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The 1st Report of the ROPPA REGIONAL OBSERVATORY OF FAMILY FARMS (OEF / ROPPA) addresses four issues that successively deliver (i) a farmer’s interpretation of West African family farm features over the past two agricultural campaigns; (ii) a table of local advisory support received by these FFs; (iii) an analysis of the policies these FFs and their central organizations had to face; and (iv) the OEF perspectives. At the same time, ROPPA took advantage of the information generating process that documented this first report to analyze its current family farm monitoring practices. For convenience of use, this report is broken down into four BOOKLETS and one SUMMARY and CONCLUSION document.

The part of the report dealing with the observation of family farm features on the 2 agricultural campaigns constitute the core of this booklet (BOOKLET 1: OBSERVATION OF FAMILY FARMS). From this observation, it can be noticed from one year to another that, depending on climatic patterns, but also on the intensity of public support, family farms are able to make significant progress and thus improve the food security and sovereignty of the region. Thus, 8 countries in the West African region improved their yields for the 2015 - 2016 agricultural campaign compared to the previous year. These include Niger, Mali, Senegal, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia. For most of these 8 countries, food shortage was more efficiently dealt with this year as family and community granaries were well provisioned, yields from harvest / counter-season activities were substantial, markets were well stocked, and prices remained stable. In these 8 countries, the good rainfall in 2015 and favorable public policies (especially on subsidies), coupled with family farm strategies and the action of FOs, generally favored these results. In some areas, natural disasters, civil insecurity and shortcomings in the implementation of public actions have limited the results of the agricultural campaign. On this point, the report concludes that, alongside natural factors, human action (FF strategies, State action) remains equally decisive. It also concludes that FOs should develop the monitoring of agricultural campaigns in order to strengthen their role in the setting and implementation of policies.

This part of the report also lays down an assessment of the yields from family farms per group of countries that share more or less the same eco-geographical and socio-cultural characteristics. So in the Sudan-Sahel countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger), FFs have been rather self-sufficient and often in surplus regarding food production, with an increase in livestock production, a good marketing, an increase in revenues, and a contribution to economies. The coastal countries of the western Atlantic seaboard (Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Senegal) have also had an increase in food and livestock production and improved marketing conditions, except in one country (Guinea Bissau). In the forest-rich countries recently affected by the Ebola epidemic (Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone), there has been a distinct increase in food production but a slower increase in animal and fishery production and the supply hardly keeps pace with market demand. Finally, in the coastal countries of the southern Atlantic seaboard (Benin, Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Togo), there is, on the contrary, a downward trend in food production even if food security is not threatened. However, livestock farming is in progress.

The report identifies, for the 4 groups of countries, the factors that have favored or constrained the yields of FFs and provides information on the strategies implemented by the family farms to achieve the objectives they pursue given the opportunities and constraints that arise. Finally, the report concludes that section
with an analysis of the sustainability of FFs in West Africa, which will progressively depend on their ability to transform themselves so as to always be more attractive to young people and women. Several arguments point to the fact that FFs should draw the interests of States in view of their substantial contribution to national economies and businesses.

The observations in **BOOKLET 2 (OBSERVATION OF FARMER ADVISORY SUPPORT TO FAMILY FARMS)** give an overview of the current services offered by FOs regarding advice and support to family farms. Outcomes show that major farmer based support systems to FFs exist in 5 countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Senegal, Guinea, and Benin), partially functional or under development farmer systems in 4 countries (Niger, Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana), and that there are not yet farmer support systems to FFs in 4 countries (Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone, Togo). This booklet also describes and makes a comparative analysis of the practices and systems of farmer support, and an identification of the conditions under which farmer practices and support systems to FFs are developed. Eventually, after a first assessment of the outcomes of these farmer systems, the report suggests progress perspectives in this 2nd Booklet, particularly the promotion of a national support and advisory system to family farms (SNAAP / EF) in each country, based on the FO / State partnership, and making it possible to reinforce the adaptation and proximity of advisory services to family farms. It should be noted here that, in this view, 5 countries (Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea, Mali and Senegal) already have proposals jointly developed by the national farmer platform and the supervisory ministry in each country.

**BOOKLET 3 (MONITORING OF PUBLIC POLICIES WITH REGARDS TO FAMILY FARMS and EFFECTIVENESS OF FARMERS ACTIONS)** gives the analysis and appreciation by the farmer organizations of the main current public policies from the point of view of their effects on the FFs. This analysis focuses on the main public policies known to POs in each country. They are identi-
BOOKLET 4 (MONITORING PRACTICES OF ROPPA PO MEMBERS) presents the picture of current monitoring practices of agricultural campaigns, monitoring practice of family farm behaviors and results, advisory support practices and the political watch practices of ROPPA platforms that gathered the information used to produce the first ROPPA OEF report. This inventory, mainly for internal use, should serve as a basis for improving these practices in the process of progressive consolidation of this observatory.

Finally the REPORT SUMMARY shows the characteristics of this first report, summarizes the knowledge produced by farmer organizations on the dynamics of family farms, how to follow and support them, and the assessments of farmer organizations on policies relating to family farms, as developed in all 4 Booklets, and outlines the prospects of the ROPPA family farm observatory, particularly in terms of dissemination of this report (which for ROPPA is only the first of a series), and in terms of the progressive improvement of its observation and consolidation mechanisms of the ROPPA Regional OEF.
The observatory of family farms gradually built by ROPPA seeks to inform on the behavior of family farms over the agricultural campaigns. It is fed by the information provided by the monitoring of the campaigns carried out by the PO of each country and those from the various monitoring systems of family farms, which remain unevenly developed according to the PO.

This booklet includes four chapters:

• Chapter 1 presents the overall characteristics of the last agricultural campaigns (2014 / 2015 and 2015/2016) retained by ROPPA based on observations made by its national platforms.

• Chapter 2 presents per country the main approaches and results of family farms during these campaigns.

• Chapter 3 presents the observations made by the national platforms on the family farm strategies.

• Chapter 4 presents the first critical assessment of ROPPA based on the observation of the behavior of farms on the issue of conditions of the current viability of family farms.

Depending on the nature of the information given by the PO, the choice was made to present the behavior of family farms during the last agricultural campaigns in a geographical empirical grouping of 4 sets of countries which have some natural or socio-political features in common:

– Coastal countries of the west Atlantic façade (SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU)

This grouping is due to its reference to the Ebola fever epidemic (MVE), but seems significant on the last two campaigns (the disorganizing effects of the epidemic are still perceptible in 2016). What these countries have in common is that they benefit from natural favorable conditions (strong potential). The share of tubers is important in their agricultural production. In Guinea, the rearing of large ruminants is very limited by the constraints of climate. The effects of civil wars are still perceptible in Sierra Leone and in Liberia. Space competition with the FF of industrial plantations and the action of companies is important.

– Coastal countries of the south Atlantic façade (GUINEE, SIERRA LEONE, LIBÉRIA)

Ce regroupement est conjoncturel par rapport à sa référence à l’épidémie de fièvre Ebola (MVE), mais paraît significatif sur les deux dernières campagnes (les effets désorganisateurs de l’épidémie sont en effet encore sensibles en 2016). Ces pays ont en commun de bénéficier de conditions naturelles favorables (fort potentiel). La part des tubercules est importante dans leur production agricole. Outre pour la Guinée, l’élevage des grands ruminants est très limité par les contraintes climatiques. Les effets des guerres civiles sont encore sensibles en Sierra Leone et au Libéria. La concurrence sur l’espace avec les EF des plantations industrielles et l’action des firmes y est importante.

– pays côtiers de la façade Atlantique Sud (COTE D’IVOIRE, GHANA, TOGO, BENIN))

This epidemic has also had an impact on the agriculture and the food situation in the south of Senegal because of the closure of the land borders of the countries affected, which has particularly affected certain weekly and regional markets in the south of Senegal, as that of Diaobé.
These countries are the umbilical cords of the countries without coastal access. They have a strong natural potential conducive to diversification, and are attractive for migration and transhumance, and are therefore areas of space tension (land problems) and conflicts (farmers/producers). In these countries with strong economic and commercial dynamism, family farm is not politically supported. The issue of the "modernization" of agriculture and livestock is very sensitive, and the model of Agribusiness not much discussed.

This non-conventional order of presentation will bring us to scan the region in a circular way from the North East to the West and going back to the South East which is reminiscent of the trajectory of some large population movements in the history of West Africa, and to revisit the data of its current History (rise in extremism, epidemic outbreaks of Ebola fever...).

Although the priority target of the information collected by the platforms is subsistence crops, cash crops are addressed in an indirect way.

Three forms in which cash crops are addressed indirectly in the inputs of platforms:

1. The orientation of the FF cash crop strategies: according to the agro-ecological zones where they exercise their production activities, some FF can specialize in subsistence crops or cash crops, but this choice is not definitive: it can change according to the campaigns. In the areas where the choice is possible, the FFs consider both food crops and cash crops, with consequences on sown areas: "should they ensure the food security of their family through cereal availability? Or should they dispose of monetary income?" The trends discussed in the exchanges at the country level describe in some areas a tendency to an orientation toward cash crops at the expense of subsistence crops.

These trade-offs are less binding if the choice spans over one agricultural campaign (trade-offs between the millet and peanut in Senegal). They are much more binding when it comes to long-term choice (several years): this is the case of the development of the cashew tree in Guinea Bissau and in Liberia, or even of the rubber tree in Côte d’Ivoire.

2. These trade-offs are also made by States in the framework of public subsidies between cash crops and subsistence crops. This is the case in Mali, between the dry zone and the area of cotton or in Benin where the distribution of imported fertilizers till then reserved for cotton has been extended to subsistence crops. The orientation of these grants or the conditions of access can also influence the trade-offs at the family level. However the States are evolving in their policies and are looking to diversify agro-silvo-pastoral and fishing production which guarantees national food security.

3. The threat of agro business to family farms, oriented toward cash crops, is an issue raised in Senegal, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Togo (risk of an extension of the land code from urban to rural regions, concerns about agro poles), in Benin (hoarding of land by public servants), Ghana (concerns about the coastal zone), etc. with direct implications on land tenure and social stability.

The monitoring approach of agricultural campaigns and family farm dynamics which have allowed the national platforms to achieve these results are described in Booklet 4 (MONITORING PRACTICES OF ROPPA PO MEMBERS).
Presentation:
Agricultural campaigns constitute the backdrop against which one can observe the behavior of family farms in relation to the climatic conditions and the state of natural resources, the evolution of markets as well as the implementation of public policies.

The follow-up of the campaigns by the PO allows them to both adjust their support for family farms and supplement the data provided by the national monitoring campaign systems - which they participate to in most countries, and to call on public authorities.

Their practices in this area are unevenly advanced depending on the country, and the revival of the Observatory of ROPPA must enable them to gradually improve.

We will present in the first section of this chapter the main data provided by the platforms on the characteristics of the last campaign.

In the second section we will comment on the presented results.
### Observation of Family Farm Dynamics

#### Countries of the Sahelo-Sudan zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reminder on the 2014 / 2015 campaign</th>
<th>Fairly good results</th>
<th>Good Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
<td><strong>BURKINA FASO</strong></td>
<td><strong>MALI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive campaign</td>
<td>Fairly good results</td>
<td>Good Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delay in rains/sudden stop</td>
<td>- Slight decrease in cereals compared to the 2013/14 campaign; delays in rains, granivorous birds, but increased by 7% compared with the five-year average</td>
<td>- Increase in cereal prod. 22% compared to 2013/14 (81% of the campaign objectives - Gap ← rainfall) + 24% cotton prod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pest attacks</td>
<td>- Over 45 provinces, 13 remain in deficit</td>
<td>→ <strong>Surplus of cereals compared to needs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Despite improvement of pastures fodder balance in deficit</td>
<td>- <strong>Fragile food situation</strong> <em>(almost half of the FFs have cereal deficit according to the estimates of the Platform)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pressure on the land linked to people and herd migration (Conflicts/insecurity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ <strong>Food crisis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations made at the end of the 2015/2016 campaign</th>
<th><strong>Less good campaign</strong></th>
<th><strong>Good campaign</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGER</strong></td>
<td><strong>MALI</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better campaign</td>
<td>Less good campaign</td>
<td>Good campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Abundant rains</td>
<td>- Abundant rainfall, but bad space-time distribution (floods, waterstress)</td>
<td>- Good rainfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phytosanitary situation under control</td>
<td>- Decrease of 6% in the cereal production</td>
<td>- Phytosanitary situation under control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good reaction of public authorities and farmers strategies</td>
<td>- Decrease of 11% in the prod. of cash crops</td>
<td>- Effective public action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surplus of cereals</td>
<td>- 20 provinces/45 in deficit</td>
<td>- FFs Intensification trend (judicious use of subsidized inputs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced availability of pasture and water by the end of the dry season → affected results of livestock farming</td>
<td>- FFs tendency to increase cultivated areas</td>
<td>- Increase in cereal and animal production (Good Availability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ <strong>Food situation improved, but vulnerability remains (structural food crisis)</strong></td>
<td>- Satisfactory supply of markets</td>
<td>- Results however limited by insecurity and bad techn.service practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ <strong>Food situation improved thanks to subsidized sales prices of cereals and picking products</strong></td>
<td>→ <strong>Food situation satisfactory, except in areas affected by flooding or insecurity.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) The 2015/2016 AGRICULTURAL CAMPAIGN: better than 2014 / 2015 campaign as a whole

