



Sommaire

| PRESENTATION: | |
|---|----|
| Part I: FARMERS OBSERVATION ON NATIONAL PUBLIC POLICIES FACE TO TO FAMILY FARMS | 9 |
| Chapter 1: National policies general framework for | |
| 1)National Policy Frameworks | 10 |
| Chapter 2: What FOs have particularly pointed out in the policies effects on family farms | 15 |
| 2) Improving the use of SEEDS and other INPUTS by family farms through subsidy | |
| 3) Improving EQUIPMENT and INFRASTRUCTURES | |
| 4) Specific policies in the field of ANIMAL AND FISHERIES PRODUCTION | 18 |
| 5) Support to the MARKETING of of family farms products | |
| 6) Access to FINANCE | 22 |
| 7) LAND SECURITY | 24 |
| Chapter 3: The recent action of the farmers' platforms | |
| on national policies and its main results | |
| 8) The action of the farmers platforms at national level | |
| 9) The main results of the political action of the national platforms | 30 |
| PART II: REGIONAL PUBLIC POLICY ON FAMILY FARM | 39 |
| Chapter 4: The general framework for regional public policies | 40 |
| 10) The participation of FOs in the definition of the general | |
| framework for regional policies | 40 |
| 11) ROPPA's overall assessment of the implementation of regional policies | 42 |
| 12) ROPPA's assessment of the implementation of the main program | 43 |
| Chapter 5: Recent ROPPA Action on Regional Policies and Key Results | 45 |
| 13) ROPPA's approach to intervention | |
| 14) The main results of the network at regional level | |
| 15) More specific action by ROPPA on ECOWAS policies and their national variations | 47 |
| 16) ROPPA challenges in relation to monitoring | |
| public policies and their influence in favor of FF | 51 |

| Part III: BACKGROUND TO WHICH PROVEN POLITICAL ISSUES ARE VIEWED BY THE OBSERVATORY53 |
|---|
| Chapter 6: Cross-cutting issues to which ROPPA should pay particular attention in relation to public policies54 |
| 17) Question 1 : Which model of agriculture must be promoted?54 |
| 18) $\textbf{Question 2:}\ \mbox{Which space management and planning of the territory?}$ |
| 19) $\textbf{Question 3:}\ \text{How to renew natural resources and anticipate climate change?}55$ |
| 20) Question 4: What to do in fisheries and aquaculture56 |
| 21) Question 5 : Which livestock policies and pastoralism management?56 |
| 22) Question 6: What contribution may roppa have to benefit women in policy? 57 |
| 23) Question 7: How to involve youth in policy?57 |
| 24) $\textbf{Question 8:}$ in which perspective is safety adressed in the rural world?58 |
| 25) Question 9: how to improve roppa's contribution |
| to policy definition and implementation?68 |
| List of acronyms60 |
| Tables: |
| TABLE A: MAIN NATIONAL POLICIES IN WHICH NATIONAL PLATFORMS ARE INVOLVED (based on platform inputs)11 |
| TABLE B: MAIN NATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN RURAL AREA 23 |
| COMPARATIVE TABLE C: RECENT POLICY POSITIONS OF ROPPA PLATFORMS 28 |
| COMPARATIVE TABLE D: MAIN RESULTS OBTAINED THROUGH THE POLICY ACTION OF THE ROPPA PLATFORMS |
| TABLE E: DIFFERENT PROGRAMS, TOOLS, PRIA 1 MEASURES IN WHICH ROPPA IS INVOLVED |
| TABLE F: ROPPA POLICY ACTION AT REGIONAL LEVEL AND ITS MAIN RESULTS FOR FAMILY FARMING |

Global overview of the report

The part of the report on the observation of the family farms behavior on the two agricultural campaigns is the subject of a **Booklet 1 (FAMILY FARMS OBSERVATION).** From this observation, it can be seen from one year to the next that, depending on climatic functioning, but also on the intensity of public support, family farms are able to make significant progress and thus improve food security and sovereignty in the region. Thus, 8 countries in the West African region have improved the results of the 2015 -2016 crop year 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 well supported this year as family and community barns were well filled, inputs from harvesting / off-season were substantial, markets were well supplied, and prices remained stable. In these 8 countries, the good rainfall in 2015 and favorable public policies (notably on subsidies), coupled with the strategies of family farms and the action of the FOs, generally favored these results. In some localities, natural disasters, civil insecurity and shortcomings in the implementation of public action have limited the results of the agricultural season. The report concludes on this point that, alongside natural factors, human action (FF strategies, state action) remains equally decisive. It also concludes on the interest of FOs in developing a monitoring function of agricultural campaigns to strengthen their role in the definition and implementation of policies.

