmental impacts dictate how farmers can produce.

Under these conditions, the development and adoption of new agricultural practices incorporating agroecological principles, sometimes referred to as ‘ecological intensification’ or, in a more general way ‘sustainable intensification’, appears necessary if family farmers are to sustainably improve their livelihoods. According to many experts, family farmers have a competitive advantage in implementing agroecological principles on their farms, and by capitalizing on this advantage they could remain major contributors to food security in the next decades.

Pathways towards agroecological intensification

Agroecological intensification (AEI) of agricultural production means pursuing two goals simultaneously:

1. Improve the ecological and economic efficiency of resource use. This means that each resource unit used (whether internal or external) must contribute to more production without negatively impacting the environment, the access of other farms to these resources, or the functional integrity of the system.

2. Rely on and enhance ecological processes naturally involved in agroecosystems. Farmers may act on these processes using physical devices (mulch, anti-erosive stone bunds, zaï, etc.) or biological agents (symbiotic organisms, cover crops, natural enemies, predators, etc.), or sometimes by applying external inputs.

While taking family farmers’ specific constraints and skills into account, various technological and institutional options may be implemented to achieve these goals:

- Integrated soil fertility and resource management (controlling degradation processes, ensuring efficient management and use, mitigating risks and climate changes, balancing the long-term availability of chemical elements).

- Integrated pest and disease management (combining chemical, mechanical and biological control).

* Although there are differences in what each term means and encompasses. Moreover, the question remains as to whether intensification is actually a relevant starting point, what the underlying development and societal models compatible with it are, and whether there is a need to change the corresponding paradigms. These issues were recently hotly debated at the Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition Symposium organized by FAO in Rome (September 2014), and will no doubt continue to be debated within the context of the Conference of the Parties on Climate (COP21 in Paris in 2015), for example.
• Integrated plant biodiversity management (improved or adapted crop cultivars, diversification of species used in rotations and/or intercropping, multifunctional crops, etc.).

• Better organization and representation of family farmers at local, regional and national levels.

• Devising a set of consistent mutually–reinforcing policies capable of triggering and driving family farmers’ transition to ecological intensification.

Implementing AEI thus requires the adaptation of current practices, reorganization of farm activities and resource allocation at the family-farm level. Specific adaptations may also be required at farm or regional levels for family farms (FF) to adopt AEI, e.g. through market development strategies enabling crop and commodity diversification, crop-livestock integration, multifunctional land use, interactions and synergies among different types of farms, etc.

Agroecological intensive production systems tend to be harder to manage because they are knowledge intensive and require a fair amount of learning over time. Moreover, while in the long term they often induce positive changes in local agroecosystems, their short-term performance may be disappointing (e.g. yield reductions in already high-yielding systems, costly initial mistakes, inefficient insertion in targeted markets, etc.). In contrast to conventional off-the-shelf technical packages, they mobilize farmers’ local knowledge and can best be designed through collaboration between researchers, farmers and other local stakeholders, as well as other R&D stakeholders, the private sector and administrations.

Intensive agroforestry systems, conservation farming practices, various forms of organic farming and integrated mixed farming systems are examples of on-going transformations towards agroecological intensification.

An integrated approach that builds on the diversity—both agroecologically and socioeconomically—within existing production systems is required for AEI development. Among all concerned stakeholders, priorities will have to be established for different types of FF, while developing diversified strategies for each type.

AEI requires changes at the field and farm-level but also at higher scales to actually achieve functional integrity in the long-run. It is hence essential to focus attention on the socioeconomic, cultural and political dimensions to achieve a smooth transition of FF towards AEI. For instance, land tenure security often appears to be a critical precondition for investing in sustainable intensification, while the interaction of various types of stakeholders at different scales is a key to the diversification of farm-level production and quality service (knowledge) delivery to FF. Similarly, AEI implementation depends on public or national priorities and policies, funding devoted to AEI vs. other forms of agriculture, the position and role played by multinational companies, etc.
Building family farmers’ capacity to innovate around AEI

Family farms have always demonstrated a strong innovation capacity, probably due to three main features of FF: (1) the capacity to mobilize labour, (2) the multifaceted and dynamic knowledge of natural processes, (3) the intrinsic, systemic and pragmatic vision farmers apply to agriculture, their farms and the environment.

Each of these strengths offers many possibilities to come up with new ways of managing and organizing agricultural production at individual and societal levels, and in developing all kinds of agricultural innovations, useful for implementing AEI. The role and importance of off-farm livelihood opportunities (e.g. through mobility) must also be better understood and built upon, as they have often contributed to agricultural innovation in the past in the form of new ideas, financial or social capital, etc.

Part and parcel of their capacity to innovate is the capacity (i.e. both ability and power) of family farmers and their organizations to influence the wider policy environment in which they operate, by creating or strengthening the institutions that drive the transition to AEI, so that these will be truly suited to their own conditions and objectives. Are family farmers able to achieve this on their own? How much do they need to mobilise or receive support from a host of key sectoral stakeholders, including research, extension, education, finance, private sector, NGOs and the various relevant levels of government and local authorities?

Old and new fields of research for supporting the transition to agroecological intensification by family farmers

There are still many unsolved issues that must be dealt with in order to ensure that AEI with and by family farmers will work, as FF livelihoods are highly diverse and complex production and consumption systems. These issues include biophysical and technological aspects but also socioeconomic and policy aspects at the farm, local, national and international scales. Existing research approaches and methods also have to be modified and adapted so that research will be more demand-oriented and supportive of greater diversity of farmers and other stakeholders that drive agricultural transformation. Finally, we cannot overemphasize the need to focus on capacity development and sometimes empowerment of the many stakeholders, especially family farmers, who need to get involved in AEI transition.

A non-exhaustive and non-prioritized list of research issues and questions related to AEI is presented below. It is classified under various themes, which resulted from group brainstorming at the FF conference in June 2014. All of them warrant systematic research on the diverse settings in which family farmers operate. For such research to actually take place, sufficient public and private funding should be made available and accessible under relevant conditions specifically geared towards supporting AEI transition for family farmers.
Research approaches and methods

One hypothesis in this section is that research on AEI needs to be much more participatory, inter-disciplinary, multi-scale and systemic than usual if it is to be successful and truly support family farmers’ transition to AEI. An additional hypothesis is that research on AEI has to not just mobilize formal research institutions, but also farmers, farmers’ organizations and other local stakeholders, CSOs and NGOs and input suppliers. Increasingly, research on AEI has to be a collective undertaking implemented in the name of and by multi-stakeholder alliances working within the framework of formal or informal innovation systems or networks with a strong interest on and commitment to AEI. Under such premises, the following topics and issues seem especially relevant:

- Document and learn from what is already known or ongoing about AEI with family farmers and other local stakeholders. Identify the diverse range of farmers’ needs and expectations with respect to AEI.
- Develop a systemic approach and framework specifically focused on AEI.
- Develop participatory approaches and methods for co-design and diffusion of AEI innovations with family farmers having a leading role.
- Better target AEI research: with and for whom should AEI research be conducted?
- Develop approaches and tools, including modelling, to take the multiple scales affected by AEI into account.
- Ensure that research results are more accessible and actually used to support the transition to AEI.
Biophysical and related technological aspects

- Better characterize local interactions between biological agents in AEI systems (competition, facilitation, predation, allelopathy) in order to improve management of each component accordingly.
- Study soil biology in a broad range of FF situations, including the long-term consequences of AEI practices on soil fertility, carbon sequestration and GHG emissions, so as to help develop adapted biomass management strategies.
- Understand and manage resource use efficiency and recycling under AEI, and the level of external inputs which might be needed under specific conditions in order to foster/support the desired ecological processes and functions.
- Assess the impact of AEI systems and model their dynamics at various spatiotemporal scales.
- Minimize climate change impacts and manage the associated risks through AEI. 
- Develop integrated agroenvironmental assessments for a variety of conventional and AEI systems:
  - Develop typologies that enable functional classification of AEI systems and practices
  - Assess how, where and why AEI systems work
  - Identify AEI cropping systems best suited to specific FF characteristics, and pinpoint the technical and knowledge gaps to adapt existing or new AEI systems to the diversity of FF conditions.

Farm level and other socio-economic issues

- Identify the best entry points and strategies for effective FF transition to AEI:
  - Assess if and how family farms may benefit from advances achieved in the transition of bigger farms to AEI (and vice versa).
  - Identify other benefits that FF could expect from adopting AEI beyond production increases resulting from intensification.
  - Strengthen the relationship between the transition to AEI and household food and nutrition security.
  - Assess how AEI transition contributes to sustainable food systems.
- Assess the relationship between AEI and the need for increased employment generation at the farm level, and the implications of adopting agroecological practices for FF labour and capital needs.
- Assess the economic benefits of AEI transition at different levels (farm, community, regional and country, including ecological and social services), but also the associated risks.
- Identify intra-household diversity and its dynamics (gender, youth), and how it interacts with AEI. Assess the impact of AEI on gender relations and the empowerment of women on the generational succession.
• Assess better ways of integrating livestock in agroecological farming systems, develop integrated crop-forage AEI systems, assess and optimize nutrient use efficiency throughout the crop-animal chain, and enhance organic use of animal dejections.

Institutional and policy issues, education and training

• Identify ways to ensure efficient coordination of family farmers’ transition to AEI, while promoting synergies regarding interventions and activities of all those involved and a consistent distribution of roles and responsibilities. Identify what research could actually do, what roles it could and should play in the AEI transition process.

• Identify types of innovation systems and processes needed around AEI.

• Improve the governance of research and other public R&D stakeholders, and their responsiveness to family farmers’ needs and demands with respect to AEI.

• Identify conditions and structural/organizational changes (including changes needed in the stances of organizations) needed for effective scaling-up of AEI systems and practices at all relevant scales and institutional levels.

• Find ways for influencing policy makers, and developing policies which could favour AEI innovation and transition.

• Assess the actual or potential effects of different types of possible subsidies, safety nets and insurance schemes on AEI transition. Determine whether payment schemes for ecosystem services and other forms of public payments could encourage family farmers to embark on a transition to AEI.

• Identify capacities that need to be strengthened to achieve transition to AEI, as well as the skills and knowledge that research and educational institutions should develop to create the capacities needed to support the transition to AEI among the various stakeholder groups involved.
The discussions of this workshop focused on the challenges of employment, individual and collective wellbeing, in all their dimensions, and which question forms of agricultural production, food security, poverty reduction, cultural diversity, sustainable management of natural resources. Participants believed that family farming is already doing a lot at the macroeconomic level, and that it could meet these challenges in the future, but it is generally better equipped than agroindustries to address them efficiently and simultaneously.

The workshop defined ‘family’ as a complex set of individuals—men and women, young and old—producing, consuming, travelling, communicating, diversifying their activities, with personal aspirations and collective concerns, interacting with each other as well as with other stakeholders and institutions outside of the family setting. Participants discussed both the strengths and weaknesses of this complex entity, not only from the standpoint of the categories (gender, age, status, etc.) of individuals comprising it, but also as a separate group. Power relations and, more broadly, social interactions within the family, as well as within the community, were also a prime focus during the debates. Viewed from this perspective, recommendations departed significantly from the preparatory orientation paper.

Drafting a summary is always simplistic. To ensure clarity in the recommendations, three main entries around which the discussions revolved, both in terms of the situation analysis to be taken into account and the new questions to be put to research regarding the specific area of in-house issues, are underscored: the limited interest in social interactions within families, which simplifies our representation of family farming; the special role of women and youth within families and within individual and collective farming dynamics, at several levels; the importance of what is happening beyond the family farm and agriculture per se in a bid to understand and enhance the performance of family farming.
Accounting for social relations in family farming

Setting the scene

Agricultural research has historically prioritized technically- and economically-oriented works aimed at improving the functioning of farms. While it is possible to produce more and earn more, the social dynamics that go with technical and economic changes continue to be major determinants of agricultural and rural transformations. However, very few studies have been devoted to social relations in agriculture in general, and particularly in family farming. The group nevertheless drew on a few obvious premises to advocate that such relations be given greater consideration in order to understand and thus better support family farms.

The first premise is that agriculture throughout the world is mostly a ‘family trade’ and that it is considered as such by farmers themselves, even though a trend towards standardizing this ‘trade’ generally follows economic development. This equally holds true for other sectors, especially in handicrafts. However, very few research initiatives have been devoted to the social functioning of families as producers, which does not presuppose a single utility function, but rather complex social interactions (reciprocal and solidarity-based relations as well as power and domination relations). In this regard, it should be recalled that the family can be a threat for some of its members who desire more autonomy and who may be inhibited (at times violently, both physically and mentally) by the domination they suffer.

Another premise concerns the diversity of family farming around the world, and thus the variety and complexity of such social interactions within and between them, and with their environment (which itself may take very diverse forms).

Owing to individual approaches to family farming, the social and legal status of family members within the farm are not acknowledged or, if so, only to a limited extent. This knowledge gap gives rise to an ambiguous situation: the family is seen as a refuge, a recourse that limits the vulnerability of individuals, but also as a setting of structural bias against women, the elderly and the youth. The status issue is similar to the inadequate consideration given to the land tenure issue in the nexus between the individual and the family. Very few studies have recognized the key nature of the struggle for land, of specific needs for access and tenure, usage and transmission, for the different categories of individuals within the family and for the whole family.
Moreover, few research studies have focused on non-market-related intra- and inter-family exchanges of gifts, etc., and other types of ‘in-kind’ social exchanges. However, such exchanges usually play a crucial role in the identity of groups not only within the farming family, but also in the way they operate, as well as in measuring their performance (financial, environmental, food security, etc.). It is often through such exchanges that the labour of the different family members is tapped and their participation in collective farm work secured. Labour management is one of the specific characteristics of family farming.

Nevertheless, the group participants stressed that exploring the different social dynamics between family farm members is not irrelevant, and above all not without pitfalls. It sometimes involves research that violates the privacy of families, which may have private consequences and exceed the research role and functions. The promotion of Eurocentric visions is another potential issue. These observations call on researchers to be attentive and prudent with regard to the methods used and the way their findings are leveraged.

The family farm is both an affective unit and a community of interest. In studying members of the family, it is necessary to take into account the fact that they are highly involved in family plans—joint consumption, division of labour, heritage building—although at the same time, each member has his/her own individual plans. It is thus necessary to consider that personal decisions very often depend on collective ones and that this can be both a source of serious conflicts and tension, and of stronger solidarity within the family.