COMPARATIVE TABLE A: THE 2015/2016 CAMPAIGN (indicative data according to the Platforms analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation of Family Farm Dynamics</th>
<th>Coastal countries of the West Atlantic Facade</th>
<th>SÉNÉGAL</th>
<th>GAMBIE</th>
<th>GUINÉE BISSAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reminder on the 2014 / 2015 campaign</td>
<td>mauvaise campagne</td>
<td>Poor campaign: productions of cereals (including rice) and peanuts in decline compared to the average of the last 4 years.</td>
<td>Poor campaign: - Poor space-time distribution of rain - Cereals: decrease in seeded area and yields; decrease of 38% of the prod. - Rice: decrease of 36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Late and erratic rains</td>
<td>- Decrease in dry cereals, groundnut, cotton, and tomato prod.</td>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td>- Increase in rice, onion, milk prod. and poultry products</td>
<td>- Drop in results compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) The 2015/2016 AGRICULTURAL CAMPAIGN: better than 2014 / 2015 campaign as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest-rich countries (affected by the Ebola fever)</th>
<th>GUINEA</th>
<th>SIERRA LEONE</th>
<th>LIBERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reminder campaign 2014 / 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong negative impact of the Ebola epidemic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite better weather conditions compared to the 2013/14 campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unproductive campaign (difficulty to access inputs, inexistent and expensive labor, no mutual assistance) decline in yields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong impact on livestock (border and markets closures, containment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ ↑ 30% population in food insecurity (70% in rural area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong negative impact of the EVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4,000 deaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 47% of agricultural activities impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sudden interruption of the gradual relaunch of agricultural activities since the Civil War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Losses and modification of economic and agricultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Food insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unproductive campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong negative impact of the EVD + rainfall issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spreading of the epidemic during the period of agricultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very low yields; decrease of 8% in the production compared to 2013 (-12% for rice);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In some areas, loss of 25% in paddy production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ increased food insufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24% increase in imports of cereals: 250,000 people in food insecurity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations made at the end of the 2015/2016 campaign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better campaign</th>
<th>Recovery of the situation</th>
<th>Average results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- EDV resurgence controlled</td>
<td>Despite poor climatic conditions (floods, extreme heat)</td>
<td>Difficult to assess because of the input of Liberia (seems to fear that the 2016 campaign won’t be very good because of delays in the provision of support (inputs, equipment))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production and exchange resumption</td>
<td>- Post-Ebola support from the Gvt and international assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better access to inputs, but to limited producers</td>
<td>- Increase in the quantities produced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Nutritional situation remains precarious, but dropped below the threshold of &quot;critical situation&quot;</td>
<td>→ Situation is not yet satisfactory; huge imports of foodstuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acute malnutrition: 8%, of which 2% severe. Critical malnutrition pockets in High Guinea)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPARATIVE TABLE A: THE 2015/2016 CAMPAIGN (indicative data according to the Platforms analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal countries of the South Atlantic Façade</th>
<th>CÔTE D’IVOIRE</th>
<th>GHANA</th>
<th>TOGO</th>
<th>BENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reminder campaign 2014 / 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight increase in a broad downward trend</td>
<td>Better campaign</td>
<td>Good campaign</td>
<td>Slight increase in the production of corn, tubers, cotton; decline in rice and sorghum production (rainfall variations). Stagnant animal prod., fish prod. in slight increase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(important yields in 2015, despite a slowdown in the vegetative growth due to the early arrival of the dry season)</td>
<td>Despite of the campaign financing issues</td>
<td>Despite the downward trend and the irregularity in rainfall since 4 years. - Well-prepared campaign - Increase of production for all products, except yam, sweet potatoes and soybeans - Marketing problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ For several years, there is a tendency to the improvement of the food situation</td>
<td>→ Good food availability for several years, but 30% pop. in food insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations made at the end of the 2015/2016 campaign</th>
<th>Decline in production (a divergence of opinion between State services and the farmers)</th>
<th>Less good campaign</th>
<th>Pretty good campaign, but slight decline</th>
<th>Less good campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Climatic disturbances (heavy but short rains, tornadoes)</td>
<td>- Delays in sowing due to bad rainfall</td>
<td>- Insufficient rainfalls (less rainy season, delay in sowings)</td>
<td>- Insufficient rainfalls (less rainy season, delay in sowings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Seed insufficiency</td>
<td>- Issues with supply of cassava cuttings</td>
<td>- Low coverage of fertilizer needs</td>
<td>- Low coverage of fertilizer needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better support for cash crops compared to food crops</td>
<td>- Post-harvest losses</td>
<td>- Reduction of yields and production of the main crops, including food crops.</td>
<td>- Reduction of yields and production of the main crops, including food crops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ The quantities produced will not be enough to ensure food security</td>
<td>- Decline compared to the previous campaigns</td>
<td>- Bad rainfall, pest attacks (African armyworm) and animal health issues(plague and Avian flu)</td>
<td>- Bad rainfall, pest attacks (African armyworm) and animal health issues(plague and Avian flu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overall production surplus</td>
<td>- Overall production surplus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- decline of cereal surpluses</td>
<td>- decline of cereal surpluses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>→ Decline in the supply of agricultural products (increase in the price of foodstuff)</td>
<td>→ Decline in the supply of agricultural products (increase in the price of foodstuff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>→ Food security ensured, but less important surplus reserves for 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>→ Food balance remains in surplus for corn, yam, cassava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The 2015/2016 AGRICULTURAL CAMPAIGN: better than 2014 / 2015 campaign as a whole
The overall trend seems better compared to the average of the past five campaign.\(^1\)

1. Better results in the majority of countries

Table A compares the 2014/2015 campaign and the 2015/2016 campaign. From a farmer perspective, the 2014/15 campaign was bad in 7 countries due to poor rainfall and the impact of the Ebola epidemic (NIGER, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, and LIBERIA).

For the 2015/16 campaign, 8 countries had a better campaign than the previous year (NIGER, MALI, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, and LIBERIA). In CÔTE D’IVOIRE, official data show a good campaign, though from the farmer perspective this data does not reflect the state of affairs in family farms. In TOGO and BENIN where a slight drop in production compared to the previous year has been recorded, there were surpluses and food security remains guaranteed.

2. A relatively well handled food shortage

The duration and the severity of the period when the granaries are empty (food shortage), constitute, for the farmer, a tangible indicator to measure the success of his cropping season. For the 8 countries that provided information (NIGER, BURKINA FASO, MALI, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, GUINEA, CÔTE D’IVOIRE, TOGO), shortage in the 2016 rainy season (which coincided with the month of Ramadan) has had in the Sahelian countries, a similar duration to that of the previous year (3 to 4 months depending on the agro-ecological zones); it was shorter in TOGO (2 months). Most families could have two meals a day (except in some cases in NIGER, where the severity of the 2016 shortage is however considered moderate).

Defaulting products during the shortage period are not exactly the same according to the agro-ecological zones of each country, but these are generally cereals (NIGER: millet, sorghum, corn; BURKINA FASO: sorghum, corn; MALI: corn, millet; in GUINEA BISSAU, CÔTE D’IVOIRE and TOGO as well) and rice (MALI, GUINEA BISSAU, CÔTE D’IVOIRE). There has also been shortage of yams and bananas in some areas of CÔTE D’IVOIRE. In SENEGAL, there has been scarcity of off-season crops (conservation issue) and fish. In livestock farming areas, good milk production has reduced the nutritional consequences of the shortage, except NIGER where there has been shortage of milk and derivatives (butter, cheese).

There has been no exceptional movement of cattle during the 2016 shortage.

The analysis of the shortage carried out by the ROPPA national platforms highlights six factors that helped in mitigating the severity:

a) The filling rate of family and community granaries: where family farms have been in surplus (see Chapter II), there was no shortage issues.

b) The availability of harvested products (BURKINA FASO) or off-season cultures

c) The good supply of market allowed families to buy the products they needed. With the exception of areas of insecurity (NIGER) and Guinea where there have been supply disruptions, the supply of markets has been satisfactory because stocks had been constituted by the FFs which marketed their surplus, by traders (except MALI) and importers (NIGER in particular), and by the government.

d) The stability of market prices: Apart from the usual increases during Ramadan (GUI-NEA) and Tabaski (SENEGAL), seasonal increases have been moderate and similar to the five-year average in BURKINA FASO; in MALI prices of dry cereals were inferior to the average price of shortage periods of the last 5 years; they have been (as well as those of fruits) inferior or equal compared to previous years in SENEGAL; there has been a slight increase in TOGO. On the other hand,

\(^{1}\) En ce qui concerne la production céréalière, ces résultats sont selon le RPCC supérieurs à la moyenne quinquennale dans 10 pays sur 13 (GHANA : + 2%; GUINÉE : + 13%; TOGO : + 15%; NIGER : + 16%; LIBERIA : + 17%; SIERRA LEONE et GAMBIE : + 18%; MALI : + 28%; SÉNÉGAL : + 56%; CÔTE D’IVOIRE : + 88%). Ils sont par contre en baisse par rapport à la moyenne quinquennale dans trois pays (BÉNIN : - 1%; BURKINA FASO : - 7%; GUINÉE BISSAU : - 8%)
these prices remained higher for some crops in SENEGAL (vegetables, fish, and meat) as well as in GUINEA BISAU, and increased by 50% in NIGER compared to the 2015 shortage, and thus jeopardizing FFs access to basic food. Livestock product prices have generally increased giving an advantage to livestock farmers (exchange terms of livestock/cereals in favor of livestock farmers - BURKINA FASO).

e) Government intervention: this had positive effects in NIGER, BURKINA FASO (food security pilot shops, subsidy to cereal prices) in MALI (assistance to populations in difficult food situation) and CÔTE D’IVOIRE (shortage funds). In GUINEA BISSAU food aid intervention also helped in mitigating the severity of the shortage.

f) Family adaptation strategies: these strategies are defined according to the results of family production, but also according to the market (GUINEA - over 75% of FF expenses monitored by FOs are affected to feeding).

- Though families did not generally reduce their daily meals (except NIGER), they have however consequently changed their feeding habits during shortage periods by consuming "exceptional food" (NIGER: cassava flour, tubers, off-season crops, BURKINA FASO: rather millet than corn in the Sahel, rice imported in the south Sahelian zone; MALI: unusual millet and sorghum consumption in rice production area; GUINEA-BISSAU: consumption of products supplied through food aid).

- Moreover FFs have tried to generate income to buy the food stuff they needed either by destocking - their cereal surplus or others (cowpea, groundnut in TOGO), but especially small ruminants and poultry (NIGER, BURKINA FASO, MALI, GUINEA-BISSAU, TOGO) - or by intensifying their non-agricultural activities (crafts, gold mining, woodcutting...) or by resorting to family solidarity, including that of emigrants (BURKINA FASO, MALI) through donations during Korité (end of Ramadan) and Tabaski (Muslim sheep celebration) (SENEGAL) or intensifying exodus and migration (NIGER).

- Some families could not escape debt which occurred in more or less favorable conditions (MALI: debt with cereal producers: 1 bag refunded with 1.5 to 2 bags after harvest; NIGER: with Nigerian traders; however in TOGO, small borrowings with the National Inclusive Finance Funds are easily refundable).

However, some events have worsened the difficulties of the shortage: floods (center of BURKINA FASO and Mopti, Segou and Sikasso regions in MALI and also GUINEA BISSAU); population displacements related to political unrest (BURKINA FASO: 29,000 Malian refugees in the provinces of Soum and Seno, displaced Ivorians departing from the Noumbiel province; MALI: emergence of new armed groups in the Mopti region resulting into the displacement of families of farmers, confrontation between herders and farmers around Téninkou). Strong malnutrition is recorded in armed conflict zones (MALI, NIGER).

(2). Comments on the agricultural campaign results and first findings

3. Four key factors explain the good results of the past campaign

- Pluviometry: except Ghana and BENIN where rainfall deficits have been recorded and some pockets in the other countries, the amount of rainwater was generally sufficient in all countries. The effects of climate change have been rather significant during the 2015/2016 campaign compared to the distribution of rainfall which was often disturbed.

- Measures taken by the states

They are part of the commitments taken by States in Maputo and the priorities of ECO-WAP / CAADP. They were mainly translated into support measures to family farm production means.
In some countries, the Government has also strengthened its advisory system to bring targeted advisory support to producers (for example in Burkina Faso).

The country analysis of these public interventions is presented in Booklet 2 of the OFF report ("Observation of Farmer Advisory Support: state of affairs in the 13 ECOWAS countries")

### High Reactivity of FFs

It is illustrated by the important leaps made by the FFs between 2 agricultural campaigns, in particular concerning cereal productions in Côte d’Ivoire (+88%) and Senegal (+56%), and on the production of sheep meat in Niger (+31%). In chapter III, we will comment on the strategies of family farms that help explain this reactivity.

### Action of the FOs

The FOs have often provided services to facilitate access of FFs to public support. So in Niger, the FUCOPRI (organization of rice producers) used OPVN sales contracts to get credit in order to facilitate access to inputs; in Mali, the national platform of rice producers gave their moral support to the Malian Office of Agricultural Products (OPAM) to directly sign contracts with organizations of rice producers in order to build the country’s stock (25,000 tons); in Senegal agricultural products consolidation and marketing services developed by the FOs through contracting with various sector industries (peanut, rice, tomato...) have partially completed public interventions concentrated on upstream production. In Guinea, FPFD has guaranteed the refund of loans granted for the campaign.

### A FEW EXAMPLES OF PUBLIC SUPPORT MEASURES

- **Seed grants**: Benin (free corn and rice, vegetable seeds); Togo (536 tons); Senegal (groundnut, rice, cereals, potatoes); Guinea Bissau (rice and vegetables), Guinea, Sierra Leone (rice), Burkina Faso.
- **Fertilizer grants**: Togo (decrease from 16,000 to 11,000 CFA francs/bag, for 40,000 tons); Ghana (chemical fertilizer subsidy program); Senegal (fertilizer grants); Mali, Burkina Faso, The Gambia.
- **Agricultural equipment grants**: Benin (tillers); Togo (Agricultural Equipment), Ghana (subsidy program to heavy agricultural equipment); Senegal (agricultural equipment grant); Mali (tractors), Niger (tractors), Burkina Faso (plows and carts).