This part of the report also lays down an assessment of the yields from family farms per group of countries which share more or less the same eco-geographical and sociocultural 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 west Atlantic seaboard (Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Senegal) also have 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.

for the 4 groups of countries, the report identifies, , the factors which 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 Governments in view of their substantial contribution to national economies and businesses.

The observations in **BOOKLET 2 (OBSERVATION** OF FARMER CONSULTING SUPPORT TO **FAMILY FARMS)** give an overview of the current services offered by FOs regarding consulting 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 consulting 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 consulting 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.

(MONITORING OF BOOKLET 3 PUBLIC POLICIES WITH REGARDS TO FAMILY FARMS and EFFECTIVENESS OF FARMERS ACTIONS) gives the analysis and appreciation by 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 identified and the effects of their implementation are assessed by area. Six areas were identified: the use of seeds and other inputs, building facilities and infrastructure, support for animal and fish production, support for marketing, access to finance and credit, and access to land. The positive effects of recent policies on family farms in most States are significant in terms of improved access to inputs; they are more mitigated regarding product marketing; there are problems for small-scale family farmers, for women, for livestock farmers in several countries in terms of land security and access to managed land. The farmerss also watch highlights many policy implementation problems and analyzes the recent work of national platforms on policies and its main results.

The second part of this Booklet outlines the main regional policies in which ROPPA is involved, their tools and regional implementation programs (regional food security reserve, development programs of UEMOA priority sectors, PRAPS - Sahelian pastoralism PRIDEC - farming in coastal countries, GAFSP, Sahel irrigation, PAPROSEM, rice offensive). The political positioning of ROPPA is presented in collaboration with networks of FOs and CSO partners and an assessment is made of the results obtained through their lobbying and their expected effects on family farms. Significant progress in

the participation of POs in political dialogue is highlighted.

Basing on the internal reflections of ROPPA prompted by the results of its policy watch at the time of the validation of its first report, this booklet highlights nine cross-cutting issues which ROPPA is and will remain particularly sensitive to: (i) the temptation to focus on industrial agriculture to the detriment of family farming; (ii) spatial management and land use planning; (iii) renewal of natural resources and anticipation of climate change; (iv) fisheries and aquaculture;; (v) management of pastoralism in policies; (vii) inclusion of women in policies; (viii) inclusion of young people in policies; (viii) security in the rural world; (ix) the definition and implementation of policies.

BOOKLET 4 (MONITORING PRACTICES FOR ROPPA FO MEMBERS) shows the picture of current monitoring practices of agricultural campaigns, monitoring practice of family farm behaviors and results, consulting 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 features 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 the 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 FFO ROPPA's Regional.

Presentation

The family farms results presented in the first booklet of the ROPPA 2016¹ Regional Observatory of Family Operations report do not depend exclusively on their strategies and how they are supported by the local² support systems. They are also heavily influenced by policy directions and their implementation.

Depending on the distribution of roles in the ROPPA, while the FEDERATIONS and their divisions are mainly responsible for the operational role of proximity support, it is the FARMERS PLATFORMS and the ROPPA that take the lead in the representation and the defense of the interests of the farmerss at the political level. In order to fulfill this mission, they set up monitoring tools on policies that are more or less developed in different countries, but which, together with the monitoring of campaigns and the monitoring of family farms and their accompaniment, constitute the fourth element of The ROPPA³ observatory.

This booklet of the FFO regional report is divided into three parts and includes six chapters:

In the first part, on POLICIES

- Chapter 1 provides a background to the national policy framework for family farms
- Chapter 2 shows what FOs have particularly noted in the effects of policies on family farms in each country.
- Chapter 3 discusses the recent actions of national platforms on public policies and the results they have achieved or are expecting for family farms

In the second part, on REGIONAL PUBLIC POLICIES

- Chapter 4 shows the framework for regional policies of concern to family farms
- Chapter 5 provides an update on the main policy issues with respect to which ROPPA has positioned itself over the past two years and on the results it has registered or expectations in the aid of family farms

The third part concludes with the main questions to which ROPPA should pay attention in relation to public policies (Chapter 6).