**Research questions**

**Research to understand the link between individual and collective dimensions within families**

- Taking the different cultural, political and institutional contexts into account at local and national levels, what is the room for manoeuvre and what strategies are available for individuals in family farming? What kind of social relations are there and how have they evolved?
- How can families as groups with variable outlines (to be defined according to the context) face interpersonal tensions and promote collaboration? What kinds of organizations, standards and governance approaches do they develop?
- How do families actually reconcile the individual aspirations of their members with a collective goal of achieving efficiency and competitiveness in their economic projects, including farming and cattle breeding? Specifically, what are the systems of rights and obligations to which the different categories of players are subjected and how do they change over time?
- What is the status of members of rural and farming families? What does it cover in terms of power relations? To what extent is it formalized in law and how has it changed over time?
- How do tenure rights of individuals influence their strategies and those of the whole family, and conversely? What are the threats to the land rights of family farmers and thus their internal organization?
Research linking social relations to the technical dimension of agricultural production

- What technologies are suitable for the different individual players? What types of links are there between social status and farming practices? How can this be drawn upon when developing adapted techniques?

- What technologies are suitable for groups formed within family farming, in particular for the capacities and conditions for mobilizing labour within such groups?

- What technologies are suitable for families when taking their institutional environment into account, namely the various trade organizations/associations likely to support them?

Research to improve statistics and upgrade investigative methods

- How can adequate statistics on family structures, multiactivity, mobility, labour distribution among families, reciprocity and solidarity, internal tension/power relations be secured?

- Research must have a role in this definition, by leveraging its understanding of the internal functioning of families. It should thus work with all relevant partners (NGOs, policy makers, farmers’ organizations, as well as institutions responsible for producing statistics at national and international levels, including FAO).

- Given the complexity and dynamics of the inner workings of rural families, research must adopt systemic and dynamic approaches. This is the only way to hope to economically and econometrically model family farming practices and results, their systems of activity, their relation to the natural and institutional environment, etc.
A need to recognize the position and role of individuals, especially women and youth, in family farming in relation to the position and role of the group

Setting the scene

Many studies have recognized the important contribution of all categories of individuals to family farming within the family unit. Especially, women play a key role in the nutrition of both children and adults, as well as in the daily economics of the family. In a ‘care’ approach, even though it would be necessary to avoid limiting them to this topic by ‘naturalizing’ the rules regarding the division of labour and tasks, they are often responsible for the family’s daily purchases and reproduction activities. Youth very often also plays invisible roles in the family reproduction and in the functioning of farms.

On the one hand, it is essential to accurately measure the economic and financial weight of activities performed by all individuals. This is crucial, besides the social dimension alone, especially in low-income countries where the financial situation is the primary concern. On the other hand, attention must be focused on ‘invisible wealth’. This is not sufficiently understood and recognized, but continues to be of paramount importance. This refers to the role of women within the family with regards to its social reproduction, notably:

- offering domestic and civic education to young generations.
- caring for family members who are seasonal workers in periods when they are out of work—which justifies the fact that their wages are assessed at below subsistence levels, especially in agriculture.
- caring for the sick and elderly, including by means of traditional medicine to make up for the inadequacy of public health services.
- self-consumption and in-house production of inputs such as organic fertilizers and seeds.
- maintenance of local cultivated biodiversity and use of environmentally-sound practices (another form of ‘care’ for natural resources).

Although economic theory does not consider this invisible wealth, such unpaid labour accounts for a sizeable amount of the family’s wellbeing and its effects go beyond the strict family setting. Here also, research is necessary to overcome this invisibility and highlight these contributions.

As such, quantifying the contribution of women and youth to home economics (paid work, regardless of the forms the payment takes, as well as unpaid work) is required to understand the dynamics involved. However, because of the diverse ways in which families and societies operate, our reasoning must not be based on any assumptions or presumptions. Standards as well as positions of power vary between player categories and between groups.

Finally, women also foster and maintain ties with the family’s economic and social environment through specific activities within farmers’ organizations or other associations. This involvement in community life takes place differently from that of men, a situation that helps, through specific assets, to boost families’ social and human capital. The same holds for youth, but with no precise indication of the nature of such ties or academic analysis of the drivers, impacts and prospects of
this involvement. An analysis of the roles and positions, and the individual needs and aspirations of the different family members must therefore combine and align with strategies for families in their different forms, as well as with those of the associations with which individuals and families interact.

**Research questions**

- What are the roles and positions ascribed to individuals in the systems of family activities, and specifically in agriculture? In what ways does the social status of such individuals restrict them or not to specific functions, practices and strategies?
- What mechanisms limit women's strategies and practices in successfully carrying out the activities in which they are involved? Conversely, what strengths and levers do they use to create wealth and wellbeing? What is to be made of such mechanisms based on gender relations?
- What mechanisms restrict youths' strategies and practices when carrying out the activities in which they are involved? Conversely, what strengths and levers do they use to create wealth and wellbeing? What is to be made of such mechanisms based on intergenerational relations?
- What are the cultural values and power relations in societies that impact the role of women and youth and their status in rural development?
- What is the role of the market and of asymmetrical relations on such markets in reproducing social inequalities? Conversely, in what ways do market integration and market relations help reduce such inequalities?
- What policy processes and actions would be needed to remove the constraints faced by women and the youth, and enhance their strengths? What social organizations or collective initiatives could help drive social change?
- Conversely, would some policies not contribute to reinforcing the constraints faced by individuals within families?
- What are the individual trajectories of women and youth leaders? What can we learn from such trajectories in terms of drivers of individual fulfillment and the social organizations of family farming?
A need to “step back” from agriculture to gain greater insight into the social workings and issues within and between family farming households

Setting the scene

Agricultural research is mainly focused on agriculture and yield optimization and often overlooks the off-farm and non-farming activities of family members. Here also, we are referring to women’s and youth’s activities which are the least documented: food processing, transportation, storage, marketing, packaging, etc. Yet, these activities are widespread among different agroecological, social and economic family situations and are often crucial for the maintenance of family farming. They are considered in conjunction with the family farming and cattle breeding, both in terms of time management (individual and collective) and funding. The financial sustainability of families and their working system are crucial and often achieved through multiactivities. It is necessary to consider the opportunities of multiactivities even when thinking ‘business’.

The pivotal issue of land tenure in understanding the role of family farming has already been underscored. Land ownership is a key to explaining why the potential of family farming is hampered, and is often related to issues that go beyond the agricultural dimension alone. A more global perspective is therefore required. The family unit, including women and youth, must develop strategies (tenure, production, family) based on what is small, precarious or inadequate, while making sure to adapt such strategies to the territory as well as to their political and institutional environment.

Building the capacities of individuals and families in the area of farming, but also in other sectors, including to enhance their voice, autonomy and relations with policy making, could prove to be a key leverage. It could also help to disseminate best practices and develop local knowledge. This effort should also account for the know-how of individuals and families and integrate the way they function, as well as their overall potential.

An environment that is conducive to individual fulfillment must be fostered to improve the internal working of families. This may entail easing transportation, storage and marketing of products, boosting their communication and information capacities, and improving all kinds of public services available to them. Development is also achieved at the territory level and the various levels should interact.

Research questions

• What are the systems of activity of rural and farming families? How do the various activities performed combine? How are priorities set with regard to the assignment of work? How have these combinations evolved over time?

• How is individual mobility decided? How does income from migration link to income from other systems of activity? How does the role of mobility evolve over time?

• In what family, societal, agroecological and economic contexts are multiactivity and mobility established? In what ways are the forms of multiactivity and mobility influenced by such contexts?
• How do market policies interact at the macro and meso levels in terms of social security, health, education and support to agriculture? Even with a mere economic analysis, is it necessary to better identify cross-sectoral linkages in order to more accurately assess family farming performance?

• How can the high diversity of systems of activity and their evolution over time be described and understood?

Other general recommendations on research practices

• It is necessary to differentiate and contextualize research and avoid normative positions. Several observation and analytical levels should also be used, with time and rapid changes in individual as well as collective contexts and strategies taken into account.

• A certain ethic should be adopted and adhered to when conducting research on social relationships, especially within families. Internal processes for self-evaluation and ethical scrutiny of research should be strengthened, but also shared with NGOs and farmers’ associations.

• It is necessary to promote research WITH family farming (as a living and complex research topic). It is necessary to jointly develop research topics with family farmers (men and women) in order to enhance the legitimacy of research studies and findings.

• It is also necessary to promote research FOR family farming (by completing research in view of developing actual applications that benefit them). Research should be able to strengthen the position of family farming and farmers’ associations.

• The role of human and social sciences in research on family farming should be strengthened, while developing qualitative approaches on social relationships within families, with a link to quantitative approaches.

• The principle of equal knowledge should be adhered to and any participatory approach to data collection and processing promoted.

• Research partnerships should be diversified and extended to professional farmers’ associations, as well as to sector organizations and social activists.

• While adhering to the set of ethics mentioned earlier, it is necessary to objectively pull the blinds on power and domination relations within family farming.

• Finally, there is need for ‘advocacy’ research in relation to the global society–research that makes a statement. This is crucial to ensure that family farming is valued and translated into policy.
Workshop 3—In-house issues within family farming

Local market with traditional vegetables in Muzaffarpur, Bihar, India.
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Workshop 4

Family farming facing the challenges of urbanization and employment

Bruno Losch (France), Karim Hussein (Italy), Chahaya Bhavsar (India), Oluwabunmi Ajilore (Nigeria), Yuna Chiffoleau (France)

The recommendations issued from this workshop do not claim to be exhaustive. They are organized in three sections: Setting the scene of what we know about the challenges of urbanization and employment and what they mean for family farming, The capacity of family farmers to adapt to an urban environment and, Research questions suggested to be addressed and research themes.
Setting the scene: What we know about the challenges of urbanization and employment and what they mean for family farming

The socioeconomic context of every country and region determines the employment patterns and range of opportunities and constraints related to urbanization

- Urbanization necessarily has impacts on market opportunities. Demographic changes, accompanied by a growing urban/rural ratio, potentially reflect a growing market for every farmer. However, this discussion needs to be geographically focused. A diverse range of structural change processes (economic transition and demographic transition) prevail throughout the world and they deeply modify family farming opportunities (and constraints):
  - World urbanization reached the tipping point at the end of the 2000s, but urban shares of the overall population vary widely: 82% in North America; 79% in Latin America; 73% in Europe; 45% in Asia (but 50% in China and 30% in India, respectively); 36% in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)*.
  - The share of agriculture in the economy (in terms of GDP, trade, employment) is also very different across countries and regions. The share of the EAP (economically active population) working in agriculture represents nearly 60% in SSA, 55% in India, 15% in Latin America, 4% in Europe (EU 27) and 1.5% in North America.
  - The relative share of the rural population (as compared to people living in urban areas) will decrease everywhere. However, in some regions the rural population will continue to grow in absolute terms: in South Asia until the 2030s and in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) until after 2050. In these two regions, agriculture will be on the front line for the absorption of new entrants into the labour force.

• These major differences (and the predicted trends for the coming decades) position family farming in different ways:
  - in regions with growing rural population and densities, decreasing farm sizes and pressure on natural resources are critical issues and question the viability of family farming.
  - in regions with decreasing rural population and densities, increasing farm sizes offer new options for agriculture growth. They can attract new investors and challenge the market supply position of family farming.

• Family agriculture is a major occupation for women and it offers them important employment opportunities, and also opportunities for empowerment and to improve their social status.

Urban markets are growing opportunities, but they are very competitive

• Urbanization offers market opportunities for family farming due to the rapidly changing urban/rural population ratio. Growing population densities and urban centers potentially mean closer towns and cities with increasing accessibility, access to services and more dynamic rural-urban relationships. Urban food demand offers opportunities to stimulate the development of food systems and agricultural value chains and the emergence of new (and higher value) markets related to evolving diets: fresh fruits and vegetables (F&V), animal products (meat and dairy), more processed food.

• Family farming can benefit from these new market opportunities if they are able to produce, process and market different types of food that respond to changing consumption patterns. For example more and smaller scale greenhouse units produce F&V food around Nairobi to supply city markets all year round. But they face increasing competition from: (i) imports (many towns and cities easily rely on cheap imported food which can be more affordable and accessible than products coming from their hinterland); and (ii) agroindustries engaged in larger scale agriculture with adequate infrastructure, transformation, conditioning and marketing of food products. This competition can lead to a growing differentiation among farm structures with the marginalization of many family farms that are not able to specialize, meet quality standards, and increase their productivity.
• However, this trend towards long distance supply, standardization of products and specialization is gradually counterbalanced by new concerns related to sustainable development and/or food sovereignty, as well as sanitary crises, which favour the development of urban or periurban agriculture, short food supply chains and local food networks (a pattern that is increasingly observed in rich countries, but also in some developing countries). In the future, these opportunities will expand with the development of sanitary standards (human health is the same everywhere and sanitary measures should help to eventually reach these standards).

**Urbanization patterns are decisive**

• Increasing connectivity between urban centres and rural areas can produce positive synergies in terms of access to food markets and services, job opportunities and rural income diversification. Migration to cities is a major trend, but short-term migrations are facilitated and take place in most rural contexts where, combined with multiple activities, they contribute to an emerging 'new rurality'.

• However, urbanization patterns matter and can influence rural economies and family farming very differently. In some developing regions, fast growing urbanization is characterized by metropolization (high weight of primary cities versus secondary cities). A lack of infrastructure, along with missing public goods and services in secondary towns, results in weak urbanization processes and limited economic opportunities. In that context, there is a need to strengthen the 'missing middle' between mega-cities and rural towns through adequate equipment and service provision (social, health, education, electricity, communication and information systems, etc.). These improvements can drive rural diversification, facilitate market access and create attractive jobs.

The capacity of family farmers
to adapt to an urban environment

*Agriculture can continue to be a major employer
but policy choices are critical*

• In regions with a growing rural population and limited rural diversification, agriculture must continue to play its historical role of providing access to income generating activities. In SSA, 200 million youths will enter the rural labour market between 2010 and 2025 (370 million in South Asia). In most cases, agriculture will necessarily be part of the solution for these transition regions, but it will depend on the type of agricultural development process and policy choices.