### Improved animal race grant for livestock farming

- Benin (3000 cocks of improved race); Burkina Faso (6000 draught animals)

### Grant for livestock food

- Senegal, Niger;

### 4. Different factors in the country have limited the trend of improvement in results:

- **Natural disasters**: Persistent consequences of the Ebola epidemic: Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia; floods, poor distribution of rains Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea Bissau; insufficient rainfall: Ghana, Benin; pests attacks (not globally important, but locally reported in Niger, in Burkina Faso (granivorous birds) and Togo (African armyworms), diseases (swine fever and avian influenza in Togo).

- **Social disasters**: Terrorism related insecurity, insecurity related population movements: Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali; persistent aftermaths of war: Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Côte d’Ivoire.

- **Failures in the implementation of policies**: limited access to support related to inputs...
and equipment (available quantities, quality, price, and supply/distribution: GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, CÔTE D’IVOIRE, GHANA, BENIN)

We will come back on these limiting factors by groups of countries in Chapter II of this booklet ("Orientations and results of family farms during the last agricultural campaign").

5. Main observations

It is observed that:

• On the whole, pest attacks and phytosanitary risks have been well controlled (which had not been the case in 2014/15).

• Unstable variations in rainfall have destabilized farming practices (impact of climate change), but their negative effects have been overcome when appropriate support has been given by the Government and led to a good responsiveness of family farms.

• Unlike 2008, farmers have not endured significant consequences related to the fluctuation of agricultural products on the international market (they have just suffered the depreciation of naira on trade to Niger and Benin).

• The food situation remains precarious in several countries (Niger – due to the inaccessibility of the deficit areas, Mali in besieged areas, Burkina Faso, Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Liberia), but there has been no major food crisis. Deficits have often been addressed by imports and food aid.

• In the majority of countries, Government and development agency actions have helped amplify the favorable trends and to mitigate the effects of unfavorable factors, which led to a good outcome of this campaign. It is however noted that government efforts to support production are for the most part concentrated upstream (inputs) and little downstream of the production (price support).

These observations are similar to those made by the FAO and the RPCA when the 2015/2016 campaign was ending.

(FAO, January 2016)
The main 2015-2016 agricultural campaign is over and cereal production is estimated to be 12 percent higher than the five-year average and 5 percent higher than in 2014-2015 for the West African region and the Sahel. This is positive for the entire region; however, the dry spells and early end to rains in Chad, northern Benin, Togo and Ghana have caused cereal production to decline in these countries. The effects of this fall in production could lead to price increases in the markets in affected areas. Despite good production forecasts, the food and nutrition situation of the most vulnerable people in the region could deteriorate during the next lean season (June to August 2016) owing to the deterioration of their livelihoods, the early depletion of their stocks, localized increases in food prices and deteriorating terms of trade. In addition, a growing number of the poorest households does not always depend on agriculture and livestock for food and access to income and was not able to profit from good agricultural production. The agricultural off-season campaign has started in the region and could help fill production deficits from the main agricultural season.

RPCA (FOOD CRISIS PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT NETWORK/CILSS) – (RPCA, April 2016) With mitigation measures implemented by governments and their partners, the number of people needing food assistance declined from December 2015 to March 2016. However, the region has to deal with 6.7 million people in food and nutrition insecurity of which nearly 4.2 million people are displaced due to insecurity in the Lake Chad Basin, in northern Mali, Libya, Central African Republic and Sudan. The mitigation measures implemented since December, allowed to reach about 1.2 million people previously affected by food insecurity. The Network welcomes the efforts of States and their partners, and encourages them to continue their actions.
6. Conclusions

> The **first lesson** that ROPPA draws from this campaign is that the positive effects of natural factors can be valued or their negative effects mitigated by the action of farmers and government, and it is appropriate that the Observatory provides ways to monitor this action. Therefore, ROPPA finds useful that the *Observatory monitors the progress of family farms* and advisory support strategies that can strengthen them. We will come back on it in the last chapter (Chapter III on FFs strategies). It is also addressed in Booklet II of the report (*OBSERVING FARMER ADVISORY SUPPORT TO FAMILY FARMS* and in sections I and II). Furthermore, Government action is also crucial to facilitate the success of a season and improving outcomes for farmers: the monitoring of public policies by FOs is the subject of Booklet 3 of the OEF report (*MONITORING PUBLIC POLICIES RELATED TO FAMILY FARMS AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FARMER ACTION*).

> The **second lesson** that ROPPA draws from this first regional campaign analysis focuses on the importance of developing this type of monitoring for agricultural campaigns in different countries as countryside features enlighten us both on FF results and policy impacts. It already appears that one of the Observatory’s objectives is the refinement of campaign monitoring practices by FOs.
Guidelines and results of family farms during the past agricultural campaign

Presentation:
In all countries, family farms account for most of the agriculture, forestry, pastoral and fish production. Their results are both determined by the conditions in which the season unfolds, and determine the outcomes of the campaign. The monitoring of family farms, which is the main purpose of the FFO, thus helps refine and complete that of the campaigns.

For each of the groups of countries in this report, the major results attained by family farms from the viewpoint of food security (crop and livestock production) and marketing will be presented by country. Then the summary of the information provided by the platforms on the factors that explain these results (positive, negative, ambivalent).
COMPARATIVE TABLE B: TRENDS IN THE EVOLUTION OF FAMILY FARM RESULTS (2015/2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NIGER</th>
<th>BURKINA FASO</th>
<th>MALI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food production</strong></td>
<td>Self-sufficiency, and often surpluses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal surpluses</td>
<td>Mitigated results</td>
<td>Good yields, surpluses, intensification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal production</strong></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Production of cattle/sheep –slowed down at the end of the dry season</td>
<td>Relatively satisfactory results</td>
<td>Milk increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish catch increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>Good marketing, revenue increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naira depreciation related issues</td>
<td>In progress in Sahelian areas and South Sudanian zone</td>
<td>Important in cotton production areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable factors</strong></td>
<td>No major climatic disturbances,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective support to family agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of markets in progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable or ambivalent factors</strong></td>
<td>Civil insecurity tends to expand</td>
<td>Difficulty in accessing fertile lands (land issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unskilled or unavailable workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deficiencies in service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural hazards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Coastal countries of the West Atlantic Facade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENEegal</th>
<th>GAMBIA</th>
<th>GUiNÈE BISSAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global increase, intensification.</td>
<td>10% increase</td>
<td>Rice: + 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry cereals: + 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>in progress</td>
<td>in at least 1 country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk increase</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>No specific data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94% coverage of meat needs have been met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency to improvement noticed in 1 country</td>
<td>Satisfactory groundnut marketing</td>
<td>FFs remain constrained by intermediaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good for onions and horticultural production; Good for the FF that seized the opportunity granted by Asian markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality seeds</td>
<td>Lower prices for fertilizers</td>
<td>Soil fertility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input and equipment subsidy</td>
<td>Dikes and bridges</td>
<td>Support to a few hitched culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/advise extension</td>
<td>Cooperative relay</td>
<td>Facilitators and technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better rainfall</td>
<td>Easy accessibility to inputs and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Support-advise to FFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support-advise to FFs</td>
<td>Soil fertility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to a few hitched culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitators and technicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fertility degradation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low level of equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space saturation and land grabbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deficiencies in service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient grants to renew equipment, Delays in grant implementation, Land saturation in the groundnut basin</td>
<td>Lack of equipment, Land grabbing, Delays in seed supply</td>
<td>Unequal access to equipment, Land grabbing, Absence of a seed policy, Environmental impact of cashew tree development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Table B: Trends in the Evolution of Family Farm Results (2015/2016)

**Forest dominated countries (affected by the Ebola fever)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guinea</th>
<th>Sierra Leone</th>
<th>Liberia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noticeable progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural production higher than the five-year average; enough stocks in FFs</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative progression</td>
<td>Surpluses in 3 agro-ecological zones. Deficit in 1 AEZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slower progress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Marginal livestock</td>
<td>Strong progression in 1 AEZ, average in 2, drop in 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The demand may be higher than the offer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal resumption of internal and cross-border trade</td>
<td>Still affected by the EVD</td>
<td>Variable depending on the regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable natural conditions, few hazards in 2015/16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to health security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Ebola rehabilitation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downturn caused by the epidemic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to implement resumption measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures on space and land disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post EVD deficiencies**
- Unfavorable to vulnerable FFs
- **Space pressure**
  - Plot abandonment, population and livestock displacements

**Post EVD deficiencies**
- Lack of equity in service delivery
- **Space pressure**
  - Difficulty for vulnerable people to access land

**Post EVD deficiencies**
- Delay in services delivery
  - **Space pressure**
    - Competition of large industrial plantations
### COMPARATIVE TABLE B: TRENDS IN THE EVOLUTION OF FAMILY FARM RESULTS (2015/2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CÔTE D’IVOIRE</th>
<th>GHANA</th>
<th>TOGO</th>
<th>BENIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food production</strong></td>
<td>Assured food security, but downward trend</td>
<td>Farmers do not expect surpluses</td>
<td>In surplus but slight decrease</td>
<td>Results may vary depending on the cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease in yields, competitions of cash crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal Production</strong></td>
<td>Generally good results for livestock, decrease in catches for fisheries</td>
<td>Large livestock stagnation, progression of poultry, crisis in the traditional fishing sector</td>
<td>Crisis in the traditional fishing sector</td>
<td>Increase in cattle and poultry farming Change in traditional fishing sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large livestock stagnation, progression of poultry, crisis in the traditional fishing sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in cattle Decrease in aquaculture Crisis in the traditional fishing sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>Variable marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absence of market organization</td>
<td>when there are big markets</td>
<td>Good (some issues with cereals)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (cross-border market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favorable factors</strong></td>
<td>Good quality land, seems available to FFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of skilled labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic economic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peaceful social climate or being pacified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavorable or ambivalent factors</strong></td>
<td>Low productivity Space mismanagement and land disputes Lack of appropriate State support</td>
<td>Land pb. Concerns in coastal zones</td>
<td>Land pb. Opaque land market</td>
<td>Land pb. Land grabbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land pb. Regular conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approaches and results of family farms in the Sahelo-Sudanian countries (Niger, Burkina Faso, Mali)

A. Generally positive results from FFs

7. from the perspective of food crops: tendency to self-sufficiency often with surplus. Unlike the previous campaign, this general tendency is noticed by the platforms of the three countries. This is especially observed with cereal production, which was generally good.

- We know that on the whole, family farms in Niger have produced excess of cereals, but no detailed information on the FFs of this country is available. In this country, the production is focused on agriculture (72% of national production, better yields for millet, sorghum, groundnut and sesame) and agro pastoral production (26% of national production, higher yields for rice, Bambara groundnut, nut edge, onion and tomato; good yields for okra). It may be noted that although the FFs of the pastoral production account for only a small part in the national production of food crops (0.8%), they record the best yields for corn and cowpea, and yields similar to those of the agro pastoral zone for most products.

- In all surveyed areas (cotton areas, irrigated areas, dry crops areas) in Mali, the FFs have recorded an increase of production (average +15% higher compared to the past campaign). Yields have been higher (including rice), and excesses frequent.

- In Burkina Faso, where national statistics show an overall decline of around 6% of cereal and cotton production, the results of FFs are more in contrast depending on the agro ecological zones. More simplified, FFs in Sahelian zones have improved their results compared to the past season and recorded surplus (+19% in the North Sahel with cereal balances set between 90% and 120%, +18% in the South Sahel with cereal balances however inferior to 90%). These areas remain, however the areas where malnutrition rate is the highest. Besides, the FFs in Sudan zones have recorded bad results and are often in deficit (average decrease of 12% in the northern Sudanian zone, and 17% in the southern Sudan zone). Some FFs have recorded losses in their harvests due to irregular rains in the South Sahelian zones (5% of production) and South Sudanian zones (8% of production).

8. from the perspective of animal production in FF: increasing

- In Niger, in all the studied areas (agricultural, agro pastoral and pastoral) the production of ruminants increased. National statistics indicate that cattle, sheep and goat production have been particularly large and increasing (in particular for sheep: +31% between the two campaigns in the agricultural zone) in agricultural and agro pastoral areas.

- Niger’s foreseeable feed balance for 2015/16, on the other hand, was negative, regardless of whether the influx of refugees was taken into account. The difficulties of food shortage, which started early with livestock farmers, confirmed these predictions (poor livestock feeding conditions in pastoral areas).

- In Burkina Faso, where 80% of FFs breed, livestock farmers benefited from favorable livestock / cereal terms of trade (1 Sahelian goat for 130 kg of millet on the Gorom-Gorom market, for 171 kg of millet on Dori market, 187 kg on Djibo market - normal: 1 goat = 150 kg). Prices of rams and goats increased, but bull prices declined (demand for Nigeria and Ghana declined - livestock is the country’s third largest export destination after gold and cotton).

- In Mali, a big livestock producer, the production of controlled meat in 2015/16 was 65,000 Tons out of an available potential of 220,000 Tons, and 9,400 Tons of milk out of an available potential estimated at 625,000 Tons. The increase in animal production is noticeable on family farms; it is reflected in large ru-
minants with a particular increase in milk production and animal sales. This increase is particularly important for poultry (layers and broiler chickens).

Fishing information is available only for MALI, where an increase in catches (river and lake fishing) and fish products is noticeable, but there is a downward tendency in the size of the species and in BURKINA FASO, national needs are only met at 20%.

9. From the perspective of marketing: good marketing, and a higher income
Production surpluses in all three countries stimulated the marketing of food crops (including cereals) and livestock from family farms, and increased family cash income.