THE ROPPA'S VOCATION AND POLITICAL ACTION

The context in which ROPPA arose:

Structural adjustment policies (1980-1996), the results of which destroyed the foundations of the rural economy in our countries, were an opportunity for farmers to organize themselves outside state structures in order to seek out answers to questions on how to boost agrosylvo-pastoral and fisheries activities and what partnerships, based on a clear definition of roles and responsibilities, needed to be built between actors.

In a number of countries of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), self-promotion initiatives had led to the creation of umbrellas industries that were oriented in the process of building national farmers farmers platforms and producers.

From 1976 to 1994, a process of exchanges began between professional organizations of agricultural producers in certain countries (Burkina Faso, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Togo). It was a question of solidarity in the fight against the effects of droughts and structural adjustments in order to develop strategies for defending family agriculture and the well-being of our grassroots communities.

From 1994 to 2000, the signing of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Marrakesh and the outbreak of failures of projects and programs ignoring the involvement of the farmers farmers were on the agenda of the international trade cooperation, the basis for launching the Millennium Development Goals.

Between 1994 and 1996, two droughts in Sub-saharan Africa were responsible for the privatization of rural economies. Rural areas were emptied of their able-bodied arms, despair grew in the populations, the multiplicity of projects did not sufficiently address the problems of family farms and poverty became the lot of the populations. All these factors have helped to develop the farmers farmers structures which have undertaken to provide their own understanding of the issues dealt with by States and their partners and to respond to the impacts of Agricultural Structural Adjustment Policies (ASAP)

¹ Booklet 1: FAMILY FAMRS DYNAMICS OBSERVATION

² Booklet 2: PEASANT FARMERS CONSULTING SUPPORT OBSERVATION

³ Booklet 4: FOLLOW UP PRACTICES OF ROPPA FO MEMBERS

The ROPPA's actions:

The creation of the ROPPA enabled West African farmers farmers' organizations to build a collective capacity to defend and promote the values of farmer agriculture based on the dynamics of family farms within the framework of the formulation and the implementation policies, strategies and programs / projects for the development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries production sector.

Four meetings between 1998 and 2000 resulted in the regional network in 2000 in Cotonou, Benin, with ten (10) countries including eight (08) WAEMU countries, plus Guinea and the Gambia. The founders are committed to the emergence of family farms (multifunctional and multi-sectoral companies) for the development of agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries activities; To safeguard the positive sociocultural values of our communities; and in the defense of our identities in a globalization of the economy, social and cultural attitudes and behaviors.

ROPPA members have also built up this regional movement to defend the strategies and actions that strengthen and guide the socio-economic and cultural integration of the region. The creation of ROPPA coincided with the process of drawing up the Agricultural Policy of the West African Economic Monetary Union (PAU) and the process of revitalizing ECOWAS as a commission.

At the global level, the MDGs, the WTO, the process for developing the Cotonou Agreements were also of concern to ROPPA leaders.

Basing on consultations and strategic policiess within the national platforms, exchanges of experiences between FOs and regional meetings to consolidate positions and proposals on issues in debates, feeding its policies with field studies, and by mobilizing various expertise to accompany its reflections and strategies, ROPPA and its national platforms developed and defended in the PAU, ECOWAP and in national policies the vision of an agricultural policy centered on family farms and based on the the principle of food sovereignty. An agriculture that allows those who practice it to live decently their trade to meet their basic needs of food, habitat, education, health, leisure and culture.

ROPPA has also been actively engaged in dialogue at the continental and international level on sectoral policies affecting the agricultural and rural sector, in collaboration with allies, to defend its vision of the values that underpin Family Farming

It is therefore understandable that the first ROPPA action plan focused on farmers understanding and better involvement in programs and policies development.

Here are the following priority areas where ROPPA played a very active role in defending the interests of family farming:

- climate change: since 1995
- PAU and its implementation: since 2000
- the ROPPA / CILSS / UEMOA / ECOWAS / Club du Sahel partnership: since 2001
- The Cotonou Agreement: 2001-2003
- CAADP negotiations in 2003
- the creation of the Rural Hub: 2004
- ECOWAP / CAADP negotiations in 2003 2005
- the launching of Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs): 2005
- the EPA negotiation process: since 2006
- lobal Agricultural Food Security Program (GAFSP) proposal: 2010
- the dynamism of the Committee on World Food Security (CSA): since 2010
- The other projects on which the ROPPA is working are:
- permanent and sustainable access to appropriate financing for the benefit of family farms
- harmonizing national and regional public funds for negotiated support, guarantees, calamities, improvement of agricultural credit rates, etc.
- development and strengthening of ROPPA partnership frameworks / research on innovation platforms (FO/research framework)
- the ROPPA / WAEMU / ECOWAS / NEPAD partnership
- in the future, ROPPA will have to revisit:
- shared understanding of the family farm
- the solidarity between platforms that should auide the ROPPA
- Indicators on the use of results and interpretation of information;
- iMPROVING women's role
- initiatives and trends in relation to pastoralism;
- attractiveness and retention of young people in agriculture