• The first issue relates to the modernization pathway. The agricultural development path followed by richer countries, based on high chemical input use and motorization, translated into fast growing productivity and major destruction of jobs. Depending on the regional context, it cannot be reproduced at the same scale due insufficient employment alternatives. And, more globally, it raises a question of sustainability related to ecological impacts and growing negative externalities of the current fossil fuel based development model.
The second and related issue refers to the consequence of this modernization pathway in terms of farm specialization and increasing farm sizes, and to the development of corporate agriculture. These trends do not favour agricultural labour and question the role of policy choices. Public policies have a role to play in smoothing transformation processes, in providing adequate support to family farming, and in helping in the design of new more ‘eco-friendly and labour-friendly development pathways.

*Youth are the future of family farming, but...*

- In most developing countries where the agriculture share of employment remains high, agriculture is necessarily part of the solution to meet the job creation challenge. But it is also part of the problem because of a growing paradox—the increasing disinterest of youth for agriculture, which is now one of the major issues to be dealt with.

- Most young people in developing countries have a negative view of agriculture and agricultural labour, due to the gap between their aspirations—often shaped by ‘modern’ lifestyles and the media in an increasingly connected world—and the reality of the agrarian context, the rural economy, limitations to access modern technology and natural resources, and attitudes in rural society as a whole. For rural youth, their dream of a ‘good life’ is generally fulfilled far away from the countryside. Very low returns provided by agriculture, often harsh working conditions with hand tools, as well as the difficulty of economic and social emancipation from the elders, the weight of obligations to, and control from, the community, are major constraints. All of these difficulties and limitations are often complicated by the lack of access to education, health, and transport services. They are even worse for young women who usually have no prospect of access to land due to inheritance rules and who are aware that they will mainly have to work for their husbands.

- To deal with these issues, constant and coordinated efforts are necessary to provide youth with a status (considering farmers as professionals) and to restore agriculture and rural life as positive options (promoting decent rural employment by improving farm labour with adapted mechanization and providing infrastructure and services for rural towns). Youths voices have to be heard. They can share their needs, realities, and experiences and their own vision about the future of agriculture and rural areas. Trends observed in developed countries show that youth can return to and invest again in farming, giving it a renewed and improved image of agriculture, based on the development of local food networks and closer producer-consumer relations which are socially rewarding. Similarly, many young people in the developing world find innovative ways to rebrand agriculture and engage and galvanise their peers to see it as a profitable and ‘cool’ venture.

- But when obviously higher incomes and better job opportunities often exist in urban centers, trying to keep youth in rural areas somehow seems inappropriate and unrealistic. Trying to create positive synergies and accompany peoples’ choices seems better than implementing measures with a view to preventing rural-urban migration flows that are part of the normal development cycle in many parts of the world.
Research questions: Suggested questions to be addressed and research themes

*How can innovative agricultural development pathways be designed and supported in the 21st century?*

- To avoid excessive concentration on agriculture, negative specialization and marginalization, there is a need to develop a new vision that enhances the other functions of agriculture related to natural resource management, promotion of cultural heritage and maintenance of natural landscapes. Family farms, which are deeply rooted in their local context, can develop multiple activities in addition to agricultural production, such as ecosystem services or ecotourism. They can also engage in environment-friendly production using agroecological techniques.

  - What new activities have been identified as promising in different rural contexts and take advantage of urban markets and employment opportunities?
  - What is the labour demand of these different activities?
  - What are the returns to labour and prospects for profitability?
  - What are the necessary skills and specific support needed to foster the diversified activities and roles of family farming?

*How can the viability of family farming be improved in today’s world?*

- Family farming faces growing challenges related to competition in global markets and rising issues concerning sustainability. Adequate public policies are needed to support family farming, including the provision of public goods, support services, protection from unfair competition, dumping and imports when necessary and preferential access to specific markets (e.g. priority access to public procurement, as in Brazil).

  - What specific policy measures are needed depending on the context, and particularly to take the specifics of urban and periurban agriculture into account, along with the opportunities provided by growing urban markets?
  - How should these policies be sequenced?
  - How can collective action be effectively supported (rural producers’ organizations, local development associations)?
• How can the social structure of family farming be strengthened to make it more attractive to youth and women and benefit the social life of urban centers?
  - How can the social and economic roles of women be enhanced in the urban food system?
  - What needs to be done in agriculture and the agrofood industry to make it attractive again for youth?
  - How can the emerging power of consumers be driven, particularly in cities?

*How can family farming better respond to urban food demand?*

• A better understanding of the processes and drivers of change in urban food systems and urban demand is a necessary step.
  - What are the key urban food supply chains in different regions? Where do most food products come from in these urban centres (imports, near or remote rural areas in urban hinterlands)? What are the existing distribution systems?
  - How can family farms develop their capacity to respond to changing urban food demand (e.g. improved processing, marketing and handling systems)?
  - What is the potential for local food markets and what roles and forms should urban or periurban agriculture take?

*How can the rural-urban nexus be strengthened?*

• New analysis and evidence on existing regional dynamics and identification of binding constraints to regional and local development are prerequisites for adequate policy design.
  - What are the fundamental reasons behind the ‘urban preference’? Is it related to agricultural activity, its hardness and low returns or to the lack of other job opportunities and services in rural areas? Is this preference reversible?
  - How can information systems be improved to demonstrate that the rural-urban divide is illusory and to identify these dynamics?
  - How can urban services better reach family farms to promote inclusive and sustainable city-region food system development (including the development of infrastructure, transport, services, employment opportunities, etc.)?
  - Are there priorities and is specific sequencing of policies and actions to support family farming required to improve and accelerate connectivity?

• New areas for development need to be explored, given the multiple opportunities and services that can be achieved through a stronger rural-urban nexus.
  - What should the main elements of a joint urban-rural strategy be to promote sustainable management of natural resources (air, biodiversity, land, water)?
  - How should specific sanitary issues related to bad quality water (wastewater) or abuse of pesticides be dealt with to ensure that they will not negatively impact the quality of food and raise public health concerns?
  - How should urban waste management be improved? Can waste be considered as an organic goldmine rather than a threat and what actions are necessary to facilitate this transition?
Workshop 5

Family farmers facing the challenges of climate change

Louise Jackson (USA), Martial Bernoux (France), Henry Neufeldt (Kenya), Paulo Petersen (Brazil), Lany Rebagay (Phillipines)

The recommendations issued from this workshop do pretend to be exhaustive. They are organized in three sections: Setting the scene of agriculture in a climate change environment, Family farmers’ capacity to adapt to climate change, and Research questions.
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Family farmers facing the challenges of climate change

Louise Jackson (USA), Martial Bernoux (France), Henry Neufeldt (Kenya), Paulo Petersen (Brazil), Lany Rebagay (Phillipines)

Setting the scene of agriculture in a climate change environment

Whatever the causes of climate change, whether it is mainly due to human activities or natural dynamics, or both, agriculture is predominantly affected due to its outdoor activities and dependency on the climatic factors: sunlight, rainfall, temperature, CO₂ and oxygen, etc.). Climate change has increased awareness of the new daunting challenges to achieve greater food security. Slower increases in agricultural productivity are expected, along with more rapid population growth in the most resource-limited and climate-change exposed regions of South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Preparing for global warming and the uncertainty of extreme events (e.g. heatwaves, drought and floods) implies dealing with associated changes in social-ecological systems as well. For most agricultural institutions, the focus has been on greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation practices and adaptation to changing climate conditions, with the aim of reducing vulnerability and enhancing resilience to shocks and stress. Policy institutions face concerns about the risk of new and severe food riots due to price and yield volatility, as well as political instability and tensions that may arise as a result of resource conflicts and migratory movements. Much of the discourse has been focused on the implementation of sustainable (and/or ecological) intensification of agriculture (also called agroecological intensification in workshop 2), especially for the most vulnerable and poorest people. However, a major challenge now is to engage farmers in a ‘multifunctionality’ mindset to encourage them to deliver a broad range of ecosystem services (provisioning, regulating, cultural and supporting services), and to enable them to better cope with resource scarcities.
As such challenges can be addressed by agriculture—the main human economic activity worldwide—it must be kept in mind that family farming accounts for most farming systems and has a great potential global impact. Why should family farmers be a specific focus for scientific research on agriculture and climate change and, more broadly, for science policy related to climate change preparedness? A family farm in Brazil can easily cover an area of 100 ha, while such farms in Europe or USA can be highly mechanized and profitable, or may be the sole livelihood of families living far below the poverty line on less than 1 ha of land in many parts of Africa, Asia and Latin America. At first glance, the only apparent commonality between these different farming systems is that they are managed by a family. Yet, it is very likely that most farming families operate in specific landscapes, have extensive knowledge of the management history, share close emotional and physical ties among family members and the land, and are connected to a community via cultural bonds and norms. Such landscape features (including the history and human linkages), especially their heterogeneity, differ from industrial agriculture landscape features. How would this affect the responsiveness to climate change?

Family farmers’ capacity to adapt to climate change

A research program focused on family farms and climate change may best start off by examining how such aspects of social-ecological systems of family farms support (or hinder) the potential for GHG mitigation and the adaptive capacity. There is empirical evidence that the way family farmers invest in their own initiative or are incentivized to invest in agricultural practices can increase their adaptive capacity, or not. Issues discussed in this session included two aspects:

1. Would farmers’ investment in increasing resilience reduce GHG emissions as well?
2. Do communities in landscapes composed of family farms tend to cope with resource scarcity or extreme events in specific ways, such as through networks or social learning, which might be less likely when agribusiness dominates?

Indicators of social-ecological systems must be developed to address such questions and should include agricultural performance, various forms of capital and ecosystem services, and biophysical heterogeneity within landscapes, as well as social, psychological, and anthropological aspects of family structure and connectivity within communities. A rigorous framework for analysing these metrics is essential, and would provide a basis for modelling scenarios that assume complex climate change response solutions.
Lessons to be learned from agroecological farming

In many countries, the rural poor live in marginal areas, and depend on subsistence agriculture, which relies on the diversity of crops and domesticated animals as well as products collected from the wild. These family farms are thus both the bastions and users of agro-biodiversity in the developing world. The resilience conferred by diverse systems is well-recognized, but climate change and globalization (e.g. urbanization, food behaviour, etc.) will likely push agroecosystems to the point where new germplasm, knowledge, and solutions will be needed.

• Although agroecological approaches are indeed likely to be more successful in the long-term in both mitigating GHG emissions and enhancing the adaptive capacity, how are research and policy support options for practices such as agroforestry, conservation agriculture and organic farming relevant to family farmers?

• Can family farms be especially effective in knowledge sharing regarding agrobiodiversity and agroecology both locally and regionally?

• What situations will further enhance the exchange of traditional knowledge so as to create new arenas for interaction and engagement among diverse types of stakeholders to strengthen the viability of family farms?

From research recommendations to implementation of changes

Major private and public investments will be needed to bring farmers, scientists, policy makers and others together in a sustained process to identify and refine fruitful actions, and implement pathways to support agriculture despite vulnerability to climate change and variability.

• Why should family farmers be targeted as a specific entity in this process?

• Will focusing research on family farms help to better understand how climate change will affect food production stability by specifically emphasising the dynamics of family ties, rural labour force, land tenure, and cultural integrity?

• What types of incentives (e.g. credit, insurance, or private-public partnerships) will enable family farmers to make changes in their systems to cover these investments and better manage the financial consequences of weather risks?

• Is the financing of carbon offsetting mitigation activities a viable way to fund adaptations for food security? What safety nets are most relevant to maintain the livelihoods and cultural viability of family farms in order to avoid poverty and out-migration after critical climate events?

Research on climate change and family farms requires a trans-disciplinary approach, broadening the concept of social-ecological systems to include stronger emphasis on understanding relationships among family members, their communities, and land use. This will hopefully generate new ideas for resilience planning and collective action, and extend the capacity of society to stabilize food production, while maintaining provisioning and regulating services, as well as cultural services.
Research questions

There were vibrant discussions on the research questions proposed in the orientation paper and these are reported below in three parts: consensual, controversial and missing aspects. Some methodologies also clearly need to be set-up and shared among all stakeholders in order to get a common understanding of what should be measured, and how.

Results of the interactive sessions at the International Encounters meeting

The group members generally agreed with the document. Regarding the specific activities that were aligned with the ideas presented above, they expressed interest in the following topics:

- The focus should be placed on smallholders with traditional and indigenous knowledge in multistakeholder/regional platforms in order to assess their sustainability agenda in comparison with that of agribusiness, and to ensure efficient knowledge sharing. Newly designed methods, new data and metrics should contribute to this assessment.
- Agroecological practices and methods need to be up-scaled from plots or farms to landscape and regional levels.
- Innovation needs to be stimulated through technologies and policies for an enabling environment in the following areas:
  - Context-specific situations regarding climate change patterns such as high variability or great shocks.
  - Early warning systems directly related to climate issues such as risks of drought or floods, or indirectly such as invasive pests or weeds.
  - Farmer-friendly information systems based on mobile phones, social networks and internet-based communications.
  - Education, research and extension services, and participatory approaches between stakeholders and among sectors need to be promoted and supported.

Some topics discussed during the conference for which group members were not in agreement:

- GHG mitigation was criticized as a research focus, since it was considered that this issue is already included in research on sustainable intensification.
- Conversely, research on adaptation to climate change was not sufficiently emphasized and explored.
- Gender issues and the role of farmers’ organizations were not explicitly emphasized in the orientation paper, although they are closely related to family farming dimensions and potentially influence mindset changing and networking.
Some additional topics absent from the orientation paper prior to the working group sessions were mentioned by the group members as being important in framing the situation and setting the stage for developing research themes on climate change and family farmers:

- Climate change is a ‘blessing in disguise’ that now attracts more government attention to farmers and food security.
- Since drought is a widespread extreme outcome of climate change, more specific efforts are required to ensure water availability with low-cost energy supply.
- The social construction of local markets that support climate adaptation should be explored in further detail, while investigating various options such as payments for environmental services or organic premiums, and probably not carbon offsets. Too much attention has been placed on global food systems and not enough on its trickle-down effects on farms and livelihoods.