The monitoring systems of Mali’s FOs have made it possible to observe this in the cotton zone, as well as in BURKINA FASO where this was observed in an accurate way in the Sahelian and South Sudanian agro-ecological zones.

In BURKINA FASO, according to the Federation of Professional Farmers of Burkina (FEPAB) the cereal market is clearly in progress from the viewpoint of the sales over the last three years. But access to different markets remains difficult for producers under current conditions: strong influence and / or competition from traders, collectors and resellers; low bargaining capacity of producers and their organizations, lack of information on markets, etc.

In the area of the Mouhoun Union of Agricultural Products marketing groups (UGCPA-BM), the major producers of Burkina’s granaries, each of them farming tens of hectares, expressed to the head of government their concerns related to the sale of their products although government services such as the Public Company for Security Stock Management (SONAGESS) buy their cereals. New opportunities also exist for poultry and livestock feed manufacturers.

In Niger, the depreciation of the naira competed adversely with the domestic FF, favoring the import of food from Nigeria.

B. External factors that contributed to these good results

10. natural factors: no major problem
On the one hand, farmers benefited in general from good rainfall enabling them to produce more. In addition, there were no major attacks from pests. Several indicators show that the FF increased their production not only by extending the cultivated areas (case in BURKINA FASO), but also by intensifying them (in MALI, production has increased by 2% more than the production of the cultivated areas).

11. Input subsidy and supply: Governments played the role of stimulation
In the three countries, the Government implemented a subsidization policy of agricultural inputs (especially for fertilizers and seeds), a policy to which the FF reacted very quickly, as especially shown by the intensification trend observed

• in NIGER, 8,135.51 tons of selected seeds were distributed to the populations of vulnerable areas; 47,294 tons of fertilizers were distributed among several points of sale or communal fertilizer provision centers throughout the country; 239,063 liters of phytosanitary products were made available to the FFs to cover 314,000 hectares.

• in MALI, the subsidy was applied to fertilizers (sold at F 11,000 the bag instead of F 12,500) and to seeds. The Government also granted subsidy in cotton areas and in dry crop areas through the acquisition of tractors.

• in BURKINA FASO, where seeds were also subsidized (provision of 4,000 tons of enhanced seeds) and where 16,000 tons of NPK fertilizers and urea were provided, in addition we notice the effect of individual initiatives of the FFs in using the organic compost (agriculture/livestock association, compost and manure pits) and actions of community defense and soil restoration.
12. prevention of crop attacks: efficient
The efficiency of plant protection services was particularly appreciated by the FF and the FO of NIGER. In BURKINA FASO, local attacks from seed-eating birds and locusts and crop disease affected however the results of the FFs in the Northern Sahel.

13. Market organization: improving
The FFs were able to commercialize their products owing to the development of three types of markets:

- **Local markets that** are growing in the three countries (effect of decentralization).
- **institutional markets**: related to the constitution of security stocks (WFP, SONAGESS in BURKINA FASO, OPAM in Mali)
- **cross-border and sub-regional markets** (example of the export of products from the irrigated area of MALI to Côte d’Ivoire, Senegal, Guinea and BURKINA FASO).

The practice of group sales organized most of the time by the FOs also improved the selling conditions of the FFs products (BURKINA FASO).

14. Support actions for the FFs: improved farming practice
Dissemination, training, recommendation to family farm guaranteed by the FOs, the Government, the NGOs or international assistance projects……, the effects of which are being noticeable on the improvement of qualifications within the FFs (noticed in BURKINA FASO in the Southern Sahel, North and South-Sudanese areas). →See. Booklet 2 (OBSERVATION OF FARMER ADVISORY SUPPORT TO FAMILY FARMS)

C. Factors that limited the production of good results
Except for the general problem of workforce, these factors are most of the time localized and did not affect all the family farms.

15. insecurity: tends to spread
With the rise of terrorism:

- insecurity is directly affecting the North of MALI and is spreading through the rest of the country (attacks in cotton areas)
- in NIGER it is affecting more specifically the Chad lakeside and the Diffa region.
- in BURKINA FASO, it is noticeable in the Northern Sahel; armed attacks and livestock theft are increasing in the Southern Sahel.

16. difficulties in gaining access to arable lands or the shrinking of the space usable by all or some of the FFs: the combined effects of fertility problems and land pressure
This problem of pressure on the land is raised in different terms according to the contexts:

- **overpopulation**: in the refugee reception zones (NIGER)
- **soil poverty and/or inadequacy of usable spaces** (areas of dry crops of MALI, sahelian areas and northern Sudan in BURKINA FASO)
- **reduction of the possibilities to gain access to land** (BURKINA FASO: sales /land grabbing in the northern Sudan area; withdrawal by the traditional owners, of the lands formerly lent to foreign-born occupants in the two Sudanese areas).

17. agricultural workforce: problems related to qualification or availability
Mentioned especially in BURKINA FASO: either the family workforce can be mobilized, but is poorly qualified (Northern Sahel) or it is inadequate (exodus/migration, lack of interest of youth – other areas).

The development of gold mining in new gold sites diverts the agricultural family workforce in the 3 countries:
- In NIGER: in the areas of Tillabery, Agadez, Northern Zinder, Northern Maradi
- in BURKINA FASO: more than 600 sites spread all over the national territory; about 1 million of people in the gold mining informal sector)
• in MALI: the closure in 2015 of gold sites in the cotton region had favored the return of the "manpower" in the FFs, but their reopening is causing a new loss of the family workforce.

18. service provision: some weaknesses
These weaknesses limited the efficiency of the support brought to the FFs by the Government:
• in NIGER: delay in the provision of inputs,
• in BURKINA FASO: bad quality and bad use of seeds, non-implication of FOs in their distribution.
• in MALI: bad quality of hybrid seeds (cereals, cotton); insufficient provision of the subsidized fertilizers with respect to the sown areas (in Sikasso area, 42,000 T provided against 120,000 T expected)

19. natural hazards: localized
Local problems related to the rainfall mentioned mainly:
• in NIGER (the late arrival of rain which delayed the beginning of the campaign and caused some losses)
• in BURKINA FASO (unfavorable distribution of rainfall and the sudden interruption of rain leading to the water stress mainly in the Northern Sahel; flood in the province of Tapoa, Gnagna, and Komandjari, in the East region, the provinces of Nayala and Banwa in the Boucle du Mouhoun and the provinces of Houet and Kénédougou in the Hauts Bassins)

Damages to crops caused by locusts or seed-eating birds also occurred in BURKINA FASO in the province of Oudalan.

(4) Approaches and results of family farms in coastal countries of the West Atlantic Facade (SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU)

A. The FFs results better than those of the last campaign

20. From the food-crop production perspective: improving
In the three countries, the results of the FFs were expected to be higher than those of the 2014/15 campaign.
• in SENEGAL, where the ROPPA platform has database supported by the monitoring of 2000 agricultural and agro-pastoral FFs and fishermen over 3 campaigns (2010 to 2013), the FOs have a benchmark in order to appreciate the results of the FFs.
CLASSIFICATION OF THE FFS ESTABLISHED BY THE CNCR (2013)

- Consistently from a campaign to another, 20% of them are not safe (heavily in deficit from the point of view of their agro-pastoral and/or fish production); they are farms with poor factors of production (land available: an average of 6 ha for 9 active, but that most of the time they cannot fully operate due to the fact that they are under-equipped) which cannot live relying on the sole fruit of their agro-pastoral, forestry and fish production (these farms can only feed their family for less than 3 months out of 12) and are frequently indebted.

- Between 10% and 14% (depending on the campaign) have a surplus production, covering and generating surpluses. These are FFS that are well-equipped with factors of production (an average of 11 ha for 9 active, good equipment). They have the capacity to invest.

- Between 66% and 70% (depending on the campaign) are in an intermediary situation due mainly to the inadequacy of the factors of production and they may find themselves in one or the other of the preceding groups depending on the development of those factors. 38% of them are like FFS with surplus, and 29% of them like the FFS which are not safe.

(see: CNCR, "libérer le potentiel des exploitations familiales", 2014, 126 pages)

For the 2014/2015 campaign, the farms with surplus were dominating the NIAYES (vegetables, with an average covering rate of 15 months) and the sub-region of the LOWER VALLEY RIVER (rice/onion irrigated farming, average covering rate of nearly 16 months) and one part of the forest and pastoral Region (Bas Ferlo and Kooya, livestock farming, with a rate of 17 months).

The intermediary farms were dominant in EASTERN SENEGAL (groundnut, cereals, cotton, positive results, rate of nine months and half) and CASAMANCE (groundnut, rice, fruit, cotton, very positive results, rate of 11 months), that nearly reached self-sufficiency; in the MIDDLE VALLEY area (irrigated farming, flood recession farming and livestock farming, average results, rate of 7 months) and in the HIGHER VALLEY area (same profile as in the middle valley area, bad results, covering rate of 4 months, the FFS situation was more fragile; in the GROUNDNUT BASIN, the FFS were close to insecurity in the North, with poor results and a rate of 3 months, better secured in the South, with good results and a rate of more than 6 months.)

The farms in insecurity were dominating in only one sub-region of the FOREST AND PASTORAL REGION; the Ferlo (agropastoralism, rate of 1 month and half.)

For the 2015/2016 campaign, the exploitation of the results of the 2,300 monitored FFS (of which 600 in the groundnut basin) is still partial, but shows nonetheless for the BASIN and the RIVER VALLEY, an increasing trend of the FFS production of rice (which should help reduce importations), groundnut and local cereals, but a drop of the industrial tomato.

These observations are confirmed by official statistics showing an increase of 72% of the cereal production (+61% compared to the three-year average), 57% for rice (+87% compared to the four-year average), an increase of +19% for fruit and vegetables as compared to the 2014/2015 campaign. As in Mali, these increases are not only due to the extension of the sown areas by the FFS, but also to the intensification (for the cereals, the sown areas have increased by +39%, and the production by about +72%).
• in GAMBIA, where the production of local cereals represented for the 2015/16 campaign, 46% of the domestic agricultural production, the production of groundnut, 32% and that of rice, 20%, the family farms have increased their agricultural production by 10% (+9% for cereals; + 22% for paddy rice, 28% for rice grown in the highlands; + 14% for groundnuts, 73/33; + 10% for the late millet, but a drop of 2% for the early millet; + 269% for the fonio). This increase is partly justified by the fact that the FFs have extended the farm lands (+7% as compared to the previous campaign), but also to the increase of the results (noticeable for the late millet, sorghum, paddy rice grown in the highlands and to a lesser extent for the groundnut 73/73) due to the use of the enhanced seeds and fertilizers. This explains the intensification trend.

• in GUINEA BISSAU, where rain-fed farming is implemented with only one annual cycle of farming, the family farms have also increased their production noticeably as compared to the previous campaigns for most crops. Rice (58% of the domestic cereal production; 38% in the maritime area of the Northern province, 44% in the wet area of the Southern province, 17% in the Eastern part of Sudan for irrigated crops) has increased by +28%, but has decreased as compared to the years 2000 (decrease of rice from the mangroves). Dry Cereals, the production of which covers ¾ of the domestic cereal needs (55% of the production guaranteed in the Eastern area) have increased by 26%. Meanwhile, the results have been decreasing for ten years. Legumes (niébé: +28%, groundnut: +39%) and tubers (cassava: +59%, sweet potato: +61%) have witnessed the highest increase. Furthermore, the FFs have also suffered some losses (especially in the wet area of the Southern province) due to erratic rainfalls or to the problems related to the sale of products (poor conservation of products).

The suburban vegetable farming, practiced essentially by women (tomatoes, sorrel, okra, and sweet potatoes) has been increasing for 20 years (increase of farm lands and the number of vegetable farmers).

21. From the animal production perspective

• In SENEGAL, the analysis made of the 2014/2015 campaign also provides a clear insight into the contribution of the livestock farming in family farms depending on the area or the sub-area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYAYES</th>
<th>GROUNDNUT BASIN</th>
<th>CASAMANCE</th>
<th>RIVER VALLEY</th>
<th>FOREST AND PASTORAL AREA</th>
<th>EASTERN SENEGAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYAYES</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2015/2016 campaign is characterized by an increase of +5% of the livestock farming sub-sector.

- The industrial *maritime fishing* had increased by 22% to the detriment of the traditional fishing practiced by families that had slightly decreased. Problems related to fish supply during the 2016 lean period show that there has been no improvement in traditional fishing.

- For GAMBIA, no data on livestock and fishing are available.

- For GUINEA BISSAU, the predominantly bovine and ovine *livestock farming* has constantly increased since 1970 and is concentrated in the Eastern and Northern areas (95% of the total ruminants); we know that it does not cover the domestic needs of meat and milk (imports), but we have little information about the breeders’ family farms in this country. The most important fishing and maritime resources of the country are mainly exploited by the citizens of neighboring countries or industrial fishing units. There are few domestic family fishing units earning their living with traditional fishing (3,500 traditional fishermen in the Southern and Northern area). Aquaculture is poorly developed.

- In SENEGAL, the monitored FFs have marketed on average 60% of their production during the previous campaign (from 35% in the centre of the groundnut Basin to 92% in the Niayes and the area of the large irrigated surfaces of the lower Valley). This rate was higher for the 2015/2016 campaign which enabled some surpluses. Onion producers have taken advantage of the domestic market protection policy; the producers of fruit and vegetables have been able to sufficiently serve the markets, meat supply has simply been insufficient during the festivals (import of sheep, but also onions for the Korité and Tabaski festivals). Only the groundnut sale has witnessed some problems, except for the FFs that have seized the opportunity of the Asian markets in order to sell at a price higher than the official price. This good rate of commercialization is stimulated by the domestic policy that favors the creation of many weekly markets (loumas), most favorable to the producers than the farmgate sale. In addition, the institutional markets have favored the marketing of rice and the practice of contract markets has developed (tomato, cotton, rice, maize, groundnut, seeds, milk) ; however, the crisis of the tomato processing industry will have in 2015/2016, negative consequences on the FFs of the Valley who produce these crops).