Farmer observation on national public policies face to family farms

Chapter 1: National policies general framework

(1) NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PUBLIC POLICIES

1. At the national level: specific policy documents, PNIAs and their direct or indirect programmatic variations

These frameworks are known to ROPPA's national platforms. They are fairly standardized and strongly determined by strategic orientations inspired, among others, by considerations external to the region and to family farms.

As a follow-up to the PASs, the various states have formulated agricultural pocies, programs or legislation aimed at supporting the sustainable development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector and / or the so-called strategic ensuring food and nutrition security and reducing poverty. These policies, strategies and programs are predominantly in three (3) initiatives:

- ECOWAP/CAADP, which is delivered through the PRIA at the regional level and the NAPs at the national level. Since 2010, the year in which the first generation of NIPs was developed, countries have made efforts, with varying degrees of success, to converge their different policies, programs and NIPs. The PRIA and first generation NIPs was completed by 2015 and are being redefined on the basis of the guidelines adopted by the Dakar Conference in November 2015 following the ECOWAP + 10 process and the decisions made by the CMS DAERE.
- PAU implementation strategies and programs, the WAEMU agricultural policy, in which the 8 member countries are committed;
- Implementation programs for the CILSS strategic framework for food and nutrition security.

Countries are also involved in commitments, declarations and agreements at the regional, continental and international levels which determine and / or shape their policies/strategies

for the development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector (MDG, Maputo ...).

ROPPA monitoring and studies, national platforms and other FO and CSO networks indicate that the formulation of NIPs as a reference framework for interventions that combines national priorities has not generated the increase of financial resources discounted for the development of the sector and the strengthening of the coordination of technical and financial partners' interventions. In most countries, TFPs have maintained their project / program approach, which has little or no alignment with NFIPs (priorities, principles, implementation process, etc.), despite the existence of a number of commitments which should be binding on all (the Paris Declaration on ODA, national pacts in the context of NAIPs).

While some countries have met the 2003 commitments in Maputo (BURKINA FASO, GHANA, GUINEA, MALI, NIGER, SENEGAL, SIERRA LEONE, TOGO), some issues remain, regarding the structure of public spending related to agriculture.

ROPPA notes that the efforts of the ECOWAS Commission and / or some partners have resulted in some thematic regional programs taking place in countries. Countries benefit from the West African Agricultural Productivity Program (WAAPP), initiated by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) for the benefit of member countries, with financial support of the World Bank (IDA).

For the pastoral livestock sector, the regional programs for support to pastoralism in the Sahel, financed by the World Bank (PRAPS, 2015), started in 2016 and involve 4 countries of the ROPPA network (NIGER, BURKINA FASO, MALI, SENEGAL), and the Regional Program for Investments in livestock in coastal countries (PRIDEC), also supported by the World Bank Group, covering 4 countries in the network (CÔTE D'IVOIRE, GHANA, TOGO and BENIN)

TABLE A: MAIN NATIONAL POLICICIES IN WHICH PLATFORMS ARE INVOLVED (AFTER PLATFORMS CONTRIBUTION)