To identify research themes regarding how family farmers could cope with climate change challenges, the group members discussed three aspects of research methods that would enhance the relevance to family farmer decision making:

- Participatory research, with opportunities for farmers to drive the research agenda.
- Capacity building as part of the project, to ensure mindset changing for problem solving.
- Development of a monitoring and evaluation approach based on metrics and indicators to be used by farmers and farmers’ groups to understand changes
Research questions formulated within research topics

Three high-priority research topics, using the set of methodological approaches, were identified and are described in more detail below: i) Diversification, agroecology and landscape heterogeneity for climate change preparedness and resilience; ii) Adaptation and resilience to climate shocks on family farms; iii) Social organization, infrastructure, and collective action for climate resilience on family farms.

**Diversification, agroecology and landscape heterogeneity for climate change preparedness and resilience**

- Design new metrics and data frameworks (for researchers and farmers): heterogeneity in biophysical, economic, culture, solidarity aspects such as resilience for family farmers.
- Identify sustainability indicators for family farming.
- Upscale from knowns to uncertainties (time, space).
- Take advantage of potential interlinkages regarding public and private goods in farmer decision making (e.g. global/local synergies on carbon, etc.).
- Combine community management of agrobiodiversity and agroecology: local dynamics of building knowledge as a common asset (e.g. seeds, crop landraces, and seed banks, breeds, agroforestry trees).

**Adaptation and resilience to climate shocks on family farms**

- Distinguish, for family farmers, between gradual climate change evolution and catastrophic climatic events.
- Study drought and desertification, which are considered to be the most widespread shocks that family farmers have to cope with.
- Improve studies on weather change and prediction based on indigenous and scientific knowledge.
- Test incentives (e.g. credit, insurance, or private-public partnerships) to enable family farmers to make changes in their systems to cover new investments and better manage financial consequences of weather risks.

**Social organization, infrastructure, and collective action for climate resilience on family farms**

- Enable access to resources, e.g. that prepare farmers for climate change (micro-insurance, other safety nets, etc.).
- Promote farmers’ organizations as platforms for climate adaptation (political dynamics at the local level, e.g. rehabilitation after a climate event).
- Encourage solidarity/collective action for the implementation of environment-friendly practices.
- Design organized markets that support climate adaptation (e.g. enhancing crop and livestock diversity), or get closer to achieving this.
Workshop 6

Contribution of family farming to food systems

Renato Maluf (Brazil), Mahamadou Fayinke (Gambia), Fatma Ben Rejeb (Tunisia), Idir Baïs (Algeria), Jean-Louis Rastoin (France), Mathilde Douillet (France)

The topic and goals set for this workshop, as well as the proposed recommendations, are very ambitious but address major and vital issues: food quality concerns all people; a third of the global labour force is directly or indirectly involved in the food system, mainly within family farms; while new technologies and organization methods are required to deal with climate change and natural resource depletion. The global agricultural and rural agenda should now be geared towards addressing the food issue and sustainability. The goal of this workshop was to consider these issues in the light of family farming.

Discussions were structured around a proposed typology of different food systems encountered across the globe, as well as their interactions at local and global levels. However, this typology, which was amended during the discussions, was deemed useful to identify categories of food system stakeholders, their roles and public policy support. The focus was on family and non-family farmers to highlight contributions related to family farming, as well as prospects to promote sustainable food systems. Avenues for research were put forward based on this premise and the need for proactive policies regarding food.

These recommendations are organized in two parts. The first describes the typology reviewed and highlights key points to be considered as family farming contributions to various food systems. The second details potential focuses of research suggested by the participants.
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Setting the scene: family farming in food systems

What we know about food systems

A food system is composed of a set of independent players whose role is to feed a population in a given territory and sometimes beyond via exports. Every food system mobilises many stakeholders: farmers, industrialists, traders, caterers, transporters, civil servants, researchers, trainers, etc. In most countries, the food system is by far the leading economic sector. It includes the fishing and aquaculture sector, which is the source of animal protein in many parts of the world.

Global food systems have many different organizational and operational forms and arrangements depending on the specific agroclimatic, social, economic and technological characteristics of the countries and regions. From a very simplified standpoint (this simplification was discussed in the workshop), it could be considered that three main types of food system have been developed in our world:

- mass agroindustrial systems (MAS)
- food self-sufficiency systems (FSS)
- territory-based food systems (TFS).

MAS are specialized, concentrated, financialised, globalised and organised in long supply chains, while being dominated by very large multinational industrial and commercial firms. Agribusiness is a key constituent of such systems, even though they still include many family farms, especially in Europe and North America. The agroindustrial model generates cheap and potentially safe food and is suited to supplying major cities. This model contributes to job delocalization and destruction, land concentration and land grabbing by large land owners. In most farming approaches, it contributes to overall biodiversity depletion and increases in chronic foodborne diseases. Figures are hard to come by and are criticised—some people think that the publicity surrounding MAS has resulted in overestimation of the magnitude of this model. Available data seem to show that MAS currently supply more than half of the global population and may roughly involve 20 million farms (out of 570 million). For a few decades now, a global food system has been developing mainly around MAS. The suggestion that the recent food crisis should be considered as a crisis of this globalised system is debatable.
FSS are focused on village or nomadic farms. They produce food tailored to natural resources and the local cultural heritage. They preserve biodiversity in non-crisis settings (population, climate, political, etc.). Their feeding practices contribute to fostering social ties. Labour productivity is low in high pressure or crisis situations, when they are generally unable to properly feed people in rural areas and neighbouring towns where they prevail. Heavy poverty and infectious diseases are prevalent. However, the actual extent of their productivity, including the many free services they provide society, is undocumented as it is very hard to measure. FSS involve about 450 million farmers and generally feed over 40% of the global population.

FSS herald a new form of food production and consumption based on sustainable development criteria, the ‘overall quality’ of products (nutritional, sensory and cultural) and close linkages between the various operators: family farms, micro, small- and medium-sized agrifood companies (MSMEs), alternative marketing channels and consumers. FSS are rooted in territories and thus have a marked impact on local development and employment on account of their social and solidarity-based economic organizational arrangements (pooling of resources through a cluster effect, and value sharing). They contribute to ensuring greater regional food security by raising local food self-sufficiency levels. They can be structured around recent forms of regional integration. FSS represent an interface between the two main systems, i.e. MAS and FSS. Depending on the country, they account for 1 to 10% of the national food system and farms.

Several food systems can coexist more or less conflictually in the same country and help maintain a relatively acceptable level of food and nutritional security. Several types of farming system may also be found to varying extents within each food system. Similarly, several types of marketing agent may be involved at various levels. The agroindustrial model tends to favour large farms that are mainstreamed in agribusinesses and global distribution enterprises, whereas traditional and territory-based models provide conditions that are more conducive to maintaining small- and medium-sized family farms.
Food system heterogeneity is an ongoing research issue. The proposed typology provides a simplistic differentiation, which attracted strong criticism from some participants because it overlooks a more realistic continuum of situations. Moreover, the ‘nature’ of family farms within these systems depends on the natural, social, political and economic contexts. The mode of governance and nature of human resources mobilised appear to be more critical in characterizing a family farm than its productivity level or even its size. The prominent role played by women, as a labour force and in the management of agricultural production, handicrafts and food consumption, should be underlined. Another feature regarding farm labour is the high proportion of youth with little or no training and status. Moreover, substitution of labour by uninnovative, capital-intensive production models gives rise to massive rural-urban migration and high unemployment.

The extent of agroindustrial food system globalisation is not easy to assess. However, the rapid increase in the market power of very large multinationals operating in farm-supply, agrifood and product marketing, at both commodity and retail levels, likely results in widespread production and mass consumption in high-income and emerging countries. This situation results in an unequal sharing of the ‘food value’ created between countries and within each country, and between sector stakeholders, including consumers. This limits the scope of local action, especially the autonomy of public policies specifically devoted to territories.

The major role played by financial markets in orienting agrifood networks and markets (through shareholder control of many large businesses via private or listed investment funds) and intangible investments (R&D and advertising) should be mentioned. The poor nutritional quality of some products and advertising pressure on consumers can prompt significant changes in eating habits and set the stage for pathologies such as obesity, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, etc.
**The family farming prism: roles of farms**

Agriculture is still and will long remain the pillar of food production. Agricultural performance is thus pivotal to food product quality (and thus consumer health and wellbeing), to natural resource and environmental management, to the conservation or erosion of cultural foundations regarding food and eating habits, to production costs, jobs and ripple effects on food chains.

The type of farm governance has a substantial impact on the social, environmental and economic performance of agriculture. Short-term return on investment is thus a key indicator in the agribusiness model, whereas heritage, social and cultural considerations are taken into account alongside the economic criterion in the family farming model.

Many factors thus justify the goal of supporting family farming. Public policies—especially agricultural and food policies—should be geared towards developing TFS since a territory-based food system is best placed to facilitate the development of this type of agriculture, while benefitting consumers, the environment and territorial stakeholders.

Some challenges associated with this goal should be pointed out. First, farming models coexist. Family and small-scale farming (a very heterogeneous category) and agribusiness do not operate in separate worlds, but they differ in their principles and goals (economic, social, cultural and environmental). As they coexist, there are complementarities, competition, conflicts and contradictions involved.

Food supply then raises sovereignty issues that go beyond the mere availability of goods. It also contributes to fostering linkages between access to adequate healthy food and diversified and sustainable production models (as can be promoted by agroecology on family farms). Here we are touching on issues related to the spatial distribution and diversity of agricultural production, food quality and price setting. Public regulation is also required to promote TSF by controlling the private sector rationale which tends to dominate food production, marketing and distribution.

**These considerations lead us to the public policy issue**

Food and nutritional security has become a major reference for the promotion of family farming as a source of adequate healthy food. There is a clear need for a food policy, beyond the debate on promoting urban migration for urban jobs vs. maintaining a dense rural fabric.

Several studies conducted in different settings have shown that this security may be the result of a social construction process and specific support programmes for family farming and rural families. Hence, the role of public procurement to build markets for family farmers and the development of specific management support programs should be mentioned. Conversely, conventional farming programs may foster a type of productive specialization that could undermine the long-term survival of family farming.
Modernizing family farming through productive specialization involves pitfalls in the sense that the individual empowerment that often accompanies it may jeopardize social group reproduction. The effects of production on self-consumption, conservation of diversified family units and replication of the rural family model should be reconsidered. In order to move in this direction, integrated sector and productive specialisation strategies should be revised in favour of increased added value and market construction, e.g. using short marketing chains and institutional markets (public procurement, etc.).

Finally, social policies are widely used to fight rural poverty, which raises the issue of aligning them to promote poor rural farming families. Territorial policies can play a role in this alignment process between social and agricultural policies. Indeed, family farming support involves a certain level of social density in rural areas, which could be more of a social project than the result of simple economic reasoning.

Coordination between sectoral public policies is essential. To achieve universal food and nutritional security, food policies should be drawn up that include a farming component (moving agriculture towards good quality products), an agrifood component (including family structures), a spatial component (sustainable development of rural areas) and a social component (easing access to healthy food for the poor and least educated consumers). The focus on poverty reduction through income transfer policies, particularly in favour of poor rural families, interacts with policies that improve their producer status. It is thus essential to rise above the usual divisions between ministries. Lastly, national policies should be coordinated at regional and international levels (WTO, bilateral and multilateral agreements on non-trade related issues such as health and the environment).

Research questions

The workshop participants clearly expressed the need for policy-oriented and ‘advocacy’ research in support of family farming. Significant changes are necessary in both consumer behaviours and food production methods to promote sustainable food systems and the inclusion of family farming in such systems, especially through TFS development. Such changes are dependent on innovations and thus on investments in knowledge (R&D) and its dissemination (training).

The group discussions focused mainly on three major research areas, underscoring the fact that research activities should follow two general principles:

1. Adopting a participatory approach involving all stakeholders: farmers’ organizations, business associations and unions of agrifood workers, consumers, associations, education, research and public institutions.

2. Using a systems approach: a multiscale, cross-sectoral and multistakeholder approach must be prioritised in research by formalising the research issue based on systems theory and its toolbox.

3. Focusing the impacts of studies and surveys: research should be assessed according to the way research findings are used to improve food systems and the situations of the various stakeholders implementing them (including consumers).
On food consumption and dietary patterns

Food system-based approaches underscore the need to focus research beyond the production sector. Consumption receives limited attention from family farming research and the group appealed for greater focus on this aspect.

- The issue of lack of useful information was frequently raised during group discussions, with particular emphasis on consumption. It is important to gain greater insight into eating habits (in all their diversity), their determinants and dynamics, by setting up regional and national observatories. Research must provide methods to ensure the relevance of the information to be gathered, and hypotheses for analysing it. Attention should be paid to self-consumption, which is a major component of rural families’ food security.

- Research must help in developing arguments and designing instruments to guide consumers towards local products from family farming and related sectors. It must develop objective criteria to assess the nutritional and sensory quality of food products, as well as their environmental conservation attributes, so as to promote better local and family food supplies. Research must also assess factors likely to impact consumers’ endorsement (or refusal) of different food systems through sociological studies.

On production and marketing

Several cross-disciplinary research areas should be considered and encouraged regarding production, which is directly related to family farming in essence, but also as compared to the other forms of production. However, participants clearly underscored the fact that systemic issues and the relevance of interdisciplinarity should not be overlooked.

- At the technical level, research must aim at designing agricultural production systems that meet sustainable development criteria and are able to generate sufficient income for family farms (economic, energy and environmental performance). This research must include upstream and downstream production determinants, and thus clearly address food systems as a whole.

- Research must consequently focus on the selection of products based on their nutritional and sensorial qualities, as well as their multisectoral development potential (food and non-food).

- Research must therefore focus more on developing technologies for processing agricultural raw materials that are suitable for small agrifood businesses integrated in or close to farms, without overlooking the importance of conservation.

- Research must contribute to enhancing information on marketing network operation, including price setting across food systems (notably FSS and TFS). The aim is to better assess their performance.

- Research must focus more on designing instruments for highlighting and providing legal protection for product quality (standards and labels, including geographical indications). This of course requires an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of existing standards and labels, while taking their diverse and multiple goals into account.
• As in the case of consumers, research must provide relevant information to understand why producers choose one food system over another. Research must outline the factors for or against such choices by focusing on family farming and its specific features. This approach is part of the broader goal of providing better information on the operation of family farming and its contribution to sustainable development.