28. *From the trading point of view : improving in the trading conditions in 2 countries out of 3*
• In GAMBIA, groundnut has been well commercialized and paid cash at a satisfactory price (the equivalent of 150F/kg). The improvement of trade conditions is included in the domestic policy perspectives ("Vision 2020"), and the future priorities of Gambian FOs.

• IN GUINEA BISSAU, family farms are victims of intermediaries who impose their prices and do not guarantee a regular sale. (no warehouses).

B. Factors which favored the production of good results at the family farm level

29. Natural factors: have globally played a positive role but differently, depending on the areas
• in SENEGAL and GAMBIA: good rainfall
• in GUINEA BISSAU: soil fertility (despite the over-exploitation – contribution of artificial fertilizers in the lowlands and compost in vegetable farms)

30. access to inputs for FFs (seeds, fertilizers: has been facilitated
• SENEGAL where the "rice self-sufficiency" program has deeply mobilized the producers and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER) asserts that as far as the rice, groundnut and maize sectors are concerned, the quantities of the subsidized seeds have reached record levels over the past 5 years (but the farmers’ opinion is more mitigated on the situation)
• GAMBIA: drop in the price of fertilizers, contribution of high-yield rice and maize – PPAAO, FAO, NARI, ADB/FASDEP contribution: seed banks, innovation/seed platforms, AU-CRAB project.

ASPRODEB supports; FOs (AFET, FANDEMA) support in the constitution of seed stocks, the creation of seed cooperatives and the implementation of seed programs.

• GUINEA BISSAU: no support

31. Public investments made in infrastructures and support for the FFs equipment: have been effective
• SENEGAL: the creation of marketing infrastructures, construction – equipment subsidies (according to official sources, expenditures related to the mechanization have increased by 60%, compared to their value in 2014, a result of the efforts made by the government these past years for the modernization of agriculture)
• GAMBIA: construction of dikes and bridges (NEMA/IFAD and GCAV/ADB projects)
• GUINEA BISSAU: some supports to the FFs for the animal drawn cultivation provided by the Government or projects

– Support/assistance guaranteed to the FFs: have intensified
• SENEGAL: supports/assistance of the FOs: grouped provision (inputs, equipment), production of certified seeds, support and guidance (cotton, rice, global), and marketing support.
• GAMBIA: program relayed by the cooperatives
• GUINEA BISSAU: provision of facilitators and technicians for the monitoring/assistance of the FFs by the Regional Directories of Agriculture and NGOs.

C. Factors that have limited the FFs progress capacities

32. The fertility degradation: generalized

It is different in the three countries depending on the agro-ecological areas. In Senegal, the current data show that almost 2/3 of the arable lands (WB, 2009), that is 2.5 million of hectares and about 34% of the country surface (CSE, 2011) are affected by diverse forms of degradation. Out of the 34% of degraded lands, only 5% present a high density of degradation, less than 24% is moderate and 4% is poor.

33. The equipment level of the family farms: remain poor

- SENEGAL: this equipment level is rudimentary or worn out in the groundnut Basin, Casamance, the forest and pastoral area and in Eastern Senegal; subsidies are insufficient everywhere in order to improve and renew this equipment.
- GAMBIA: lack of adequate equipment
- GUINEA BISSAU: use of traditional equipment in the village FFs, difficulties in getting access to better equipment; use of modern equipment in the farms of ponteiros (major farm owners).

34. The size of the usable areas and land issues: tendency to saturation intensified by land grabbing

- SENEGAL: land saturation in the groundnut basin, insufficiency of constructions in the Valley where the poor capacities of Government in supporting the hydro-agricultural constructions lead to the privatization of lands in favor of private investors (PDIDAS).
- GAMBIA: land grabbing (especially the trans-border arable lands by foreign firms and investment funds); absence of land rights protection (evasive and inefficient regulatory framework)
- GUINEA BISSAU: land is owned by Government that gives the best lands to ponteiros (award of concessions from 20 to 3,000 ha representing 27% of the cultivable lands to 2,200 farmers equipped with modern means of production, but who are most of the time absent – only 1,200 are really installed). 90,000 small village farmers ensure 90% of the domestic agricultural production by cultivating small surfaces (about 2ha/FF) and have to rent lands.

35. Political support and provision of services to the FFsF: some lacks

- SENEGAL: subsidies are appreciated by the FFs, meanwhile, their efficiency is limited due to the insufficiency of the subsidies quotas (seeds and fertilizers), the delay in their provision and to the fact that private storers take advantage of this situation more than vulnerable families that do not benefit from the mechanisms of prioritization.

Concerning the amelioration of the rural population access to basic social services through the implementation of socio-economic infrastructures the rural families are supposed to benefit from, programs have existed (PNDL) or exist (PUDC), but their realizations are less visible.

- GAMBIA: delays in the provision of seeds (rice – PPAOP program)
- GUINEA BISSAU: absence of seed policy and legislation in this area; absence of the control of production, multiplication and certification of seeds. Some problems in providing the FFs with enhanced and certified seeds.

36. Some natural hazards: even for a good year, the FFs are exposed to natural risks

The main climate hazard in these countries has been related to the rainfall: the excess of rains (heavy rains that have affected the production of the early millet, the salt intrusion into freshwater in GAMBIA, the passage of the hurricane in GUINEA BISSAU) and floods that have resulted from this hurricane and that especially have affected rice production.
Attacks from grasshoppers have also affected the production in GUINEA BISSAU.
We also notice in SENEGAL (Casamance, Niayes) and in GAMBIA, the effects on salinization of water on the irrigated crops (rice, market gardening).

**D. Ambivalent factors**
At least two factors contribute to the improvement of the financial results of the family farms, but they have adverse effects:

37. The lower cost of workforce
Mentioned in the contribution of GAMBIA, in fact it applies to the FFs of all the countries and enables them to limit the cost of production. Meanwhile, there is an obvious problem of social equity and it contributes to moving the youth away from agriculture and forcing them to emigrate.

38. The development of cashew exploitation
Mentioned in the contribution of GUINEA BISSAU (main producer and exporter of cashew where 2/3 of farmers plant cashew trees that increase their incomes). The extension of these plantations is done on the surfaces previously occupied by food-crop production and to their detriment. The cashew tree has in addition, some negative effects on fertility. This ambivalence of crops is found elsewhere, namely in LIBERIA, with other speculations (rubber tree, palm oil trees...)

(5) Approaches and results of family farms in the forest-rich countries recently affected by Ebola fever (GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, LIBERIA)

A. A resumption of the FFs contribution after the epidemic

39. From the food-crop production perspective: a net increase
- GUINEA: the main food-crop produced by the FFs are as follows in order of importance: (1) rice, (2) cassava, (3) maize, (4) fonio, (5) groundnuts, (6) yams, (7) potato, (8) banana. Salt production is important.

  **Situation during the 2014/2015 campaign in the 2 regions affected by the EVD epidemic (MARITIME GUINEA and FOREST GUINEA)**

- The FFs have on average ensured a cover of **7 months** out of 12 (difficult lean period, frequent indebtedness of the FFs)
- They have contributed to half of the domestic rice production with good results (MG: 34% of the production with a yield of 2.8T/ha; FG: 17% with a yield of 2.3 T/ha) and very few losses (respectively 8% and 7%).
- They have contributed to 37% of maize domestic production with a yield of 1.15 T/ha (MG) and 1.05 T (FG) and lower losses (2%)

  → in the 2 regions that have not been affected by EVD (MIDDLE GUINEA and HIGH GUINEA)

- The FFs have ensured on average a covering of 9 months
- They have contributed to 63% of the maize domestic production with better results than MG and FG (MG: 32%, 1,37T/Ha; HG: 31%, 1,23T/Ha), with more losses (5%).
- They have ensured the other half of rice domestic production, with poorer yields and more losses (MG: 10% of the prod., 1,2T/ha, 10% of losses; HG: 38% of the prod., 1,28T/ha, losses: 15%)

Such detailed data are not available on the results of the FFs during the 2015/16 campaign, where the FFs have benefited from the measures taken in order to revive plant production, but the collected indications show that the FFs have really reacted to the encouragement and that resumption has effectively taken place. Agricultural production has been above the five-year average and vegetable crops have enabled the FFs to store food up and increase their incomes.

- SIERRA LEONE: main food-crop produced by the FFs are as follows: rice (produced by 85% of the FFs), cassava (consumed in various forms, higher urban demand), maize, sorghum, sweet potato and groundnut. Other
products: palm oil (main forest product), citrus, cocoa, coffee, coconut, sugar cane.

The results of the 2015/16 campaign that came from the farmer survey carried out by the platform on an UP LANDS (plains) site and on two LOW LANDS (shallows) sites are not quantified, but show progress in terms of quantity and quality (considered as above average), meanwhile, the yield remain average and losses have increased. Food-crop production does not cover domestic needs (significant imports, namely for rice).

- **Liberia:** food-crop production is essentially a family affair, predominantly rice-growing (basic food produced by 71% of the FFs according to traditional techniques – slash-and-burn farming; poor results: 1.1T/ha) and legumes, supplemented by tree crops. 87% of agricultural lands are dedicated to rice and legumes. The field survey carried out by the FOs with the farmers who have benefited from an assistance (leading farmers) for the 2015/2016 campaign shows that:

  - In the 3 agro-ecological areas, the monitored FFs have accumulated surpluses: NORTHERN SAVANNAH: very good rice and cereal quantities (the highest surpluses), average results for legumes. LOWER TROPICAL FOREST: very good legume quantity, good rice and cereals quantities. UPPER HIGHLAND TROPICAL FOREST (agricultural belt): very good legume quantities, good rice and cereal quantities. In general, farmers estimate that the results have been good (especially in the LOWER TROPICAL FOREST area).

  - In the COASTAL PLAINS area, family farms have remained in deficit with bad results for rice and cereals, slightly better for legumes and very poor results.

**40. from the animal production and fishing perspective:** very slow increase

- **Guinea:** livestock farming, bovine predominantly, ranks second among the most extended activities in GUINEA family farms, especially in the Fouta Djalon. In terms of value, bovine production ranked third before the epidemic as far as contribution to the domestic agricultural production is concerned. According to information coming from farmers, livestock farming, still in 2014/15, enabled them to ensure the agropastoral FFs, a covering of up to 10 months. However, significant losses have been witnessed during this campaign, especially for aviculture. Due to prevention measures taken in order to restrain the epidemic, livestock farming has slowed down throughout the whole nation.

  - **Bovine losses:** in the areas directly affected by the EVD: MG: 8%, FG: 10%; in non-affected areas: MG: 12%, HG: 10%

  - **Poultry losses:** areas directly affected: MG: 60%, FG: 70%; other areas: MG: 55%, HG: 60%

Where **fishing** is concerned, the 2014/2015 agricultural campaign as the other sectors, has also been affected by the epidemic mainly on landing sites on the coastline (Forécariah, Boffa, Dubréka and Boké) leading to the desertion of the fishermen villages

- **Sierra Leone:** livestock farming is relatively marginal and is not sufficient to cover the domestic needs. Cattle breeding is concentrated in the North, with very low rates of parturition and a high mortality rate. On the national level, poultry represents the greatest part of livestock farming (depending on the areas, 71% to 75% of the interviewed FFs are involved in poultry breeding, 40% in small ruminants).

  According to the platform, products of river, lake and maritime fishing as well as aquaculture constitute the main source of proteins for the majority of Sierra-Leone people (their contributions to the domestic economy are more important than those of livestock farming). Fishing is an important source of employment and income for the rural family farms. Small-scale maritime fishing practiced by families of fishermen is in competition with the capital-intensive industrial fishing lead by foreigners.

  The fishing situation has not been reported in the contribution of Sierra Leone for the 2015/16 campaign.
• **LIBERIA:** the contributions of livestock farming are marginal and even lower when we consider those of meat from hunting. For climatic reasons, cattle breeding is very rarely practiced, but rather the breeding of small ruminants (goats, ranked twentieth among the domestic agricultural, forest, pastoral and fishing production before the EVD epidemic, pig breeding (ranked 9th), and the poultry breeding (ranked 7th). It is in the area of LOWER TROPICAL FOREST that livestock farming is most developed. According to the information collected from farmers in 2006:

- **For the county of Lofa (NORTHERN SAVANNAH):** 3% of the domestic animal production (3% of the produc. of poultry, 4% of small ruminants, 3% of pig) – average increase
- **For the county of Nimba (LOWER TROPICAL FOREST):** 29% of the domestic animal production (31% prod. of poultry, 34% of small ruminants, 14% of pig) – strongly progressing
- **For the county of Bong (UPPER HIGHLAND TROPICAL FOREST):** 7% of the domestic animal production (5% of the poultry, 8% of small ruminants, 6% of pigs) – average increase
- **For the county of Bomi (COASTAL PLAINS):** 3% of the domestic production (3% of the poultry, 4% of small ruminants, 3% of the pig). - drop.

Where **fishing** is concerned, it highly contributes to food supply and GDP, information collected from farmers comes from the areas that have no maritime access and have to do with the continental fishing (practiced mostly by women) and this ensures additional resources to FFs. In the four counties taken into account, the results are down compared to the previous campaigns.

The traditional maritime canoe fishing or fishing from the beach along the coastal strip, mainly in the counties of Cap Mount, Grand Kou and Montserrado, creates direct or indirect employments (fish processing). It has to deal with competition from traditional fishermen of the neighboring countries and industrial fishing.

**41. from the product marketing perspective: supply hardly follows demand**

- **GUINEA:** for the 2014/15 campaign: whereas the sale of rice has been affected by the EVD epidemic, this epidemic has mostly affected the production of other products rather than their commercialization. ²

The scarcity of fishing products has led to the 2014/15 fish price boom.