| COUNTRY | Policy documents | NAIP | Main Programmes/projects |
|-------------------|---|---|---|
| Countries of the | Sudano-Sahelian belt: | | |
| NIGER | INITIATIVE 3N (INige- riens feed Nigeriens- 2012) Pastoral Executive Order (2010) completing RURAL CODE of 1993 | NAIP/SDR (2010) | Acceleration plan for the implementation of I3N – 2014 |
| BURKINA FASO | PNSAN (Food Safety National Plan-2014) SDR by 2025 Rural development Strategy— In the process of vali- dation) rural landed law(2009) | PNSR (National Programme for Rural sector, 2011) | PAFASP (Support to the sectors, 2012) PNDEL (Stock Farming/Milk, 2010) PAPSA (Inputs management – 2010) PNGT 2, PACOF-GRN (Land, 2014), PDIRV (development of small rural irrigations, 2001) |
| MALI | PDA (Agricultural development Policy, 2013) PFA (Agricultural Land Policy P 2014) | PNISA (Agricutural Sector National Plan for Investment - 2014) | Differents SUBSIDY PROGRAMMES (of INPUTS, Agricultural EQUIPMENTS, 2015) FNAA (National Support Fund for agriculture – 2010) FIER (Professional Training Programme for the insertion and support of rural youth entrepreneurship – 2014) |
| Coastal countries | of the West Atlantic coas | tline | |
| SÉNÉGAL | PSE (Senegal Emergence Plan , 2014) | PNIA (Agricuture National Plan for Investment - 2010) | PRACAS (Segal pace Acceleration programme, 2014) PRODAF (Poultry farming, 2014) PROMOFA (Modernization of stock farming, 2010) PRONAM (Ovine Productivity, 2016) Actions taken in the implementation of LPS/PA (Sectorial policy letter of fishing and aquaculture, 2014) |
| GAMBIA | Vision 2020, The Gambia Inc (1996) ANR Policy (agricultural and natural ressources – 2001) | GNAIP (Agricuture National Plan for Investment Gam- bia, 2011) | ANRP (Agricultural and and natural resource Policy, 2011) Vision 2016 (Agricultural prioritisation/ rice, 2014) PAGE (Acceleration of the Implementation of GNAIP, 2013) |
| GUINÉE BISSAU | GUINÉE BISSAU 2025 (Plan stratégique TERRA RANKA, 2015) | PNIA (2010, revised in 2013) | PPASA (Food Safety Support Project, BOAD, 2013) PEASA (Emergence Project and Food Safety Support, World Bank, 2014) |

TABLE A: MAIN NATIONAL POLICICIES IN WHICH PLATFORMS ARE INVOLVED (AFTER PLATFORMS CONTRIBUTION)

| COUNTRY | Policy documents | NAIP | Main Programmes/projects |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| forest-dom | inated countries: (Affect | ed by Ebola) : | |
| GUINEA | PNDA (National sustainable agriculture development plan, 2007) | PNIASA (Agricul- tural national Plan for Investment and food safety, 2010) | 5 sub-programmes of PNIASA (rice, diversification, cult. Export and agribusiness, GRN, institutional reinforcement i, 2010) Governmental programme for Agricultural Campaign Support PNAAFA (Agricultural Actors Support national programme, FIDA, Through FO 2011/19); Agricutural Productivity Programme (PPAAO/WAAPP - 2009/14, PU-APA (Agricultural Emergency Support Project for Productivity, WB, 2012/14) |
| SIERRA LEONE | AFP (agenda for prosperity, 2013/2018) NSADP (National sustainable agriculture development plan, 2010) | NAIP(Investment Plan of Sierra Leone's National Agricultural Invest- ment Programme (2010) | campagne de redressement post-Ebola (SCP/GAFSP (Small scale farmer Com- mercialization Programme, 2011) Ebola recovery plan (recovery plan Banque Mondiale, 2016) |
| LIBERIA | FAPS Food and Agriculture Policy and Strategy (From Subsistence to Sufficiency (2008). | LASIP (Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Pro- gram, 2010) | AASRP (agriculture sector rehabilitation project - BAD, 2009). SAPEC (Small scale farmer Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization Project -BAD, 2014) |
| | | | PDAI (Agriculture & Infrastructure Development Project – World Bank, 2009) FED (Food and Enterprise Develop- ment Program - US AID, 2011) FSNS (Food and Nutrition Security - 2008). West Africa Agricultural Productivity Project/Liberia. |

TABLE A: MAIN NATIONAL POLICICIES IN WHICH PLATFORMS ARE INVOLVED (AFTER PLATFORMS CONTRIBUTION)