**On public policies**

As is the case with all working groups, the goal of promoting targeted research, with significant and measurable impacts, led participants to pay special attention to policies and to the role that research could and should play in supporting policy making. Discussions in this working group covered all policy levels, from production unit to international governance, with an emphasis on understanding changes in scale and on linking the different levels.

• Research must provide analyses for the assessment and design of support tools specifically targeting family farms, as well as micro, small- and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in the agrifood sector: legal status, differentiated taxation system, funding, structuring of professional farmers’ organizations and inter-branch associations, etc.

• Research must also operate at the national level to assess and develop food policies including a specific component focused on family farming and related sectors. Special attention must be paid to linkages and relationships between family farms and agrifood MSMEs.

• Research must study, but also suggest decentralized forms of governance, which improve access to quality food for all. More specifically, research must contribute to the development of methods and approaches for building multistakeholder organizations at the local level. The goal is to guarantee a balanced participation of all stakeholders of food and agrifood systems in the development of agendas for addressing issues at different levels.

• Similarly, it is important to develop instruments to facilitate international policy coordination in a specific multilateral forum (CFS). Research—by assessing existing mechanisms and making alternative proposals—has a prominent role to play in this regard.
Banana collection market, Sri Lanka.
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The recommendations from this workshop are organized in three sections: Setting the scene, The three most debated family farming research issues and, The role of research in the evolution of family farming as part of the food system: what priorities, methods and governance?
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Setting the scene

• Family farming plays an essential role in global food production, and via its direct contributions to environment, society and culture. Family farming is not the only stakeholder in the food system, others include different producers (e.g. large-scale producers or corporate agriculture), as well as upstream and downstream stakeholders. What is the current status of family farming in relation to these other food system stakeholders? Family farming encompasses a wide range of situations and has diverse potential futures. These are frequently described from a dualistic perspective whereby market-oriented activities are contrasted with subsistence or multifunctional activities. This dualistic vision should be questioned. Indeed, family farmers produce for a variety of consumers and markets, ranging from themselves to local village and town markets, from globalised food chains to public procurement programs. Family farming is also affected (e.g. through labour flows) by transformations in non-food sectors of the economy (e.g. industrial development). With regards to the general consideration of ‘family farming as a contributor to the future of agriculture’, participants stated that, as family farming is a way of life and a culture, farmers’ knowledge must be valued and given priority. It should be kept in mind that the scope of this paper is thus necessarily narrower as it focuses solely on agriculture.

• The interplay between family farming and other food system stakeholders takes diverse forms. The extent, nature and impact of the interaction depends on various drivers, some of which are relatively indirect (e.g. demography, industrial development, urban development) while some others are more direct (e.g. public policies related to agriculture).

• Globally, it is a challenge to characterize the nature of this interplay as it depends on a confluence of spatiotemporally specific factors. These include, for example, stakeholders involved in the relationship, the scale of their activities, how they are organized, their relative access to economic and political power, as well as what regions, crops, markets, technologies and infrastructures are concerned.
• Regarding the evolution of family farming within the food system, it should be recognized that the pathways of development are the result of policy choices and not an inevitable or predetermined outcome of natural forces. The situations and trajectories observed are the result of past choices made in settings involving a wide range of macro- and micro-economic factors, including demographic patterns, economic transitions and public policy choices. This means that the change patterns are shaped by normative judgments on the contributions of family farming in achieving society’s goals. Future trajectories cannot be expected to be mere extrapolations of past trends. The participants therefore highlighted the need for holistic, interdisciplinary, applied/practical and qualitative (not just quantitative) methods.

The three most debated family farming issues

• First, the relationship of family farming with certain parts of the private sector (large-scale and corporate agriculture, processing and distribution). 500 million smallholder farms are estimated to produce more than 70% of the food eaten by people worldwide, but other forms of production are gaining ground: transnational corporations are engaged in contract farming in 110 countries, while half of the world’s pork production and two thirds of egg and poultry production are controlled by large corporations. There is now a call for closer ties between family farms and larger-scale private sector operators in order to cope with phenomena such as land grabbing, farmers’ difficulties in getting fair prices for their produce, asymmetrical functioning of cooperatives and farmers’ organizations as business units, or unequal access to technical support/quality inputs. The objectives should thus be to maximize production, improve productivity and apply the best processing and marketing methods. In fact most farmers are already linked to markets, but the issue is that these markets are not working for them. So how can the private sector maintain socially responsible relationships with family farms?
The relationship between family farming and the private sector raised several heated discussions in the workshop. Some participants considered that family farmers belong to the private sector while others maintained that it would be a mistake to classify them within the private sector because their goals and activities go far beyond profit making. There was also a controversy among participants about the dualistic nature of the current food production model, with some participants stating that the current model is not dualistic (politically) but rather hegemonic and counter-hegemonic (ideologically). Another controversy was related to links with markets through contract farming. Some participants considered that contract farming could benefit family farmers if their organizations were strengthened and effective regulations applied, whereas others claimed that even under these conditions contract farming would not be beneficial to family farmers. There was considerable discussion among participants as to whether the modernization of family farming should be based on the right to food.

- Second, the relationship of family farming to the public sector and the role and nature of public policies in this relationship. Certain groups assumed that large-scale investments are needed to support family farming and that these could only be secured through the private sector. The public sector’s role in this scenario is to foster private sector involvement. Another issue concerned the shift from strictly sector-oriented policies (and thus exclusively devoted to agricultural growth) to integrated policies, linking agriculture with the supply of public goods, infrastructure and territorial considerations. This shift was also a focus of controversy. Workshop participants nevertheless jointly stressed that public policies are necessary to support family farming, including policies promoting more public investment for family farming and agrarian reform programmes, as well as policies at territorial, national and regional levels, including support for regional markets. It is important to strengthen family farmers’ organizations in their relationships with other rural stakeholders. Alongside public policies, a strong legal framework is needed to support and protect family farming at national, regional and global levels. For example, family farming should be recognized as a profession with the right to social protection and to organize trade unions. Participants also indicated that the big players in global agrifood and finance systems have a major role in determining the conditions of changes in family farming patterns directly and through their influence on public policies.

- Third, the representation of family farming in global and national agriculture and food governance. Through the reform of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in particular (but other examples can be found), farmers’ voices are now heeded to a greater extent in global and national arenas. The workshop participants stressed the need for global research coordination to ensure that governance recommendations are implemented, financed and accountable. CFS should not be the only way for farmers’ voices to be heard on this issue. On the other hand, the capacity and the ability of farmers’ organizations to maintain a close link with their base, while also having a constructive impact on public policies and a beneficial interplay with corporate agriculture are still in question. This point highlights the political dimension of family farming as reflected in the dedicated policies.
• Participants were much more concerned about the research governance issue. They highlighted the following potential actions: i) democratizing agricultural research governance: farmers, CSOs, researchers and the public sector jointly participate in decision making; ii) including participatory involvement in making decisions related to setting the research agenda: definition, methods and financing; iii) defining a legal framework for the participation of farmers’ organizations in decision making and allocating resources and means for this; iv) considering farmers’ organizations and the State as priority stakeholders and beneficiaries of public research–other stakeholders could supplement their roles; v) encouraging the public sector to play the key role in funding research related to family farming; and vi) having more diversified and decentralized funding for research on family farming, instead of expensive and less focused externally-funded research.

The role of research in the evolution of family farming as part of the food system: What priorities, methods and governance?

The evolution of family farming and interactions with other food system stakeholders is not the result of inevitable ‘natural’ processes, but instead is dependent on general political decisions based on normative views of development. Policy makers and society overall require access to appropriate data to enable them to develop informed visions of the future of family farming. However, data only exists for part of the global food system. Considerable information is available on commercial commodities, export markets and large-scale traders, but less on market forms and exchange and trade structures, which are the most important factors for family farmers. This production, processing and trade could be called ‘informal’ or ‘invisible’. The economic force and value of such systems is overlooked and their specific and autonomous mode of functioning is essentially unknown.

Participants highlighted that research should not only involve formal academic study methods—the knowledge and know-how of family farmers should be recognized and supported and play a part in addressing priority research questions. There was also a clear demand for further research on the impact of different market models (e.g. public-private partnerships, contract farming, fair trade, short chains, etc.) on family farming. Participatory and collaborative methods that give a voice to the most marginalized contributors (such as women and youth) must be used throughout the research and development cycle, including knowledge exchange systems involving family farmers. This implies mainstreaming the topic of family farming in national and international research programmes (definitions, evolution of family structures, etc.) as well as changes in research methods to place farmers and researchers on equal footing in knowledge research.

Research should also be focused on the trends and drivers that shape the future of family farming. It would be particularly interesting to focus on the nature of the interplay between economic factors (which favour market-oriented policies) and alternative visions. The aim is to simultaneously address the social and territorial dimensions of development. This should include documented longitudinal research on the nature and actual impacts of family farmers’ organizations on national and global food and agriculture governance. This should also include appraisals and specific studies on the integration of agricultural policies in a broader development policy framework (health, education, infrastructure, mobility, etc.).
Participants agreed that the future was open and nothing was predetermined. There was a demand for research on the impact of public policies and local, national, regional and global laws on family farming, as well as on the kinds of policies that are needed to support family farming in the future. How can laws and policies better protect and promote family farming (at all levels) as a key part of the food system while also including other stakeholders? It was felt that the role of family farming should be more visible and that research could play a role in determining how to do this. It is essential to better characterize and define the diversity of family farms as well as their interaction with other stakeholders. Systems analysis that accounts for the role of all stakeholders in food and agriculture, as well as the power relations between them, would be useful in this respect.

Concerning family farming links to the private sector, various models presently exist and are sometimes promoted: out-grower systems around plantations owned by multinationals, working along value chains with the involvement of all stakeholders (smallholder farmers, private sector, public sector, etc.) for their mutual benefit, local markets, community-supported agriculture, fair trade initiatives, etc. An effort is certainly needed to document these models, understand their dynamics, analyse their impacts, and explore new ones. Participants insisted on the need for comparative studies to gain insight into the impacts of different market and business models and activities on family farming.

Concerning links between family farming and the public sector, there is currently a global tendency for governments to develop public-private partnerships with corporate agriculture, including in research, in order to promote agricultural development (growth corridors, etc.). What does research have to say about the role of family farms and the potential advantages and risks in these public-private partnerships? In this regard, the workshop participants stated that a systems analysis is needed to study the role of all stakeholders and power relations between them. They also indicated that, while family farmers have access to markets, the markets do not serve their needs. They thus called for public-private partnerships to be mainly focused on making markets more oriented towards meeting family farming needs. They also strongly advocated a public sector that cares more about family farmers, recognizes their diversity and the importance of their local specificities and roles in regional markets, preserves their know-how, and generates resources to enable family farmers to play a political role at different levels.
Exchanges between women villagers in southern Benin—traditional know-how, recent knowledge and changes in habits and practices in rural and urban families.
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Brief report on the Closing Session

José A. Osaba, World Rural Forum (Chair)
During the Closing Session in the afternoon of 3 June, the Chairs of the seven workshops presented a summary of points of agreement reached among participants, which included a number of proposals which are summarised below.

**Group 1—Family farming in a spatial or territorial context**

The existence of appropriate, well-adapted, productive and technical models of various dimensions was highlighted, as well as ways to describe and implement them. Comprehensive information systems related to land tenure, investments in agriculture, market access and food security are needed. These information systems should lead to territorialised policy proposals, while taking stakeholder diversity in the territories into account.

Further research is required to address these topics.

**Group 2—Family farming facing the challenges of agroecological intensification**

Agroecology as a field of research was discussed.

Who makes decisions about putting new (or rediscovered) ways of intensification into practice? Who is in charge of research programming? More transparency is needed in this area.

Concretely, there are some notable initiatives but more information, publicity and development are needed.

Local research initiatives are needed to take the diversity and complexity of national and local situations into account. Results should also be analysed from biological and organic standpoints, not only from an economic perspective.

Greater knowledge regarding the impacts of support and public policies on new intensification strategies is needed. Politicians should be better informed on the potential consequences of specific choices.

The social benefits of the multifunctionality, diversity and resilience of family farming should be assessed in addition to the economic benefits. This will require alternative methods that incorporate and take advantage of the sustainability of promoted agronomic models.
Group 3—In-house issues within family farming

A better analysis of power relations within families is needed. Women farmers generally face legal, social and cultural inequality. Social and cultural discrimination is often pervasive, even when gender-equality standards have been instituted. Further research and greater educational effort within society are thus needed to cope with this issue.

This is also the case for young farmers whose role on family farms is usually dictated by unequal power relations.

The situation concerning individual and collective land tenure and the nature and impacts of migration patterns must also be further assessed.

Joint research should be promoted, particularly in relation to women and young farmers, while taking the strengths and weaknesses of farming family organization into account.

Group 4—Family farming facing the challenges of urbanization and unemployment

The ‘productivism’ trend in food production was highlighted, while underlining major inequalities in productivity levels between farms in developed and developing countries—ranging from 1 to 150% or more. Competition is therefore unfair, and in most developing countries it is hard for non-agriculture related economic sectors to provide decent work for youths entering the workforce each year.

The multifunctionality of family farming is insufficiently promoted, in addition to its impact on employment—a topic of major importance in rural areas.

A paradigm change seems unlikely.

Participatory approaches were proposed to offer broader possibilities. Consumers must also be taken into account. The participation of women and young farmers in research must be institutionalised in order to focus to a greater extent on their problems, particularly on their wellbeing.

Dietary habits, particularly in urban areas, must be taken into account.

Distribution and marketing circuits must be thoroughly analysed to enhance conditions for farmers to sell their produce.

Public and private supply channels must be studied and assessed, along with labels of origin and specific geographical designations.

Regarding youth access to agriculture, urban-rural and city-countryside links must be strengthened to help urban youths find jobs in agriculture.
Group 5—Family farming facing the challenges of climate change

The group stressed the importance of diversification, agroecology, landscape heterogeneity and biodiversity to enhance resilience and adaptation to climate shocks. The group recommended prioritising collective use of resources and family farming systems.

Social organization, infrastructure and collective action must be promoted to address these challenges. New information must be generated on indicators and carbon credits. Access to natural resources must be improved, and solidarity and farmers’ organizations strengthened. Social dynamism is needed to cope with the range of threats associated with climate change.

A better selection of key information on the climate and climate change, droughts, desertification, fires and other disasters must be collected and published. This encompasses a broad range of well to little known phenomena and issues, such as community management of agrobiodiversity that takes both indigenous and scientific knowledge into account.