- **SIERRA LEONE:** over the 3 surveyed sites, the commercialization of products has been limited and has not fully satisfied the farmers.

---

³It is estimated that after the border closure in 2013/2014, (individual and group) producers of potatoes would have lost about 45,600,000,000 GNF (6,514,286 USD) of their income that is an average of about 4,000,000 GNF per active farmer in the sector during the rainy season and off-season campaign. The closure of these markets is a loss for the producers, traders, transporters and tax services.
• LIBERIA: according to the survey on farmers, marketing of products has been good in Nimba (LOWER TROPICAL FOREST), good in Lofa (NORTHERN SAVANNAH) and Bong (UPPER HIGHLAND TROPICAL FOREST), but bad in Bomi (COASTAL PLAINS).

B) External factors that favored the resumption

42. Natural conditions: favorable in general
In the three countries, water is abundant and, except in certain areas where lands are poor (Sierra Leone), fertility is good, which favors the relaunch of production. The access of the three countries to coastal areas with important fish resources also gives the fishing industry a good potential for growth.

43. Return of security: peace has returned but conflicts still subsist
It especially concerns LIBERIA and SIERRA LEONE where the specter of civil war has gone away. However, new insecurity factors appear around conflicts related to the access to space (reported especially in Sierra Leone).

44. Rehabilitation measures post Ebola epidemic: structural measures tend to replace humanitarian aid
• GUINEA: priority is given by the Government to the support of plant production for the 2014/15 and 2015/16 campaigns; input import (fertilizers, phytosanitary products, equipment) sold at subsidized prices (45%).
• SIERRA LEONE: support of international Aid; provision of rice seeds, fertilizers, tools and distribution of food against work (food for work) – 100,000 beneficiary families. Creation of health centers, free Mother and Infant Protection (PMI) health system.
• LIBERIA: several programs financed by the international aid (among which we have the rehabilitation program of the agricultural sector), but it is difficult to measure their impacts on the FFs because agriculture and its monitoring by government services are not part of the Government priorities.

45. Access to space usable by the FFs: where access is possible
Throughout the Guinean territory, the FFs do not have major problems of access to land. Access to land is also possible for the FFs of Liberia in the NOTHERN SAVANNAH and the UPPER HIGHLAND TROPICAL FOREST areas. However, access is more difficult in the other regions of Liberia and in Sierra Leone.

C. Factors that have limited the effective resumption

46. The epidemic of Ebola fever: continues to have "delayed effects"
On the one hand, the epidemic has led to a loss within the rural population that deprives today some FFs of their valid workforce and increases the cost of workforce (noticed by more than 80% of the interviewed Guinean farmers), and on the other hand, this epidemic has led to the disorganization of the rural world that has not recovered its balance yet (cessation of community assistance at the time of ploughing and harvesting, desertion of the affected areas and concentration of people and herds in the spare areas, interruptions of the supply chains, disruption of services and markets due to some preventive measures forbidding the movement of persons and herds).

47. Application of the stimulus measures in the provision of services to the FFs: some weaknesses
• GUINEA: inadequate system for the provision of the inputs managed by the National Chamber of Agriculture and the decentralized public services: cash transfer that does not take into account the poor economic situation of the FFs impacted by the EVD; the cost of the technical package (inputs, support-guidance) has discouraged a significant portion of FFs, which in turn reduced the impact on the results.
• SERRA LEONE: insufficient and limited access to seeds and fertilizers; poorly supported dissemination, absence of fairness in the provision of services to the FFs. Difficult access to the health centers created.
• LIBERIA: delays in the provision of inputs, little support by the government due to the poor interest in agriculture, absence of financial support expected by the farmers in order to grow on larger surfaces. Poor quality of the services provided for family farms.

48. The under-equipment of family farms: remains an obstacle to improvement
This problem is strongly reported in the three countries and prevents the FFs from improving their farming practices.
• GUINEA: demand of equipment by FFs, but their provision is difficult, existence of community equipment but difficulty in getting them.
• SERRA LEONE: rudimentary family equipment (hoes, machetes, poor level of mechanization); very poor mechanization of community equipment and absence of spare parts.
• LIBERIA: rudimentary family equipment; insufficient community equipment and infrastructures ("main challenge")

49. workforce: inadequate
This inadequacy is related to the exodus or migration of young people; it is reported in GUINEA (for the areas affected by the EVD (Maritime Guinea, forest Guinea) and in SERRA LEONE (migration departure, high costs).

50. Space management and resulting conflicts: pressures on lands and land conflicts
• GUINEA: these tensions are one of the consequences of the Ebola epidemic. On the one hand, in the areas affected by the EVD, some plots are abandoned, which reduces the space used by the FFs; On the other hand, the epidemic has forced major herds to set up on the lands intended for intensive farming, leading to an overexploitation of water, grazing and community equipment resources which results in conflicts between farmers and breeders.
• SERRA LEONE: land access is difficult for vulnerable people (women, young people), frequent conflicts related to unclear nature of the limits of family lands; multiplication of conflicts between farmers, breeders and land owners, which compromises security.
• LIBERIA: strong space competition between the FFs and the main industrial plantations (rubber tree, oil palm …).

51. Natural hazards: not significant
• They are reported in SERRA LEONE, where production has been affected by extreme heat eruption and flood. Some landslides have caused the destruction of homes and damages to rice fields in Lower Guinea.

(6) Approaches and results of family farms in the coastal countries of the South Atlantic Facade (CÔTE D’IVOIRE, GHANA, TOGO, BENIN)

D. Some relatively stable results

52. from the food production perspective: Even if food security is not threatened, some decline is observed
• CÔTE D’IVOIRE: the government services forecast before the end of the campaign, an increase of 9% of the global agricultural, forest, pastoral and fishing production, but farmers noticed on their farms, based on the analysis of weekly results that food production has fallen (about 40% for cassava, 30% for plantain). For them, competition from cash crops (especially rubber production) seems to be one of the causes of this decline. Losses related to the difficulties in getting access to plots of lands are important (sometimes ranging from 30 to 50%).
• GHANA: Production was delayed due to the late arrival of rains (the results of the surveys
are therefore not definitive). In the coastal savanna area, production appears to have remained unchanged in quantity and quality when compared to the previous campaign. In the transition area, the quantity and quality were very good and good in the Guinean savanna area; in both areas, there were no losses and the FF’s debt is low. However, farmers do not expect any surpluses.

- **TOGO**: Food production has generally been in surplus, with some fairly satisfactory results, (however, productivity remains poor). This has permitted to ensure domestic food security. Meanwhile, except for legumes, production is slightly decreasing when compared to the 2014/2015 campaign, and the sorghum and millet have witnessed severe poor performances (decline of more than the two-thirds of the production).

- **BENIN**: the rainfall problem and the lower covering of the needs for fertilizers have resulted in the global decline of food production (especially rice, millet/sorghum, cowpeas, groundnut; only maize, yam and cassava are expected to be in surplus). The farmers’ observations on the results (decline of the results for rice in Atacora and for soya in the food crop area of the South Borgou, but we notice a fairly good performance of the cereal production – sorghum, maize, small millet-, legumes - groundnuts, cowpeas – and tubers - yams, potatoes, sweet potatoes) made them more optimistic in rural areas than the government services that were expecting a generalized decline of food production (maize: -5%; rice: -13%; millet: -9%; tubers: -11%; market gardening: -8% …). The losses due to the delayed rains (especially for maize) or to service provisions (collection of products, for example seeds from farmers suppliers of seeds), as well as the important financial losses due to the sale of products at slashed prices.

**OBSERVATION OF FAMILY FARM DYNAMICS**

« Of the 40 ha of maize I grew, I did not harvest even a single maize cob, although I had already put in the fertilizer. I also grew yam for 20 ha, while I was expecting 40 tons, I only got 20 tons. For cotton, I grew 15 ha but instead of the 2 tons I used to harvest per ha, I only got 1T200 per ha »
53. From the animal production and fishing perspective: good results for livestock farming, lower fishing catches

- Livestock farming: has been little analyzed by the platforms of this group; In TOGO where 90% of the FFs practice livestock farming associated with agriculture and satisfy two-thirds of the domestic needs, the number of ruminant heads is increasing. The same situation is observed in BENIN, but it is stagnating in CÔTE D’IVOIRE. The CTOP notices that the poultry farming is increasing in TOGO and for the ONAPACI, it is slightly increasing in CÔTE D’IVOIRE where despite this situation, it does not meet the demand.

- Fishing: the effects of global warming on maritime fishing seem to be more perceptible on the South side of the Atlantic than on the West side (migration of fish to colder waters), and the decline of traditional fishing is reported in CÔTE D’IVOIRE, in TOGO and in BENIN. As in the other coastal countries of West Africa, maritime traditional fishing is suffering from the growing competition of industrial fishing which is taking advantage of the situation and is showing increasing national results. The traditional fishing crisis is reflected in the fish processing, essentially carried out by women (reported in GHANA).

The decline of continental fishing and fish production is reported in BENIN. In TOGO where fishing covers 58% of the domestic needs, fish production, still less developed, has increased by 15% from 2011 to 2014, whereas fishing production has increased only by 1.5% (a downward trend over a four-year average due to the reduction of the continental shelf and the illegal industrial overfishing).

54. From the commercialization perspective: variable marketing depending on the country, in a context of growing integration of FFs to markets.

- CÔTE D’IVOIRE: product marketing is one of the main concerns of the farmers because intermediaries take advantage of the absence of market organization. Production and financial losses are therefore important for the family farms and affect the profitability of the farms. This is a factor of indebtedness and the discouragement of young people who are then obliged to go elsewhere in order to get better incomes (exodus, working in rubber plantations for a salary...).

- GHANA: product marketing has been good in the coastal area (opportunities guaranteed by the market of Accra). Product sale is fast in the transition area where consumers buy goods on the farms and where there are main markets (some of them are cross-border markets). But it is bad in the Guinean savanna area.

- TOGO: the FF’s production has led to the provision of rural markets with sufficient and good quality food at generally satisfactory prices for the producers and the consumers (except for the peak in May and June). The sale of cereal products has therefore faced some problems (less competitive maize, few promising domestic markets, poor capacity to research foreign markets).

- BENIN: the sale was satisfactory. It is based on a good network of local and trans-border food markets, and the multiplication of livestock markets. It particularly benefits from the opportunities offered by large urban centers and Nigeria (under more or less favorable conditions due to the fluctuation of the Naira and the handicap of movement of persons and goods that subsist despite the ECOWAS legislation). Most of the times, the FFs act through some traders who remove their products from the farms and carry them to the markets. Through their FOs (FUPRO), institutional and contract markets also offer some opportunities for the FFs. (National Office for Food Security, National Company for Agriculture Promotion, WFP, HCR, Caritas, local government...).
B. Several factors potentially favorable to family farming

55. An important space usable for farming: quality space accessible to family farms in principle

Farmers know that the agro-ecological conditions are suitable for their activities and there is the presence of fertility bases (GHANA, TOGO; BENIN: 60% of agricultural lands, very fertile valleys – the basin of Ouémé is the most fertile in Africa after the basin of the Nile). The traditional land system makes lands accessible to family farmers under some conditions (GHANA; TOGO: 54% of the lands acquired by inheritance, 13% by grants; 26% of the lands for loan or rental).

56. The existence of a family workforce: the qualification level of which is increasing

This workforce has a strong female component (29% of the FF’s workforce in TOGO), and is increasingly receiving an attention in the area of capacity building for product processing (GHANA). When they have access to capacity building (that is particularly the case of the farmers, members of the FOs), the qualification of all the members of the family farm is enhanced by training and guidance offered to them, particularly by the FOs (GHANA, BENIN).

57. An economic dynamism and a relative security: that should be promising for the family farming

Stimulated by port activities (Ports of ACCRA, ABIDJAN, LOME, COTONOU) and trans-border exchanges, this dynamism favors the development of urban centers and business opportunities. The network of large markets and local markets that exists in each of these countries connects the rural producers to the rich basins of consumption. The intensity of communication and exchanges puts the rural population into contact with innovations in the area of technologies and ideas.

The social climate is sufficiently peaceful so as to allow the farmers to carry out their business without any problem (return of social peace in CÔTE D’IVOIRE, disappearance of thefts in GHANA).

C. But these positive factors are impeded

The main impeding factors are:

58. FF’s difficulty in taking advantage of the natural opportunities: poor productivity

For the platforms, this first difficulty is due to five main factors:

- The accentuation of the climatic variations affecting the rainfall. The delays in the arrival of the rain and its irregularity have impacted the producers farming calendar of the year. The sowing has been delayed, the emergence and growth rates were poor, water stress was frequent, especially for rice (BENIN, CÔTE D’IVOIRE, and TOGO). In GHANA, droughts have disrupted crops.

- A trend in fertility reduction and depletion of soils and generally in the deterioration of the natural capital of production. This may be related to:
  - Access to quality inputs (the supply is less than the demand and the use of seeds “coming directly” from CÔTE D’IVOIRE; 15% of the seeds used in TOGO are enhanced or certified seeds; in BENIN, the needs for rice and maize seeds are covered at about 50%, and the needs for fertilizers and phytosanitary products at less than 70%)
  - Bad practices: abusive use of artificial fertilizers and treatment products in order to produce more or compensate the inadequacy of the workforce, the ageing and non-regeneration of the orchards, abandonment of farms and their maintenance due to the discouragement caused by the fall of the prices (CÔTE D’IVOIRE).
  - Decapitalization: sale of livestock during the lean season (GHANA)

- The deficiencies of the family workforce, a portion of which remains unskilled (GHANA), whereas young people tend to leave the farm
in order to get better incomes elsewhere (they escape to rubber plantations where the monthly salary equals one year of income from food crops – CÔTE D’IVOIRE). The FFs are obliged to use hired labor (CÔTE D’IVOIRE, BÉNIN).