| COUNTRY | documents de politique | NAIP | Main Programmes/projects |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Coastal countr | ies on the South Atlantic | coast: | |
| IVORY-COAST | PND (National Plan for Development 2012/2015) PDDA (Development Plan for Agricultural sector (1992-2015) | PNIA (2010) | SNDR (Reviewed National strategy for rice sector Development – 2012/2020) PSDEPA (Strategic Plan for the Development of Stock Farming, Fishing and Aquaculture 2014-2020) C2D PAFARCI (Agricultural sectors revival and support Project IC, 2013) PSAC (Agricultural sector support Project, 2014) + projects and programmes oreinted toward income crops (coffee, cacoa, hevea, cotton, cashew nut) |
| GHANA | FASDEP (Food and Agriculture Develop- ment Policy, 2007) | NPIA/METASIP (medium term agriculture sector investment plan, 2010) | FERTILIZER SUBSIDY PROGRAMME (- Interrupted in 2014, taken back in 2015) AMSECs (Agriculture mechanization Enterprises Centers programme –, 2007) BLOCK FARM PROGRAMME (2009) |
| TOGO | PA-PSTAT 2030 AG- RICUTURAL POLICY/ Strategic Plan For Togolese Agriculture Change(2016) | PNIASA Agricultural national Plan for Investment and food safety, 2010 | PADAT (Togolese Agricultural sector support Project, WB/FIDA, 2011) PASA (Projet d'Appui au Secteur Agricul- tural sector Support, 2011) PPAAO-Togo (Agricultural Productivity growth project in Togo, 2011) FNFI (National Fund for Inclusive Credit, 2014) |
| BÉNIN | PSRSA Stratgic Plan for the Agricultural revival – 2008-2011, (rereading in 2009) | PNIA, 2009 | 4 Frame work progrmmes: (i) Agriculture Development Programme (ii) Stock Farming Developement Programme (iii) Fishing Aquaculture Developement Programme (iv) Administration and Agricultural Sector Management Programme. PADA (Agricultural diversification support project—WB, 2012) PPAO/Benin (Productivity through Agricultural Research and Consultancy, 2012) FNDA (National Fund for Agricultural Development, 2014 – should be abounded by PPAAO and PADA) |

2. Coming up in 7 countries: Agricultural Regulation Laws (NIGER, BURKINA FASO, MALI, SENEGAL, GUINEA, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, BENIN)

SENEGAL, with its Agro-sylvo-Pastoral Guidance Law (LOASP) of 2004 and MALI, with its Agricultural Guidance Law of 2006, played a pioneering role in the definition of a legislative framework. The whole giving the major political orientations of their country for the agricultural sector, understood in the broad sense. Farmers' organizations in these countries have played a decisive role in their development.

NIPAs subsequently provided funding for the development of agricultural guidance laws in other countries. CÔTE D'IVOIRE has adopted its LOA-CI in 2015, GUINEA, which launched its process in 2008, is on the verge of completion, BURKINA FASO, which launched its own in 2013, already has one Preliminary draft law of Agro-sylvo-pastoral, fishing and faunal orientation. The Agricultural Regulation Act of NIGER is

currently being drawn up, and the construction of the BENIN project, planned in its PSRSA, started in 2016.

The definition and adoption of these LOAs should mark a major political step forward in relation to family farming. Indeed, all these laws or draft laws:

- recognize the importance of family farming
- define the status of the family farm
- orient the organization of the profession and give place to the FOs
- provide for the strengthening of agricultural advice, research and training
- create support funds
- Their real scope depends on the adoption of their implementing decrees, which in some cases are not expected, and on the definition of agricultural policies accordingly.



Chapter 2: What FOs have particularly noted in the policies impact on family farms

The main current (positive and negative) effects of the policies identified by the FOs of the different countries through the monitoring of the campaigns and the family farms concern the implementation of the production and marketing aid, the creation of infrastructures, Access to financing, land security measures.

The ROPPA Platform's assessment of the content and effects of these national policies is analyzed in this chapter per topic, by grouping the presentations per country, according to four geographical areas selected for the report: the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian belt, The coastal countries of the West Atlantic coast, the forest-dominated coastal countries affected by the Ebola epidemic, and the coastal countries of the South Atlantic coast. The breakdown of these groupings results from the analysis of the dynamics of the family farms and of the policies made in developing this report¹.

(2) IMPROVED USE OF SEEDS AND OTHER INPUTS BY FAMILY FARMS THROUGH SUBSIDY

Coupled with the relatively good rainfall that benefited from the 2015/2016 season, public subsidy policies have undoubtedly contributed to improved yields in many cases.

3. Countries of the Sudano-Sahelian belt: large public subsidies whose impacts are globally sensitive

NIGER:

- **"content:** input support from i3N and NIPA / SDR sector programs and PAPROSEM led to a significant increase in market gardening production (availability of products on the market).
- ***appraisal:** They had a small impact on cereal production as well as on livestock and fisheries (food support).