Farm insurance must be developed and promoted through participatory processes. This also applies to crop diversification strategies, development, and networking of farmers with structured markets that favour adaptation to climate change (e.g. via crop and livestock production diversity).

Group 6—Contribution of family farming to food systems

Participatory approaches and methods must be prioritised, e.g. through associations and consumer organizations. The bottom line is that all people be recognised as the principle stakeholders determining the direction of their own lives—this is the ‘without you, against you’ principle.

The group stressed the importance of multi-level, pluralistic participatory research, even regarding the formulation of research themes.

The promotion of sustainable food production systems is favourable to family farming, whereas other options may work against it.

Regarding food consumption, research should be geared towards:

- local production
- high quality production
- environment-friendly production

Decentralisation of national food policies could encourage family farming.

The Committee on World Food Security (CFS) should promote such policies.
Group 7—Family farming as one of the players in the future of agriculture

The group focused on two concepts: stakeholders and methods. Three priority questions for research were studied:

• public policies on trade
• international markets and their functioning: contracts, public-private partnerships, impacts on family farming
• the functions of different agricultural stakeholders and their power relations

The group recommended a participatory approach regarding research methods.

Researchers and farmers should be on the same level when planning research agendas and methods. Research should be based on holistic systems of knowledge and qualitative approaches. Family farming is a lifestyle, not merely a method of agricultural production.

In this setting, there is a need for democratic governance, even with respect to research. It is thus essential to go further than previously, while giving greater voice to women and men belonging to farmers’ organizations, and to have sufficient resources to make this possible.

The public sector should be the main source of research funding.

More shared responsibility is needed regarding research findings, while research stakeholders should be more accountable and better coordinated.
Contributing to a global research agenda

Pierre Fabre, Jean-Michel Sourisseau, Rémi Kahane, Bernard Hubert
The existence of appropriate, well-adapted, productive and technical models of various dimensions was highlighted, as well as ways to describe and implement them. Comprehensive information systems related to land tenure, investments in agriculture, market access and food security are needed. These information systems should lead to policy proposals, while taking stakeholder diversity in the territories into account.

The idea is not simply to conduct research for its own sake, but rather to generate innovations and processes that foster family farming. The general objective is also to inform public policy through decision makers and professionals, as well as civil society, on initiatives needed to maintain a viable economic and social status for family farmers, thereby enhancing their food and nutritional security.

The International Encounters meeting provided an opportunity to get representatives of family farmers, policy makers, the private sector, educators and researchers from throughout the world to discuss and work together. This event also represented a milestone in the collective international move towards achieving an open-ended, yet shared, family farming research agenda. This was underpinned by the belief that interaction between representatives of the various relevant stakeholders of agricultural research for development is essential to finding concrete solutions to family farming issues and the many current global challenges.

This document is neither an outcome nor a summary of the discussions per se. It sets out the main lessons that the International Encounters organizing institutions extracted from the discussions based on the reports and recommendations from the various workshops and plenary session presentations*. These lessons are not outlined in detail, but a few salient ideas and some of the crosscutting topics discussed in the seven workshops are highlighted. It is an evolving framework that will be refined and amended through subsequent discussions. The International Encounters Organizing Committee plans to submit this contribution to a global research agenda to all stakeholders involved in the UN International Year of Family Farming, in the 3rd Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD3), and in the preparatory events for the Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21), to be held in 2015 in Paris, where family farming and research should have their say.

* Those are called by the name of the speaker or by the number of the workshop.
Six areas provide an overall framework for research agendas at different levels, ranging from local to international:

- **4 ‘thematic’ areas:**
  - Gaining greater insight into the coexistence of different forms of farming.
  - Changing the visions of assessed and measured ‘performances’.
  - Developing new sustainable farming practices.
  - Supporting family farming by upgrading participatory research practices and governance.

- **2 ‘cross-cutting’ areas:**
  - Meeting data and information needs.
  - Informing policies to ensure appropriate decision making.

1. **Gaining greater insight into the coexistence of different forms of farming**

Research for agricultural development must be structured by facts—and thus take the diverse forms of farming and markets into account—and not by stereotypes that often perpetuate an outdated or inaccurate image. M. Guillou.

Diversity should be considered in terms of:

- forms of agricultural activity (family farming, tenant and contractual farming, agribusiness, etc.) and conditions (land, implements, labour organization, etc.) beyond the simplistic opposition of small and large holdings.

- types of collective organization which bring together different stakeholders on common territories and throughout production and value chains (cooperatives, indigenous communities, corporations, etc.).

- dynamics (economic, environmental, demographic, territorial and regional) to which family farming is part and parcel.

Appreciation of this diversity will result in a better understanding of power relations and competition dynamics, as well as collective spirit and interaction between these different aspects in the same territory — understood here as being a socially and historically consistent geographic area. Land and water issues, but also migration, play a role therein and deserve greater attention on account of their dynamics and impact.

This diversity should also make it possible to link up work at various spatial scales (on biological mechanisms, farms and holdings, landscapes, territories, nations, etc.) to produce multidisciplinary syntheses of observation and analysis and carry out ambitious trans-disciplinary studies. Such studies should also shed light on how farms generally fit into food systems.
Changing the visions of assessed and measured ‘performances’

What do we expect from family farming? Owing to the challenges humankind is and will be facing, the response is no longer only income and direct food security, nor increased yields of primary commodities marketed at prices that urban consumers can afford.

The expected overall vision with respect to current yields is closely linked to the need to identify and gain insight into the impacts of agricultural practices and activities in all areas workshops 2, 5, 7. Family farming activities must be viable, sustainable and replicable. These requisites are deeply rooted as family farming is first and foremost a way of life that provides employment and livelihood, and not just a strictly economic activity workshops 3, 7; J. Osaba. This vision underscores the need for economic, social and environmental sustainability at all levels from families and their members workshop 3 right up to territories and food systems workshops 1, 6. Special emphasis must thus be on the resilience of the relevant social entities and systems workshops 2, 5, which is a key to farmers surviving and adapting in vulnerable situations.

Researchers require benchmarks to be able to reassess relevant performance criteria to:

- Increase available quantities of agricultural products and services and improvements in production and diversification are essential. This does not necessarily mean producing more, but also reducing losses during production and processing, reducing wasteful consumption and doing more to preserve natural resources workshops 1, 2, 5, 6; H. Herren, G. Conway.

- Understand interactions between the various functions of agricultural activities and the relationship among activities within the territories which they affect. It is necessary to identify suitable multifunctional and territorial criteria workshops 1, 3, 4, 6 and thereby develop new metrics for external factors, especially in the context of biodiversity and climate change workshops 2, 5.

- Appreciate changes in food systems and demand which drive production and supply systems. It is important to gain insight into the related mechanisms as well as their impacts with respect to nutrition and nutritious diets, an aspect which is often overlooked workshop 6.

- Assess the harshness and drudgery of activities (with special emphasis on female labour) workshops 2, 3.

- Family relations, especially the status of women and youth, in terms of labour and decision making and the consequences on individuals and households (empowerment, nutritional status, etc.). Monitoring gender and intergenerational relations is also key to understanding reproduction and transmission phenomena workshops 1, 3.

- Describe on- and off-farm employment, income generation and appropriation. Involvement in off-farm activities in many situations amounts to job diversification, which directly supplements farming activities and constitutes a key source of employment to meet the challenges associated with population growth and urban/rural balance workshop 4.
Developing new sustainable farming practices

Innovation is a common area of agricultural research. Technical expertise in this area is substantial, but novel aspects regarding agriculture and levels of performance that are currently expected for employment, climate change, natural resource conservation and other areas have changed the way technical innovation is used. To meet new and complex challenges to family farming, which can be especially vulnerable, existing cropping systems must gradually be improved to overcome the dominant technical models that rely on simplistic solutions and simplifying practices worksh 2, 6, H. Herren, G. Conway, R. Bourgeois.

There is a rising number of technical and organizational innovations aimed at improving sustainability in all production areas. They must be adapted to ecosystems and socioeconomic constraints in order to be effective. Research should not be limited to tailoring technological models that work for large farms to family farms. Exploratory research on different scales and farming models is also essential. Moreover, the constraints that family farms face are not solely related to their size. New agroecological practices are highly reliant on the agricultural, ecological, economic and social settings, so it is crucial to take this complexity into account. An immediate consequence is that such research can only be conducted within a systemic conceptual framework worksh 1, 6, 7, H. Herren, G. Conway, R. Bourgeois and that farmers are key players in such research programs.

In practice, it is advisable to apply scientific knowledge and tap the general knowledge derived from long-standing innovative farming practices. Farmers manage living processes by agroecological methods H. Herren while taking into account actual physical and economic capacities, in terms of both financial resources and allocation of labour worksh 2, 3, to gain access to recommended inputs and techniques.

The contribution of research cannot, however, just be restricted to production techniques. Marketing, processing, storage, transport or consumption techniques are other avenues to be explored worksh 4, 6. One example is integration into innovative value chains like those focused on the specific quality of local products or derived from production diversification, as opposed to commodity standardization worksh 1, 4.

Supporting family farming by upgrading research practices and governance

For research to be able to effectively support family farming, family farmers have to support research in return. New forms of participatory mechanism are therefore needed throughout the research process.

The focus should not only be on developing new technical standards, but also on strengthening mechanisms for developing new and suitable production systems. Great inventiveness derives from research activities jointly conducted by farmers and scientists. A general ‘knowing by doing’ principle is necessary to enhance the relevance of this type of targeted research by mainstreaming the actual experience of family farmers, the private sector and policy makers into scientific research which is usually conducted ‘under controlled conditions’ worksh 2, 3, 4, 7, H. Herren, G. Conway.
The aim is to make effective use of knowledge derived from the experience of practitioners to complement results obtained via standard research procedures. Accordingly, it is necessary to:

- make the governance of agricultural research more inclusive by involving all relevant stakeholders at all levels into planning, decision-making, and evaluation processes. (workshops 2, 3, 6, 7)
- develop innovative collective action and consultation arrangements in learning processes.

This requires governance and arrangements that break with the usual stakeholder asymmetry, which is generally unfavourable to family farming workshops 3, 6, hence raising the issue of available financing for such approaches workshop 7.

In practical terms, the discussions underscored the need for a mechanism for sharing knowledge between the main stakeholders represented in Montpellier workshops 3, 7 with the support of international organizations working in this sector. In the field, it would be essential to build the capacities of both researchers and farmers, and particularly to encourage the emergence of young leaders workshops 1, 7 and practitioners.

Finally, by knowing how to be accountable regarding methods and outcomes to all involved stakeholders, research will be able to initiate and sustain the necessary dialogue with society. This will enhance the innovation process, while contributing to collective effort and guiding policy development.

Meeting data and information needs

In all agricultural research approaches, whether participatory or not, there is a clear need for effective organization of information on forms of production, working processes and performance (biological, technical, socioeconomic, environmental, etc.). Specifically, there is high demand for building comprehensive information systems on agricultural change dynamics within territories workshop 1. This entails:

- sharing definitions and typologies to facilitate exchange (CFS HLPE, FAO Expert Working Group).
- harmonizing and providing access to data workshop 6.
- gathering data and statistics that account for structural dynamics, including at the family level workshop 3.
- having access to strategic information on urban supply systems for different forms of production workshops 4, 6.

These systems must naturally be based on an optimal use of ICTs in open data systems.

FAO is thus offering to build shared platforms on family farming through the International Working Group on Family Farming and the World Agriculture Watch M. Villareal.
Informing policies to ensure appropriate decision making

Informing policy makers on family farming does not mean focusing solely on agricultural sector policies or on policies related to social issues. In fact, many policies impact farming activities and livelihoods in rural territories. It is therefore necessary when informing policy makers to highlight the impacts of all policies on farming, while bearing in mind that it is family farmers—the main individual investors and collective stakeholders—who generally bear the associated risks.

Research and testing on the most suitable marketing approach (contractual, regulated, etc.) should be continued to determine the operational patterns in various situations. However, over and above studies on the inclusion of individual farms in different value chains, research must also focus on supporting collective marketing arrangements. For instance, recognizing the farms contributions to environmental services.

More generally, the various roles fulfilled by agriculture are now broadly acknowledged with respect to production, income generation and economic wellbeing, natural resource conservation, maintenance of biodiversity, the environment and landscapes, or in generating other activities (processing, tourism, etc.). Consequently, research must help develop consistent multifunctional policies to support multifunctional family farming stakeholders. Payments for environmental services (e.g. incentives for biodiversity conservation or carbon sequestration) must be consistent with production, food security and income needs. Multifunctional incentive schemes should thus be developed (linking environmental services, food security, social safety nets, insurance mechanisms, etc...). Research programs must therefore help ensure that the specific situations of different stakeholders, particularly women and youth, with regards to labour, employment access, participation in decision making, and livelihoods and wellbeing, are taken into account. In summary, the aim is to guarantee that policies, often sector-related, are consistent and inclusive, i.e. ensure that they are mutually reinforcing and do not have contradictory effects.