- The inadequacy of farming equipment. This equipment remains rudimentary (poor mechanization) in the majority of FFs of the four countries, and working is highly painful.

- The inadequacy of credit which limits the investment capacities. In GHANA, in order to avoid indebtedness, many FFs have refused the grant of production credit because of the bad granting conditions (delayed approval which compromises the use of credit in time in order to get good results, high rates), and preferred to used their personal funds. In CÔTE D’IVOIRE, some FFs that have borrowed money in order to enhance their farms were unable to pay it back and became indebted.

- In GHANA: land is available under some conditions in the transition area and the Guinea savanna area, meanwhile, small farmers do not possess lands and have to negotiate contracts before they can farm. On the other hand, in the coastal area, small farmers fear the disturbing developments related to the possibilities of gaining access to lands (land grabbing).

- In BENIN, small farms do not have lands due to their grabbing by wealthy nationals (civil servants, traders).

- In TOGO, the land market is opaque. Lands belong to communities or individuals but they do not have any legal document. The land code which is being elaborated is not favorable to farmers (assimilated to the urban land code). The government’s policy is to develop agricultural centers, which will directly result in the grabbing of large farmlands.

59. The FFs difficulties in taking advantage of the usable space and risks of social tension: poor management of space and land-related conflicts

The dispersal of lands and the difficulties in gaining access to these lands can justify production losses (CÔTE D’IVOIRE). But above all, there is a very strong competition of space between food production and cash crops (CÔTE D’IVOIRE), or between farmers and herdsmen (BENIN), and the increasing land conflicts are factors of insecurity and social tension.

- in CÔTE D’IVOIRE land conflicts are recurrent (land conflicts between food producers and rubber plantation owners, conflicts about the return of the people that have been chased from the classified forests and who find their former lands occupied by other people).

60. Farmers feeling excluded from the economic prosperity:

Lack of adequate Government support

- Precarious viability

Under the above-described conditions, the profitability of the family farms is very low, and farmers are right to worry about their future when they notice as in Côte d’Ivoire that the incomes earned in the industrial farms are considerably more important than those they get from their food production.

The farmer from Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Togo or Benin feeds his country, but does pay a high price for it.
**TOGOLESE FARMERS’ PROBLEMS**

Generally, farmers are not able to cover the costs (except for cash crops) of food production, especially maize which is largely produced. Productivity is very low in Togo (lower rate of use of the enhanced seeds, problems in gaining access to artificial fertilizers, increasing infertility of lands, few promising markets) about 1.5 t/ha, which leads to the very high cost of production and this situation cannot enable them to cover the expenditures incurred in the production.

As a result, in the majority of cases, they cannot cover the family basic needs (health, education, social needs, etc.). On the other hand, some farmers of the wet and dry agro-ecological areas favorable to cotton farming prefer this crop to provide for their needs. In the forest area too, coffee and cocoa are the choices adopted to cover the family needs”.

(contribution of the CTOP – TOGO)

• **A badly assisted farmer**

Except for the case of GHANA, where the national program for the subsidy of fertilizers has been reintroduced in 2016 after its interruption, there is no consistent subsidy policy to family farms. In TOGO, the targeted subsidy policy for vulnerable farms is a problem. In BENIN input subsidies have been promised in vain in 2016. In CÔTE D’IVOIRE, nothing has been done in this area. Observations made by the other ROPPA platforms show however, that such policies have been successful in the countries where they have been implemented.

The FOs can legitimately ask themselves whether in this last group of well-endowed coastal countries, public authorities do not simply focus on industrial farming and fail to make farming their priority. See. *Booklet 3 (MONITORING OF PUBLIC POLICIES WITH REGARDS TO FAMILY FARMS and EFFECTIVENESS OF FARMERS ACTIONS)*.

61. Farmers’ solutions

• **First solution: farming experience**

“"It is by using their traditional knowledge that family farms created their plantations, produce, keep and sell their products. (...) Throughout the [agricultural] chain value, policies and programs are tacit”(according to the CÔTE D'IVOIRE platform contribution).

It is on their knowledge and own experience that family farms first rely upon in order to elaborate some strategies and develop initiatives enabling them to survive. So, for example, the contribution of the platform of Togo is aware that 70% of these family farms, the problems of which it is depicting, are seeking the improvement of farming productivity by associating livestock farming to agriculture. This point will be discussed further in chapter IV on family farms’ strategies.

• **second solution : les organisations paysannes**

Since they have been set up by farmers themselves, they are best placed to support their strategies through appropriate neighborhood outreach services. This will be discussed later in the second part of this report.
The strategies of family farms
62. "Family farm strategies" refers here to the types of paths and approaches they chose to achieve the objectives they pursue, in view of the opportunities and constraints they are facing. A farmer’s observatory is in the best position to provide its contribution to the knowledge of these strategies which is essential to develop appropriate approaches for guidance, assistance and support.

63. Each national platform of ROPPA organized in June 2016 analysis workshops which helped generate three types of information:

- the driving forces of family strategies,
- their approaches
- and their implementation procedures.

(8) The driving force of family farm strategies

64. Platforms identified three main types of driving forces:

- first driving force: main family motivation
  As the case may be, securing family livelihoods ("Crops are first grown to ensure food for own consumption and then the surplus is sold to meet social needs" - CÔTE D’IVOIRE), improving income, or conveying property (SIERRA LEONE). Those motivations may change and sometimes be combined. The main motivation will determine the basic options for family strategy. "They choose specialization within the framework of cash crops (increase in income, access to institutional support) and diversification as part of food security" (GUINEA).

- second driving force: adaptation to opportunities or to constraints
  Opportunities and constraints are positive and negative sides of the same coin. Family farms (FF) combine their choices depending on fluctuations in climate (climate change) and rainfall, market trends and possibilities for access to supports. Those opportunities may also influence family trade-offs between food crops and cash crops.

"In the SOUTHERN and CENTRAL Areas of Benin characterized by two rainy seasons, (a short one and a long one) a year, growers vary crops according to season (they grow in priority during the short season, corn, beans and groundnut, and rice during the long rainy season). As chemical fertilizers are less used by growers from southern and central regions, crops from the short season (bean, corn, groundnut etc.) are used to fertilize the soil through decomposition of leaves for the benefit of crops of the long rainy season. In addition to those main reasons, some growers diversify depending on trends in prices of farm products. Thus, there are years during which it is corn price that is more profitable than the one of bean or it is cassava price that is more cost-effective than the one of potato. If it turns out that a farmer grows nothing but corn and that it is bean price which has increased in that year, that grower would have lost a very great deal ».

In the NORTHERN areas of the country where cotton cultivation leads the market, growers perform diversification to make sure that food crops (corn, bean) benefit from post-effects of fertilizers used to cure cotton farms" (BENIN)
- third driving force: solidarity mechanisms

Through mutual help (GUINEA) or contributions from migrant workers and migrants (GUINEA BISSAU), this solidarity, "although it is very strong among the FFs, does not prevent them from suffering" (SIERRA LEONE) and tends to crumble due to rising individualism (CÔTE D’IVOIRE).

(9) Approaches of family strategies

65. Two major approaches that may be adjusted by a family depending on market conditions:

- Securing family farm

This is the basic approach, and it is the one which first prompts family farms to seek to increase their production. A whole range of sub-strategies may be implemented, most of which are based on a form of diversification and may be added up in variable proportions depending on constraints and opportunities.
### Main Securing Strategies Reported by the Platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diversification of speculations</th>
<th>Multiplication of speculations, combination of crops, combination of perennial crops/horticulture or irrigation farming (to deal with lean season), combination depending on circumstances of cash crops/food crops…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination of agricultural, fishing and breeding activities</strong></td>
<td>The most common is the combination of agriculture and animal husbandry (small and large animal breeding); agriculture/arboriculture; hunting and gathering (forest areas); agriculture/fish farming. Some fishermen are involved in vegetable farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parallel conduct of non-agricultural activities</strong></td>
<td>Upward trend. Often carried out by women (trade, handicraft, product processing, catering) and youth (provision of service, alluvial gold mining, unskilled worker, motorcycle taxi driving, coal production), but increasingly by men (livestock trade, transport, logging, wage-earning, sale of gasoline and spare parts, operation of video clubs…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of exodus and migrations</strong></td>
<td>Exodus may lead to urban areas (e.g. Motorcycle-taxi in Sierra Leone) or rural areas (seasonal employment, mining – Senegal, Liberia). The analysis made in Senegal shows that this mechanism is very different depending on areas and EAZ; in Mali one emphasizes the fact that decision of departure for migration is collective: the whole family contributes to its financing (sale of animals). In Guinea Bissau, it is reported that migrants’ money transfers tend to increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **BURKINA, MALI, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, GUINEA, LIBERIA, CÔTE D’IVOIRE, TOGO** |
| **SENEGAL, GUINEA, TOGO, and more particularly for animal husbandry : GUINEA BISSAU, GHANA, TOGO, BENIN** |
| **URKINA, MALI, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, CÔTE D’IVOIRE, GHANA, BENIN** |
| **MALI, SENEGAL, GUINEA BISSAU, SIERRA LEONE, LIBERIA** |
When all the strategies have failed, the family leaves farming (reported in CÔTE D'IVOIRE)

- Increase in FF revenue
  This objective is pursued by the FFs when security is guaranteed, or depending on opportunities.
(10) Terms of family strategies’ implementation

66. Two main terms of implementation of FF strategies are highlighted by the platforms. They work together.

- **Decision-making within the family**
  
  Decisions are related to campaign strategies (choice of production - diversification/specialization, especially when food insecurity is in sight; planning for needs – MALI, BURKINA FASO), family organization of work (division of tasks between farm manager, women and youth, use of external unskilled workers, planning – BURKINA FASO, GUINEA, CÔTE D’IVOIRE), satisfaction of the family needs (nutrition, health, schooling – GUINEA). The issue of work compensation within the FFs is not clarified (“the FF survival depends in large part on unpaid use of women and children’s work. This dimension is not taken into account by farm managers; they spend money lavishly” –SIERRA LEONE). Different decision-making methods are described. Traditionally, the head of family takes the main decisions and he is himself responsible for supply and activity monitoring (BURKINA FASO), but a change toward collective decision-making methods involving all the FFs members is noted (MALI, SENEGAL).

- **Backup of farmers’ organizations**
  
  It involves the FFs which are members of an organization. They rely on their farmers’ organization by using their services, by participating to experience sharing between farmers, and by enjoying the fruits of their advocacy actions (mentioned in MALI, GAMBIA, LIBERIA and GHANA).

The use of farmers’ organizations outreach services complies with family farms’ strategies and supports the two strategies previously described (securing the FFs and increasing income). It depends on the opportunity provided by the existence of those outreach services. Those services enable the FFs to better achieve their own objectives.

67. Provision of support and advisory service by farmers’ organizations will be efficient if it is based on those family strategies.
Conclusions drawn by ROPPA on the observation of family farm features during the 2014-15 and 2015-16 agricultural campaigns: HOW TO STRENGTHEN THE VIABILITY of family farms?

Overview:
Each commission in charge of FFOs in each national platform, examined in June the data collected on family farm features in order to validate and draw conclusions from them at ROPPA’s request on the issues of viability of family farms and attractiveness to farmers. In November 2016, the Board and the Executive Secretariat took up those platforms’ contribution to draw conclusions at regional level and over 4 points. They are consecutively presented in this chapter and deal with: 1) multifunctional dimension of FFs as base of their viability, 2) perception by national platforms of FF viability and of the conditions that determine it, 3) the analysis of FF attractiveness for Governments, women and youth in rural areas, 4) constraints to be removed so as to make FFs more attractive to youth and women, and ensure a sustained improvement of their viability.
(11) The multifunctional dimension of FFs as the basis of their viability and resilience

68. The analysis particularly dwells on the production function of family farms. But it should be emphasized that the latter fulfill many other functions which contribute to strengthen their viability and resilience, and allow farmers to "live decently" and safely by meeting his basic social needs.

69. Farmers' work highlights 5 main inseparable functions when referring to "family farm":

1) **Crop, plant, livestock and fisheries production** which, depending on agro-ecological zones and farm categories, contribute in different proportions to families' food security and to their income building. In general, it is based on family workforce (or wage-earning workforce often for cash crops, less for food crops), and is generally managed under the authority of the head of family who makes decisions concerning production, use of production factors and production. Those decisions have direct impacts on the other four functions of family farms.

2) **Consumption and nutrition**: they represent the basic needs of family farms, and the first level and socialization of the income of their members: The members of a FF have the same level of access to food and nutrition. In general, the management of consumption and nutrition is the responsibility of women, but it strongly depends on the results obtained by the family on the other functions (production, natural resource management and conduct of non-agricultural activities), the socially responsible nature of consumption and the principle of production diversification in FFs form a protection against malnutrition in rural areas.

3) **Conduct of non-agricultural activities**: it has been described in the family strategies. Depending on agro-ecological zones and farm categories, its contribution may be lower, equal or higher, than that of production in the management of family consumption and nutrition. The conduct of non-agricultural activities is observed among women and youth, and may be carried out depending on environmental opportunities and constraints in various areas, especially para-agricultural sector (product processing, trade) or services connected with urbanization in rural areas (transport, handicraft, construction, ...). It may also be performed in a continuous manner, or seasonally in temporal alternation with crop, plant, livestock and fisheries production.

4) **Natural resource management**: natural resources are the base of crop, plant, livestock and fisheries production. The production method of those family farms values biodiversity, through diversification of plant and livestock productions and their integration. The conservation and valorization of resources is a natural concern for FFs but they take it into account in varying degrees depending on several factors: location (especially cultural aspects), industrial or non-industrial character of agricultural crops (cotton/ dry grains), commercial or non-commercial character of the products (vegetables/ dry grains), the influence of the guidance of public services and assistance.