BURKINA FASO:

- **content:** Seed subsidy, provision of 4 000 tonnes of certified seed. 16 000 tonnes of NPK and urea fertilizers, in particular under PAPSA and PAPROSEM. Regeneration of orchards.
- appraisal: inputs boosted FF results, but distribution was poorly targeted and the most vulnerable farms were poorly supported

MALI:

- **content:** The National Fertilizer Subsidy Program responded to a strong demand for FF to increase productivity and revenues. It has enabled them to considerably reduce their production costs and intensify their production (production systems concerned: irrigated and rainfed rice systems, mixed cereal / cotton system, mixed river cereal-vegetable and pulses production system including cowpea And potato), livestock system dairy production and meat production).
- *appraisal: A significant improvement in yields and production but this support was not able to reach the areas occupied by the rebels (Kidal).

4.Coastal countries of the West Atlantic seaboard: a special emphasis on subsidizing quality seeds

SENEGAL:

- **"content:** PRACAS: fertilizer and seed subsidy (reconstruction program of seed capital). Increased availability of quality seeds. breeding: Artificial insemination. Fish farming: seeding of fish ponds.
- *appraisal: impact on extending plantings and intensification, but the quantities of seeds and fertilizers made available were far below requirements. Problems of availability and quality of inputs for rice cultivation, especially peanuts, and horticultural seeds. The induced effects were minimal for the majority of FF.

GAMBIA:

- **content:** input subsidies under the GAIPP policy on universal access to essential inputs and resources.
- *appraisal: Large producers have been more favored with regard to subsidies. The impact was not really felt by the FF.

GUINEA BISSAU

- **content:** improved seed supply rice and market gardening (PASA, PESEA)
- *appraisal: seeds and crop protection products are always late, which disrupts the cropping calendar. Poor coordination of stakeholders: duplication cases, unaffected villages.

¹ See details in the introduction to the synthesis of the report and of the livret 1

5. Forest-dominated countries: public support for Post-Ebola rehabilitation programs

GUINEA

- **"content:** subsidy of inputs (certified seed, various mineral fertilizers, herbicides, insecticides) Fertilizers (Dubreka The State went through the Chamber of Agriculture and by an economic operator (Tidiane Agric.) For distributing these inputs. Increased
- ****appraisal:** Productivity went for FF who used fertilizers. Only 3 crops have benefited (rice, maize, potatoes); (Rice: 12% of FF used subsidized fertilizers, maize: 2%) Producers number affected remain low despite the availability of herbicides / fertilizers.

SIERRA LEONE

- **"content:** supply of seeds (rice) and chemical fertilizers as part of the Post-Ebola recovery campaign (through the Agricultural Business Centers network).
- ****appraisal:** Only 60% of FF were affected; FOs are not involved in distribution; FF receive seeds too late and are unusable (they rot, or families consume or sell).

LIBERIA

- **content:** PDAI (Agricultural Development and Infrastructure Program): aims to increase the production of quality rice seeds.
- **Fappraisal: "It is difficult to measure the real impact of policies, given that agriculture is not one of the Government's main priorities", declares the farmers platform, while noting that these policies are developed without the FOs involvement; They are ignored by FOs, FF and the general public; priorities are elsewhere, and donor programs are limited in time and are subject to funding delays that limit the scope of their implementation, often Constrained by cumbersome bureaucracy.

6. Coastal countries on the South Atlantic coast: contrasting public commitments

IVORY COST

****appraisal:** no specific subsidy policy for seeds and inputs. Implementation of the provisions of certain programs and policies is contrary to the overall vision of agricultural development, particularly in relation to family farms. These programs obviously increase the dominance of perennial crops. Moreover, they only concern

certain regions of the country.

GHANA

- **content:** The recovery of fertilizer subsidies benefited the poor farmers and encouraged a sharp increase in their use (from 8Kg / Ha to nearly 20kg / Ha); Increase in the subsidy rate in 2015/2016, improvement of the distribution system (younchers abandon).
- *appraisal: the overall fertilizer use rate remains low. In some districts fertilizer subsidies were not made on time and some farmers did not benefited.

TOGO

- content: the government has been subsidizing chemical fertilizers (from 15, 000 to 11, 600 F CFA / 50 kg bag) as well as certified seeds since many years. PADAT distribution of kits (improved seeds, fertilizers, pesticides) to 53,000 by vulnerable FF, supplemented by advice on Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM). FNFI products (inclusive financing) increased the utilization rate of improved seeds and fertilizers.
- **appraisal: shortcomings in the implementation of some NAAHP projects, such as PADAT (poor targeting, non-FO associations in implementation, procurement mechanisms) make management of subsidies unclear or slow progress to the benefit of FF. Political deviations in communication. Divergent messages from multiple actors (public services, NGOs, FOs). Low follow-up of proximity to FF. Poor representation of FF in program monitoring / evaluation.