Research must strive to effectively meet needs by contributing to building tailored international coordination and support schemes. In this regard, it can support international stakeholder forums and networks organized in a bottom-up manner (organizations representing family farms, scientific networks, etc.), along with bilateral and multilateral forms of collaboration and institutional mobilisation (CFS, FAO, IFAD, etc.).
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Program of the International Encounters

SUNDAY JUNE 1ST, 2014

- Registration for invited participants
- Meeting for workshop chairs & co-chairs

PUBLIC DEBATE

SUNDAY JUNE 1ST, 2014

- Invited speaker: Hans R. Herren, President, Millennium Institute (World Food Prize, Right Livelihood Award, Switzerland) – What research for what agriculture?
- Round table with:
  - farmer leader: Fatma Ben Rejeb, Secretary general, Union Maghrébine des Agriculteurs, UMAGRI, Tunisia
  - a scientific leader: Patrick Caron, Director General in charge of Research and Strategy, CIRAD, France
  - two NGO leaders: Maryam Rahmanian, Vice-Chair, Steering Committee of the High Level Panel of Experts for Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, Iran & Kees Blokland, Director, Agriterra, the Netherlands
  - two policy leaders: Ibrahim A. Mayaki, CEO, New Partnership for Africa’s Development—NEPAD, Niger & Caio Galvão de França, Chief of Staff, Ministry of Agrarian Development, IYFF coordinator in Brazil

Moderator: Damien Conaré, Secretary general, UNESCO Chair “World Food Systems”, Montpellier
- Discussion with the audience
  - Language: French and English (with simultaneous translation)
  - Audience: scientific community of Agropolis, participants in the conference on June 2nd and 3rd, interested public

CONFERENCE

MONDAY JUNE 2ND, 2014

- Registration for invited participants

PUBLIC SESSION

- Opening Session - Chair: Marcela Villarreal, FAO Coordinator of IYFF 2014
- Introduction: Sir Gordon Conway, Professor, Imperial College London—Sustainable Family Farming: Is it Viable? Is it Resilient?
- Welcome address:
  - Scientific community: Bernard Hubert, Chair, Agropolis International
  - Regional Council: Christian Bourquin, President, Région Languedoc-Roussillon
  - CGIAR: Carlos Pérez del Castillo, Consortium Board Chair
  - France: Stéphane Le Foll, Minister of Agriculture, Agri-food and Forest
International opening:

- France: Anne-Marie Descôtes, Director General for Globalization, Development and Partnerships, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development
- World Rural Forum: Esther Penunia, Secretary general, Asian Farmer Association for Sustainable Rural Development
- World Farmers’ Organisation: Daniel Gad, Managing Director, Omega Farms
- La Via Campesina: Yudhvir Singh, leader Bhartiya Kisan Union
- FAO: José Graziano da Silva, Director General, represented by Marcela Villarreal
- European Commission: Monique Pariat, Deputy director-general in the Agriculture and Rural Development Directorate-General
- IFAD: Kanayo F. Nwanze, President
- Papa A. Seck, Minister of Agriculture and Rural Equipment, Senegal

FOR INVITED PARTICIPANTS ONLY

Workshops—1st part

- Departure to Agropolis campus for the inauguration ceremony of the new CGIAR Consortium headquarters
- Cocktail buffet at Agropolis campus

TUESDAY JUNE 3RD, 2014

FOR INVITED PARTICIPANTS ONLY

Session on farming futures: Contribution of research to family farming (Pasteur Auditorium):
- Perspectives offered by the study “Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security”, (June 2013) of the High Level Panel of Experts for Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, Marion Guillou, Chair of Agreenium, CGIAR Consortium Board member, member of the HLPE Steering Committee
- What could agricultural research do for family farmers? Indications from an exploration of plausible futures, Robin Bourgeois, Senior expert on Foresight and Development policies, GFAR

Reporting on the previous day’s workshop sessions

Workshops—2nd part

PUBLIC SESSION

Closing Conference - Chair: José Osaba, WRF, Civil Society Coordinator of the IYFF 2014

Conference outputs:
- Reporting by each group chair and questions
- Highlights: A global Agenda for Research: Pierre Fabre, scientific Director, CIRAD, on behalf of Agropolis International
- View from farmers’ perspectives: Ibrahim Coulibaly, FAO Ambassador for IYFF 2014

Next steps on the global agenda:
- Contribution towards the GCARD3 in 2015: Mark Holderness, GFAR Executive Secretary
- Contribution towards the CoP-Climate 2015: Laurence Tubiana, AFD Chair, IDDRI General Director, Co-Chair of the Executive Committee of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) of the UN

Closing session - Contribution to the IYFF 2014:
- Henri Rouillé d’Orfeuil, French coordinator of IYFF 2014
- Lupino Lazaro, deputy representative of the Philippines at the Embassy in Rome
Workshops

1. **Family farming in the territories:** What are the present developments on land tenure, and what are the options on land tenure management? Which trade-offs, which complementarities and synergies/tensions and conflicts do exist between the various production systems? What are the linkages and articulations with the other uses of space, economic or residential or landscaping ones? What contribution offers family farming to organize space scaling-up from the farm to watershed, landscape or industrial agro-food basin?

2. **Family farming facing the challenges of agro-ecological intensification:** in a context of an increasing scarcity of natural resources and facing the energetic challenge, which technologies for producing, protecting, processing agricultural food are offered to family farming? Which systems for training and accompanying family farmers? What types of credit to stimulate the agro-ecological transition of family farmers? What kind of productions specialized or associated considering crops, livestock, aquaculture to be developed in order to involve family farming as contributors to global food security?

3. **In-house issues within family farming:** which organization forms for agricultural activities? Family solidarity and public solidarity, family farming functions as a safety net: how to highlight this function? Which role for women, what is the future of the youth in the organization of family farms? What are the cross-generation transmissions? Which new family forms emerge from increasing mobility of people?

4. **Family farming facing the challenges of urbanization and employment:** what new markets do the cities represent for agriculture tomorrow? Which relationship between family farming and these new markets? What will be the jobs in agriculture and which part of pluri-activity? Which role for family farming in the rural-urban continuum? Which models of economic development between increasing agriculture wealth and alternatives to agriculture?

5. **Family farming facing the challenges of climate change:** what space and which roles for a smart agriculture facing the climate issues? How to integrate the landscape scale in the various individual strategies? How resilience approaches can mobilize positive transformational change in places where these global issues ‘land on the ground’ and at a pace that can keep up with a rapidly changing world?

6. **Contribution of family farming to the food systems:** towards what sustainable and accountable food systems? What answers to the stakes in food and nutritional security at the local and global levels? How to ensure food and nutritional safety of the urban populations? Which articulation between agricultural and social policies?

7. **Family farming as one of the players in the future of agriculture:** what objects and methods to report on family farming? What can be the conditions of a co-existence between various forms of farming (smallholders, commercial farms, enterprises, big companies ...) on the same territories or within the same value chains? Is the ‘farming system’ approach more accurate to take into account interactions and interdependences both within farming units and in their connections with their economic, social and natural environment?
Mechanical weeding in a cotton field.
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Introduction

Following the International Encounters: Family Farming & Research meeting, an online survey was sent to all participants to collect sufficient data to determine how the event was perceived and to be able to improve the worst rated aspects for future events.

A total of 255 participants attended this meeting, which was held in Montpellier from 1-3 June 2014, 83 of whom were English-speaking (33%), 46 Spanish-speaking (18%) and 126 French-speaking (49%). The total number of responses received was 86 (34% of all participants: 29 English, 13 Spanish and 44 French).

The percentages of participants and of responses for each language are very similar:

The survey questionnaire was emailed to all participants, each in their preferred language, on 10 June, with a reminder sent to them on the 18th. The closing day was 30 June.

The questionnaire—which was completely anonymous—consisted of five blocks of questions on the working groups, plenary sessions, logistics, along with a comprehensive assessment and a question regarding whether the event could have some continuity in the participants’ home countries.
Each of these blocks included a part with two-three questions with four possible responses ranging from very positive to very negative, along with a space provided for general comments and recommendations, open for narrative reviews.

All comments received in the original language, as well as counts of all responses, are provided at the end of this document.

Below is a brief analysis of the questionnaire findings.

**Block 1—Working groups**

*Reference document relevance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very negative</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very negative</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants’ contributions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very negative</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were significant positive responses to questions in this block. The reference documents were positively assessed: 83% (30% very positive). The methodology had 77% positive responses (19% very positive) and the participant contributions were also positively assessed (80%, with 27% very positive).
General observations and recommendations

Total N°: 56 (17 English /12 Spanish /27 French)

The lack of time for debate was notably the most widespread observation (due to many factors: coexistence of three languages, extent/complexity of the issues raised, different languages of the different participants, program time schedule deficiencies, especially the first day, etc.).

Some observations on the methodology also hinted at this lack of time. The relevance of the direct involvement of the different participants was sometimes questioned due to language differences.

The responses also indicated that the working group summaries did not reflect the richness of the discussions and moreover there was not sufficient time for these discussions in the working group in plenary sessions.

The insufficient presence of young farmers and women farmers was highlighted.

Some people claimed that the results of these groups should be more widely disseminated.

Some new proposals were put forward, such as: creating an organizing committee, dividing future events into separate sectors, and preparing them via email exchanges.

However, some participants indicated that they considered the experience perfect.

Block 2—Plenary sessions

Speakers interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 100 13 100 44 100 86 100
### WS summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very negative</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall responses in this block were as follows: 83% positive responses on the interest of papers (30% very positive); 74% positive responses on the abstracts (23% very positive). Regarding the duration of interventions, 65% positive responses regarding the intervention length (13% very positive).

### Intervention length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very positive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very negative</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General observations and recommendations

**Total N°**: 44 (14 English/6 Spanish/24 French)

At the plenary sessions, again the lack of time for discussion was stressed, and the amount of time devoted to the working group summaries at the expense of the public interest was also questioned.

There were even comments on the lack of the coordinators’ objectivity while claiming that a consensus was sought that did not reflect real situation.

Again there was a request for the participants to have access to the results.

Some participants said that there should be more time for discussions, case studies and more Spanish-speaking participants, etc.
Block 3—Logistics

Le Corum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall logistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most positive replies from participants concerned the logistics, i.e. 99% (71% very positive) and 93% (60% very positive) for Le Corum and the overall logistics, respectively.

General observations and recommendations

Total N°: 24 (9 English /5 Spanish/10 French)

The logistics were generally very positively rated. Le Corum was considered to be a very suitable venue, although one participant noted that there was not enough space at the tables for meals.

Other aspects that participants considered could be improved were the translation facilities and the possibility of getting a drink at all times.

Several people questioned the connection between the International Encounters meeting and the CGIAR launching.

Some quite creative proposals regarding future events included facilitating access to tramway tickets during registration or taking more advantage of Le Corum green areas.
Block 4—Global assessment

**Inter-stakeholder exchanges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN %</th>
<th>SP %</th>
<th>FR %</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rating of the meeting was 90% positive results (33% very positive), although exchanges among the various stakeholders present obtained “only” 70% (34% very positive) positive responses.

**General observations and recommendations**

Total N°: 43 (19 English/10 Spanish/14 French)

The very high cost of the presence of some stakeholders, especially farmers, to obtain very low performance, was questioned.

For the final conclusions, the group results should be taken into account because the presented summaries were too general. It was also recommended not to focus on political correctness and to highlight the challenges and controversies.

There was too much formality and too little debate. Producers’ views considered to be especially lacking. Concrete grassroots experiences or even a field visit were also missed.

Although many participants congratulated the organizers, the need to continue monitoring was highlighted.
Block 5—Now what?

**General observations and recommendations**

Total N°: 52 (19 English/11 Spanish/22 French)

Many of the responses in this section concerned sharing and disseminating what was discussed in Montpellier in different areas (within participants’ own organizations, with their colleagues on IYFF national committees, in other international events, farmers’ organizations, press, etc).

Some mentioned that they intended to incorporate the topics covered in the curriculum in their schools.

Other participants mentioned organizing their own events in order to remain engaged in the issue at local, national or regional levels.

The possibility of seeking support to create permanent mechanisms for dialogue between different stakeholders was also raised.

Some participants seemed to have discovered the extent and importance of family farming and mentioned that they would boost awareness on this when they returned to their countries.

There were some very concrete actions on dealing with oasis issues, extracting points to be covered in GCARD3, etc.

The need for access to the meeting conclusions was noted in several cases.
## List of participants