5) **Transmission and preservation of cultural values**: the cultural values belonging to an entire society are owned by each family farm which considers them as a critical factor for its own reproduction and perpetuation. Therefore, cultural values influence the decisions and behaviors of the different family members (farm managers, women and youth), and the possible directions that those decisions and behaviors may take will be critical to family farms' viability and attractiveness.
Perception of family farm viability by ROPPA platform members: a conditioned viability

70. The first motivation of family farm, as noted in the previous chapter, is to ensure a sustainable provision of food and health needs with the income earned from crop, plant, livestock and fishing activities. The food balance sheets performed in Mali and Senegal by Farmers’ Organizations (FOs) affiliated with ROPPA, and in other countries by other FOs, show that family farms combine their needs with other expenses (especially the educational ones). They also suggest that FFs capacity to meet their food and health needs depends on the types (internal factors) as well as the opportunities and constraints of agro-ecological zones (external factors) – see Box at point 24, page 28 related to the typology of FFs in Senegal.

The 13 national farmers’ platforms that are members of ROPPA gave their views on the viability of family farms, and consider that it remains possible but conditioned. The platforms particularly consider that viability of family farms depends on how attractive they will be for youth and women on the one hand and for the Government on the other hand.

71. The views of the 4 groups of countries point out the factors that allowed to achieve good results or that limited them and that there are 5 types. Excerpts from the platforms’ discussions illustrate their points of view.

a) NATURAL factors that determine family farm viability

These are agro-ecological conditions, climate hazards, or disasters. They fluctuate depending on period and areas. They are currently exacerbated by climate changes, and the FFs have little control over them.

Testimonies from platforms

Food balance sheet is very different from one area to another because of weather conditions (MALI)

In 2015/2016 the viability of agricultural FFs remains a challenge due to the consequences of Ebola epidemics, worsened by adverse weather conditions (SIERRA LEONE).

FF results are weakened by climate hazards (GHANA)

b) ECONOMIC factors that determine family farm viability

These are access to markets (price fluctuations of raw material and consumer foodstuffs, existence or not of market outlets), access to credit and its terms, or access to economic infrastructures likely to facilitate access to markets (roads, warehouses, etc.).

Testimonies from platforms

The selling prices of their products are low. In addition [FFs] have neither production costs nor selling price under control (COTE D’IVOIRE)

Except for cases where there is no market, productions provide value and returns and are cost-effective (LIBERIA)

Few growth markets (TOGO)

FFs are weakened by difficulties in gaining access to credit (GHANA)

c) TECHNICAL FACTORS that determine family farm viability:

The issue of level of equipment and access to appropriate technical and technological innovations is raised at this stage. The under-equipment of family farms compel them in many cases to practice manual cultivation only (GAMBIA, GUINEA BISSAU, SIERRA LEONE, LIBERIA, GHANA), or to delay the start of agricultural campaign because one waited for the neighbor to finish in order to borrow his material, Senegal.
Testimonies from platforms
Even if growers progressively use more modern agricultural inputs such as improved seeds, hoe and machetes remain the most used farming tools. GAMBIA

d) POLITICAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS that determine family farm viability: These are mainly public policy guidelines and the quality of their implementation (especially subsidy programs, commercial policy (opening/protection of markets for sensitive products), and civil security.

Testimonies from platforms
Some factors such as provision by the Government of subsidized inputs to FFs, outreach support/guidance of FOs to FFs contributed to increase some productions. (BURKINA FASO)
The viability of crop, plant, livestock and fisheries FFs in 2015/2016 still depends on government and partners’ assistance within the framework of post-Ebola recovery programs (SIERRA LEONE).
The areas where studies were conducted indicated that the equipment provided by agricultural sponsors and donors most of time come with delay; this is an obstacle to farming activities, since the latter are based on season. They also pointed out that if inputs are not available on time, increased productions will not be possible (LIBERIA).
Public expenditures for the agricultural sector increased from 3% in 2006 to 5% in 2012, but are still far from the Maputo Commitments (GHANA).

e) INTERNAL FACTORS that determine FF viability: THE FAMILY STRATEGIES
The family strategies developed in the previous chapter reflect initiatives and options they may take at their own level on practices of crop, plant, livestock and fisheries production, management and valorization of production factors (natural and technical) and family human resources, or consumption choices. Those options are taken to push back the constraints or to take advantage of the opportunities, generally related to the external factors mentioned above.

Some testimonies from platforms
Food balance of sheet is very different from an area to another because of climate conditions, access to production amenities and also because of strategies deployed by farmer families. (MALI)
Viability is different according to areas, and is very dependent on rainfall and family strategies (SENEGAL).
FFs have no rational management method. This explains marketing inefficiency (COTE D’IVOIRE)
Some growers emphasized that their difficulties are due to their lack of rigor as regards management and family charges they assume. If having many wives and a great number of children helps to better attend the family farm, induced costs do not allow the farmer to place his family and himself at an ambitious level of social life (BENIN).

(13) FFs’ contribution to national economies and national companies justifies GOVERNMENTS’ interest
72. In general
Platforms agree that their Governments have four main reasons to be interested in family farms, which represent the most common pattern of production in countries where they are established:
- they bring a key contribution to national nutrition (rural areas and towns) and improvement of their performances may provide food self-sufficiency, through their self-consumption (on average 52% of crops, plant and livestock productions in Senegal) and marketing of their productions (on average 48% of productions, Senegal);
- they contribute to stability and social equilibrium by providing jobs in rural areas and by limiting rural migration toward towns (on
average 9 working people / FFs in Senegal);
- they contribute to national wealth and country’s GDP (14 and 15% of GDP made by primary sector in Senegal in the past 2 years)
- they improve public revenues, especially through collection of foreign currencies associated with exportation of crop, plant, livestock and fishing products.

Platforms’ testimonies
Through their work, FFs succeed in providing food for the population and cater for the family needs; they contribute to stability and social equilibrium by fighting unemployment and rural migration towards towns, they contribute to poverty reduction and enable youth and rural women empowerment, they also contribute to reduce frequent food insecurity in rural areas (GUIEA BISSAU)
They allow the Government of Burkina Faso to improve the country’s food security, reduce unemployment rate; increase the country’s GDP and increase revenues through levies, direct and indirect taxes on their activities (BURKINA FASO)

73. last agricultural campaign (2015/16)
Family farms’ contribution to economies has increased during the last agricultural campaign. It can be assessed based on the monitoring of family farms in terms of increased food security (no major food crisis), supply of towns (rise in sales of food surpluses), but also in terms of estimation of family production value (gross value of family crops, plant, livestock and fisheries production during the campaign). In BURKINA FASO, where accurate calculations have been done, it is noted that although that country is one where family farm outputs are the most mixed, the gross value of family crops, plant, livestock and fisheries production has increased on average by 6.5% in the three areas where it has been calculated (North Sahelian, North and South Sudan areas).
As mentioned in Chapter 1 related to results of the last 2 agricultural campaigns, the significant leaps forward made by family farms in some countries within one year show their strong reactivity to more favorable conditions. Their strong resilience to adverse conditions (climate change, drought …) should also be emphasized.
(14) To sustainably improve the viability of FFs, they should be made more attractive to young people and women

74. Conditions required for FFs to retain the youth and women
The six following conditions are mentioned in the debates of one or many platforms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITIONS FOR FFs TO RETAIN THE YOUTH</th>
<th>Mentioned by the NPF of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Access to family property</td>
<td>Access to land, herd and canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Income</td>
<td>Adequate income, access to remunerative markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Support and assistance brought</td>
<td>assistance, effective guidance, technical and financial assistance, access to equipment and access to loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Access to qualified training</td>
<td>Training adapted to farming realities, training on farm mechanization, information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Recognition of status</td>
<td>Recognizing and valuing the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Improvement of the living environment</td>
<td>Access to healthcare and sociocultural infrastructures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. Subsectors which are developing can respond to the youth and women expectations in rural areas
These are off-season vegetable farming which enables to both diversify/increase revenues and improve nutrition, as well as poultry farming or sheep fattening that are also regular income generating activities (swift cash flows), and product processing (milk, fish products, grains, groundnut, forest products) which in most countries represents a self-employment niche for rural women.

Platforms’ testimonies
The youth and women are attracted to cash crops as sources of income (vegetable farming, rice, pineapple, palm tree, rubber tree, potato, poultry farming and integrated rice-fish farming, short-cycle animal husbandry...). (GUINEA)
The types of assets to which young people are sensitive and which would encourage them to come and settle in agriculture or remain in it are the enhancement and improvement of the quality and efficiency of public services provided by the Government, modernization of FFs, farmer status and making sure that the market becomes more attractive (GUINEA)
Enthusiasm of the youth for agricultural sectors most connected to the market (vegetable farming in the Niayes and groundnut Basin; banana in the Eastern Senegal; irrigated rice in the Delta; fruit growing in the Niayes, groundnut Basin and in Casamance; animal fattening in all the agro-ecological areas (SENEGAL).
OBSERVATION OF FAMILY FARM DYNAMICS

76. But constraints are to be removed to make FFs more attractive to the youth and women and improve their viability in a sustainable manner

Concerns about the future of family farms expressed by the platforms are related to the issue of their attractiveness to women who ensure through their activities (production, processing, marketing, non-agricultural activities, food consumption, child upbringing…) a critical contribution to family farms’ outputs, and to young people who are deemed to take over the farm when their parents could not manage it anymore.

- Women have difficulties accessing land, and when they have access to it (female household head), a problem arises about how to secure it. Actually, in rural areas, women are seldom land owners, and when they have an owner status their land property tends to be smaller and less fertile than that of men.
- The conditions required for family farms to retain the youth are often not met.

Platforms’ testimonies

Most young people are not attracted to farming activities in Liberia for they think that the latter do not bring any significant improvement to their living conditions. In general, the youth is attracted to the mining sector. (LIBERIA).

Young people are not attracted to FFs for it is not sufficiently remunerative so as to enable them to live a decent life. (COTE D'IVOIRE).

As far as women are concerned, they have difficulties accessing land. (COTE D’IVOIRE)

In Togo, the agricultural sector is unattractive to today’s youth. The main problems of the sector are in particular the arduous nature of the work (low level of mechanization), difficulties in gaining access to loans, slowdown in the sale of grains, attractiveness of urban life (lack of social infrastructures in rural areas, etc.). As a result, few young people dedicate themselves to agriculture and in particular very few undertake to settle in rural areas. (TOGO).

77. Platforms and ROPPA focus on the importance of governance of family farms, decision-making processes and their implementation which determine the choice of production, or access to and control of productive resources, particularly difficult for women. Several examples show how FF governance methods, poorly combined with other factors, may be an obstacle to FFs attractiveness to youth and women. 

78. For ROPPA and its platforms, in addition to the efforts needed to improve control over external factors (natural, economic, technical, political), further approaches and tools should be developed to improve FF governance in order to enhance their attractiveness to youth and women, for beyond current issues, there is the one of future FF takeover by the youth.

79. Outreach assistance and advice may help the FFs to better cope with external factors and improve their internal governance. In this regard, the ROPPA Observatory Center has undertaken to draft the guidelines on farming practices concerning outreach assistance and advice. The results of that observation are presented in Booklet 2 of its 2016 report (“OBSERVATION OF ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE TO FARMERS”).

1According to FAO, “in terms of land property, West Africa is the most unfavorable area for women globally” (8% of owners on average, versus 25 % in East Africa and 26% in Europe).
**List of acronyms and abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A</strong></th>
<th><strong>B</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFET</strong></td>
<td><strong>BAD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOPACI</strong></td>
<td><strong>African Development Bank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARA</strong></td>
<td><strong>BM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASPRODEB</strong></td>
<td><strong>World Bank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of farmers, educators and traders</strong></td>
<td><strong>National association of professional farming organizations of Côte d’Ivoire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional agency for food and agriculture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regional agency for food and agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senegalese association for the promotion of grassroots development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regional agency for food and agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Directors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic Community of West African States</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Community of West African States</strong></td>
<td><strong>Permanent inter states committee for the fight against drought in the Sahel region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National council for rural dialogue and cooperation of Senegal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ecological monitoring center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination of farmers’ organizations and agricultural producers of Togo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regional Agricultural Policy for West Africa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family farm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family farm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmers’ association for natural development and environmental management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Farmers’ association for natural development and environmental management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and Agricultural Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Food and agriculture sector development project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional farming association of Burkina</strong></td>
<td><strong>International Fund for Agricultural Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fouta Djalon Farmers’ Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>Federation of the unions of rice producers’ cooperatives of Niger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federation of Benin producers’ unions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guinea Forest Region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economie Interest Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guinea Forest Region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maritime Guinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Guinean franc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guinean franc</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR</td>
<td>High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAER MVE</td>
<td>Ministry of agriculture and rural equipment, Ebola virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARI NEMA</td>
<td>National Institute for Agricultural Research, National agriculture land and water management development project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEF OP OPAM OPVN OSC</td>
<td>Monitoring center for family farms, Farmers’ organization, Office of agricultural products of Mali, Office of food crops of Niger, Civil society organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPROSEM</td>
<td>Support Project for the production and distribution of sustainable certified seed in West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDDAA</td>
<td>Detailed program for agricultural development in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDIDAS</td>
<td>Inclusive and sustainable agribusiness development project in Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAAO</td>
<td>National Program for Local Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAPS</td>
<td>Agricultural productivity program in West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDEC</td>
<td>Regional support program for pastoralism in the Sahel region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUDC</td>
<td>Regional investment program in favor of livestock farming in the coastal countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPPA RPCA</td>
<td>West African Network of Peasants and Agricultural Producers, Network for the prevention and management of food crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE SNAAP-EF</td>
<td>Executive Secretariat, National outreach guidance and support systems for family farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEMOA USD</td>
<td>West African Economic and Monetary Union, United states dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAE</td>
<td>Agro-ecological area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>