### By country, Name • Institution • Category of stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Category of stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGERIA</td>
<td>BRIK Mohammed (Mr)</td>
<td>Association Agriculteurs/Eleveurs • ElArgoub</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARGENTINA</td>
<td>ALEM Alicia Beatriz (Mrs)</td>
<td>Coop. Agrop. APF Cojuelas</td>
<td>MAELA • Former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CATALANO Jose Alberto (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITTADELLI Roberto (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELVERDIN Julio Horacio (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEREZ CENTENO Marcelo (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA - IPAF Región Patagonia</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td>DESTRAIT Freddy (Mr)</td>
<td>SOS FAIM</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARMENTIER Stéphane (Mr)</td>
<td>Oxfam-Solidarity</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEBB Morag (Mrs)</td>
<td>COLEACP</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUEZODJE Lionel (Mr)</td>
<td>FUPRO Benin</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZIL</td>
<td>ARCURI Pedro (Mr)</td>
<td>EMBRAPA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAUDEL WANDERLEY Maria de Nazareth (Mrs)</td>
<td>Université fédérale de Pernambuco</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARVALHO Claudio (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRANÇA Caio (Mr)</td>
<td>INTA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOMEM Valéria (Mrs)</td>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JORGE Romano (Mr)</td>
<td>AS-PTA</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALUF Renato (Mr)</td>
<td>UFRJ</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIELITZ-Neto Carlos (Mr)</td>
<td>UFRGS</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETERSEN Paulo Frederico (Mr)</td>
<td>AS-PTA</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SABOURIN Eric (Mr)</td>
<td>CIRAD</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMPAIO da Silva Delaine (Mrs)</td>
<td>Universidade Federal do Oeste do Pará</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUMPF Waldyr (Mr)</td>
<td>EMBRAPA</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
<td>DAO Bassioka (Mr)</td>
<td>CONFÉDÉRATION PAISANNE DU Faso</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIOMA Soumahéré (Mr)</td>
<td>UGCPA/SM</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJAMAN Nana Patrice (Mr)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GANAME Amdou (Mr)</td>
<td>Fédération Nationale des Groupements Noom</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONE Hervé Yormalam (Mr)</td>
<td>Ocades Caritas Kayo</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRAVATO Laurent (Mr)</td>
<td>IDE</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURUNDI</td>
<td>SEZIBERA Annick (Mrs)</td>
<td>CAPAD</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMEROON</td>
<td>AFANDA Epse ATANGANA Elisabeth</td>
<td>PROPAC</td>
<td>Former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIOMA Saumahéré (Mr)</td>
<td>UGCPA/SM</td>
<td>Former</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJAMAN Nana Patrice (Mr)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GANAME Amdou (Mr)</td>
<td>Fédération Nationale des Groupements Noom</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONE Hervé Yormalam (Mr)</td>
<td>Ocades Caritas Kayo</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRAVATO Laurent (Mr)</td>
<td>IDE</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
<td>BONILLA ROMERO Mario (Mr)</td>
<td>AGROSOLIDARIA</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAVES POSADA Juanta (Mrs)</td>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HENRY Guy (Mr)</td>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTA RICA</td>
<td>BEER John (Mr)</td>
<td>CATIE</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEREZ JIMENEZ Gerardina (Mrs)</td>
<td>ANAMAR</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEVILLA Maria (Mr)</td>
<td>ICAC</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VARGAS JARA Dogoberto (Mr)</td>
<td>Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO</td>
<td>KAMEAZA Sylvestre (Mr)</td>
<td>CONAPAC</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIBWANKAY Movewy Gundi (Mr)</td>
<td>UPRN</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>ANDREASEN Lise (Mrs)</td>
<td>ICROFS</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>DAOUD Ibrahim (Mr)</td>
<td>Matrouh Governorate</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IDRIS Fatallah Karim (Mr)</td>
<td>Matrouh Governorate</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAVAR Mohamed (Mr)</td>
<td>Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OMAR Goedalmawia (Mr)</td>
<td>Matrouh Governorate</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SALVADOR</td>
<td>LARA Abel (Mr)</td>
<td>CONFARAS de RL</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECINOS Oscar (Mr)</td>
<td>FCAR</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUATORIAL GUINEA</td>
<td>ESONO ASANGONO Jose Teofilo (Mr)</td>
<td>MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA Y BOSEAS</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONDO BINDANG Cristobal (Mr)</td>
<td>MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA Y BOSEAS</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BERTON Sylvain (Mr)</td>
<td>AGRASUL International</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>LAPPALAINEN Juha (Mr)</td>
<td>MTK</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>ABDELHAKIM Tahani (Mrs)</td>
<td>CIHEAM-IAM</td>
<td>Montpellier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLARD Luc (Mr)</td>
<td>AFDI</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLAYA Yeid (Mr)</td>
<td>CIVAM LR</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAINVILLE Sébastien (Mr)</td>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>SupAgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARCHICHE Damien (Mr)</td>
<td>MAEDI</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BERGERET Pascal (Mr)</td>
<td>CIHEAM-IAM Montpellier</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BERTON Sylvain (Mr)</td>
<td>AGRASUL International</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BESSAOUD Omar (Mr)</td>
<td>CIHEAM-IAM Montpellier</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOSC Pierre-Marie (Mr)</td>
<td>CIAD</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGER Patrice (Mr)</td>
<td>CIAR</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARON Patrick (Mr)</td>
<td>CIAD</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAUVREAU Christophe (Mr)</td>
<td>AVSF</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEISSOUX Clément (Mr)</td>
<td>Fondation de France</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHENEVALE Jean-Baptiste (Mr)</td>
<td>CARI</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHIFFOPOU LEU Yuma (Mrs)</td>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHOTTE Jean-Luc (Mr)</td>
<td>IRD</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONARE Damien (Mr)</td>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>SupAgro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DARDEL Sylvain (Mr)</td>
<td>ICRA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEDIEU Benoît (Mr)</td>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DERMBAE ADelene (Mrs)</td>
<td>CARI</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DESCÔTES Anne-Marie (Mrs)</td>
<td>MAEDI DGM</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIONNARS Catherine (Mrs)</td>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOUILLET Mathilde (Mrs)</td>
<td>Fondation FARM</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FABRE Pierre (Mr)</td>
<td>CIAD</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GASSelin Pierre (Mr)</td>
<td>INRA</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIRARD Pierre (Mr)</td>
<td>Fondation FARM</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>MURAKAMI Shimpei (Mr)</td>
<td>AFA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GJOULO Marion (Mrs)</td>
<td>Agreunion / HLPE • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUYOT Guj (Mr)</td>
<td>MTM 51 • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAMDI Loure (Mrs)</td>
<td>AgriCard • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUBERT Bernard (Mr)</td>
<td>AgroParis International • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUET-HANOUIN Nadine (Mrs)</td>
<td>CARITAS Secours • Catholique • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAHANE Rémi (Mr)</td>
<td>CIARD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KAMAL Mahmoud (Mr)</td>
<td>Consultant • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LE FAOU Sèvren (Mr)</td>
<td>MAAF • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOSCH Bruno (Mr)</td>
<td>CIRAD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIGLIORE Stefano (Mr)</td>
<td>INRA • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORA Olivier (Mr)</td>
<td>Inra • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHELINAS Pascale (Mrs)</td>
<td>IRD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUECH Lilon (Mr)</td>
<td>MAEDI • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RASTOIN Jean-Louis (Mr)</td>
<td>Montpellier SupAgro • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RENAUDIN Marine (Mrs)</td>
<td>MAAF • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROQUER-DE-JARDINES Mélanie (Mrs)</td>
<td>CIHEAM-IAM Montpellier • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIVES Olivier (Mr)</td>
<td>ESCAIA-COEPTIS • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROUJANET Jean-Claude (Mr)</td>
<td>CARITAS Secours • Catholique • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROUILLE D’ORFEUIL Henri (Mr)</td>
<td>Académie d’Agriculture de France • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAVIGNY Geneviève (Mrs)</td>
<td>Via Campesina • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCOPPEL Eric (Mr)</td>
<td>CIRAD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERPANTIE Georges (Mr)</td>
<td>IRD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOURISSEAU Jean-Michel (Mr)</td>
<td>CIRAD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STOIAN Dietmar (Mr)</td>
<td>Bioversity International • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUHRENBERG Liora (Mrs)</td>
<td>Inter-réseaux Développement rural • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TON NU Christine (Mrs)</td>
<td>CIHEAM-IAM Montpellier • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TURQUEBIAU Emmanuel (Mr)</td>
<td>CIARD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRIOMPEH Bernard (Mr)</td>
<td>CIARD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VETTRAINO Jean (Mr)</td>
<td>CIARD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WYBRECHT Bertrand (Mr)</td>
<td>MAAF • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW CALEDONIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOUARD Séverine (Mrs)</td>
<td>IAC-NC • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAMBIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAYINKEH Mohamadou (Mr)</td>
<td>NACOFAG • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUATEMALA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CABALLEROS HERRERA Alvaro Eduardo (Mr)</td>
<td>CONGOOOP • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUINEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BARRY Mamadou Bilo (Mr)</td>
<td>IRAG • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIALLO Moussa Para (Mr)</td>
<td>CNOP-G • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MICHEL Mulaire (Mr)</td>
<td>MPP • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HUNGARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEHER Istvan (Mr)</td>
<td>Szent Istvan University • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOMOGYI Norbert (Mr)</td>
<td>Ministry of rural development • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BISH Sorioli (Mrs)</td>
<td>INHERE • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAVE Sondeep (Mr)</td>
<td>Department of Land Resources, India • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KISHORE Kamal (Mr)</td>
<td>Rainfed livestock network • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOMARAVOLU Prasad (Mr)</td>
<td>AME Foundation • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVASANKAR Sabhana (Mrs)</td>
<td>ICIRSAT • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIBAWA Gede (Mr)</td>
<td>Riset Perkebunan Nusantara • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PULUNGAN Agusdin (Mr)</td>
<td>WAMTI • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAHMANIAN Maruam (Mrs)</td>
<td>CENESTA • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IVORY COAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KONE Sokko (Mr)</td>
<td>ESA • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFFOUMOU Atté Edouard (Mr)</td>
<td>COOPARA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MURAKAMI Shimeepi (Mr)</td>
<td>AFA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JORDAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHAKHATREH Yahya (Mr)</td>
<td>NCARE • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAN GINKEL Moarten (Mr)</td>
<td>ICARDA • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZAVAYER Razan (Mrs)</td>
<td>ANFS / APN • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEUFELDT Henry (Mr)</td>
<td>World Agroforestry Centre • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KYRGYZ REPUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEMIRBEKOV Alekandr (Mr)</td>
<td>Association of Forest and Land Users • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHALAK Lomis (Mr)</td>
<td>AARINENA • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAROU EL KHOURY Dunia (Mrs)</td>
<td>WADA • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DARWICH Salem (Mr)</td>
<td>Faculté d’Agronomie, Université Libanaise • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MADAGASCAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAMINILAIORO Lucien (Mr)</td>
<td>VFTM • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOLY Faluy (Mr)</td>
<td>SEXAGON • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COULIBALY Ibrahim (Mr)</td>
<td>CNOP • Mali • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOGOBA Bougouna (Mr)</td>
<td>AMEDD • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOMMERELL Victor (Mr)</td>
<td>CIMMYT • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOROCCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FERRARH Moha (Mr)</td>
<td>Pillar II Resources Center (CRP2) • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYANMAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYINT Hla (Mr)</td>
<td>MRPPA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BADAL Kashow Prasad (Mr)</td>
<td>National Cooperative Federation Nepal • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NICARAGUA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLORES Selminro (Mrs)</td>
<td>NITALPAN • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRÉGUIN GRESH Sandrine (Mrs)</td>
<td>CIRAD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PÉREZ Francisco José (Mr)</td>
<td>INIES • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIDDO Amadou (Mr)</td>
<td>FNEN-Daddo • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AJIOLE Oluwabunmi (Mr)</td>
<td>YPARD • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCELAN Aly (Mr)</td>
<td>Pakistan Fisherfolk Forum • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIWANA Afaf (Mr)</td>
<td>FAP • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARAGUAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BENAVIDEZ Maria Celcia (Mrs)</td>
<td>SER • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAMPOS RUIZ DIAZ Daniel (Mr)</td>
<td>SER • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIELE Graham (Mr)</td>
<td>CGIAR (CRP RTB) • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHILIPPINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BANZUELA Mo Estrella (Mrs)</td>
<td>AFA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAZARO Lupino (Mr)</td>
<td>Philippines Embassy, Rome • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA Cheikh Oumar (Mr)</td>
<td>IPAR • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FALL Aioune (Mr)</td>
<td>ISRA • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GUÉYE Goussou (Mr)</td>
<td>CAPPA • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIAYE Moli (Mr)</td>
<td>ALFANG • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NIAYE Ousmane (Mr)</td>
<td>ASPRODEB • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALL Nadjirou (Mr)</td>
<td>FONGS CNCR • Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SECK Popa A. (Mr)</td>
<td>Ministre de l’agriculture • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIERES ALONSO Adolfo (Mr)</td>
<td>EU • Decision maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMPES Raul (Mr)</td>
<td>Valencia Politecnic University • Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LARREA OLABERRIA Miren (Mrs)</td>
<td>WRF • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORTIZ ETXEBERRIA Auxin (Mr)</td>
<td>WRF • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSABA GARCÍA José Antonio (Mr)</td>
<td>WRF • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUINTANA AGUIRRE Conchi (Mrs)</td>
<td>WRF • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZEBERIO Jose Maria (Mr)</td>
<td>WRF • NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table includes names, titles, and roles of participants from various countries involved in the International Encounters on Family Farming and Research.
SRI LANKA
NOBLE Andrew (Mr) • IWMI • Researcher

SWITZERLAND
BLOEMERTZ Lena (Mrs) • Universität de Bâle • Researcher
ROSSIER Ruth (Mrs) • Agroscope • Researcher

Tanzania
JUMA Mwatima (Mrs) • IFAD • Farmer

The Netherlands
ANDERSSON Jens (Mr) • CIMMYT • Researcher
BLOKLAND Kees (Mr) • Agriterra • NGO
BRUIL Janneke (Mrs) • ILEIA • NGO
CHAVEZ-TAFUR Jorge (Mr) • ETC • NGO
QUIROGA GILARDONI Gabriela (Mrs) • ETC Foundation • NGO
VAN WALSUM Edith (Mrs) • ILEIA • NGO

TOGO
QUENUM Claire (Mrs) • RAPDA • NGO

Tunisia
JIMENEZ-MCINNIS Luis (Mr) • IFAD • Decision maker

Turkey
AVAN Tahir (Mr) • Agriculture and rural development support • Decision maker
CINAR Ayca (Mrs) • Agriculture and rural development support • Decision maker

Uganda
BALIRAIINE Hakim (Mr) • ESAFF • Farmer

United Kingdom
ALPERT Emily (Mrs) • Agriculture for Impact • NGO
BRITTAIN Stephanie (Mrs) • Agriculture for Impact • NGO
CONWAY Gordon (Mr) • Agriculture for Impact • Researcher
GLATZEL Katrin (Mrs) • Agriculture for Impact • NGO

Uruguay
LOPEZ RODRIGUEZ Fernando (Mr) • COPROFAM • Farmer

USA
BROOKS Karen (Mrs) • IFPRI • Researcher
CASTILLO Gino (Mrs) • OXFAM • NGO
HERREN Hans (Mr) • Millennium Institute • Researcher
JACKSON Louise (Mrs) • University of California Davis • Researcher

Uzbekistan
IBRAIMOV Rustam (Mr) • Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources • Decision maker
MUKHAMEDJANOV Shukhrat (Mr) • Scientific Information Center / ICWC • Researcher

Vietnam
DAO The Anh (Mr) • Field Crop Research Institute • Researcher
VU LE Y Voon (Mrs) • Vietnams Farmers Union • Farmer

Multilateral Organization and International Centers
AIT KADI Mohamed (Mr) • CGIAR Consortium Board • Decision maker
BOURGEIOIS Robin (Mr) • GFAR • Researcher
EVEN Marie-Aude (Mrs) • WAO • Decision maker
FERRANTE Andrea (Mr) • IFOAM • Farmer
GAD Daniel (Mr) • WOO • Farmer
GIOVANNETTI Jean-François (Mr) • WAO • Researcher
GRANDI Cristina (Mrs) • IFOAM • Farmer
HOLDERNESS Mark (Mr) • GFAR • Decision maker
HUSSEIN Karim (Mr) • IFAD • Decision maker
JIMENEZ-MCINNIS Luis (Mr) • IFAD • Decision maker
MAMA Vincent Joseph (Mr) • CORAF/WECARD • Researcher
MATTEOLI Federica (Mrs) • FAO • Decision maker
NWANZE Kanayo (Mr) • IFAD • NGO
PALMIER Harry (Mr) • GFAR • Researcher
PARIAT Monique (Mrs) • EC • Decision maker
PEREZ DEL CASTILLO Carlos (Mr) • CGIAR • Decision maker
PIERRI Francesco Maria (Mr) • FAO • Decision maker
PRICE Thomas Louis (Mr) • GFAR • NGO
SINGH Yudhvir (Mr) • Via Campesina • Farmer
VILLARREAL Marcela (Mrs) • FAO • Decision maker
WAMBO YAMDEU Augustin (Mr) • NEPAD • Decision maker