BENIN

- **Content:** Improved access to seeds in quantity and quality and access to publicly funded fertilizers through SONAPRA (national agricultural promotion agency, ex CFDT, cotton) and a network of seed producers. Maize seed needs covered at 48% and rice seeds covered at 50%. Expansion of the distribution of imported fertilizers to food production (previously reserved for cotton production).
- **appraisal: Low technical and financial implementation rate of the SHIP. Commitments on grants not honored. Significant delays in the delivery of inputs (needs of most unfilled FF). 300 tons of rice seed not collected by SONAPRA from seed producers who sold them at paddy rice prices (heavy losses).

(3) IMPROVING EQUIPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURES

In this field, public policies have had an impact on the quantitative increase in production. Support for equipment enhancement is often complementary to support for inputs and within the same programs. The limits observed are then the same. Support programs for mechanization have encountered problems in several countries (NIGER, MALI, SENEGAL, GHANA, BENIN)

7. Sudano-Sahelian belt countries: significant but often poorly targeted support

NIGER:

- **content:** support to mechanization in the framework of i3N.
- *appraisal: low profit for FF (does not correspond to their needs). It is mainly the agribusiness that benefits.

BURKINA FASO:

- **content:** provision of producers of 11,000 plows, carts, seed drills and 6,000 draft animals. Construction of storage and breeding facilities; Development of market gardens
- **appraisal: In terms of infrastructures and equipment, the results obtained during the year are relatively satisfactory overall despite the many difficulties inherent in the functioning of the structures. Efforts are still needed in the years to come to improve the quality of services in the short term and long-term modernization of the production and livestock system.

MALI:

- Grottent: Under the Indicative Program of Agricultural Equipment to facilitate access to agricultural equipment to the largest number of FF (60% are under-equipped), the 2015 equipment subsidy program and "1000 Tractor Operations" have provided tillage equipment (500 tractors and accessories, 1,000 tillers and accessories, 400 rice and corn husks) throughout the country (except areas occupied by rebels); Livestock equipment (200 motorized straw choppers, 200 motorized baling machines) and irrigation (100 20cv motor pumps).
- *appraisal: poor diversification of the distributed equipment (the FOs proposed 400 tractors, 3000 units of harnessed cultivation, 1000 threshers, 1500 hullers). Lack of equity in distribution (the most vulnerable FF did not benefit).

8. Coastal countries of the western Atlantic coast: less intensity in support to FF

SENEGAL

- **Content:** PRACAS: access to equipment (seeders, hoes and plows, tractors, motor pumps). Creation of storage and packaging warehouses for certain categories of FF (reduction of losses). Realization, rehabilitation and maintenance of hydro-agricultural facilities; Production routes and rural electrification; forestry for production with priority to local communities. Infrastructure for sheep farm improvement (PRONAM); Aquaculture works;
- ****appraisal :** meets the needs of the FF, but insufficient intensity. The combined effects of support to hydro-agricultural development and intensification of production in the river area did not allow FF to conduct two surveys / year. Agribusiness is often privileged in the creation of infrastructure related to market gardening, especially through PDIDAS (Sustainable and inclusive agribusiness development project).

GAMBIA:

- content: product processing units (FISCA / FAO)

 inovating plateforrm (NARI / CORAF) plows,
 hoes, seeds, inputs (OMVG); (NEMA / IFAD)
- *appraisal women-oriented. Satisfactory. Better targeting of tractor inputs than in previous operations.

GUINEA BISSAU

- **"content:** in addition to the supply of certified vegetable seeds (PASA, PESEA), supply of PVC pipes
- ****appraisal:** the limits are the same as for seeds and phytosanitary products: the support always arrives late, which disrupts the cropping calendar. Poor coordination of stakeholders: duplication cases, unaffected villages.

9. Forest-dominated countries: public support for equipment and facilities supporting post-Ebola rehabilitation

GUINFA

- **content:** within the PNAAFAA framework, equipment supply to to family farms. In ricegrowing areas (national priority): opening-up of production areas and irrigation schemes.
- Appraisal/limits: marginal proportion of producers affected.

SIERRA LEONE

- **"content:** provided by Agricultural Business Centers with tools (tractors, E mill mills, cassava graters, flour dryers) as part of the post-Ebola recovery campaign. Rehabilitation of 907 kms of feeder roads.
- *appraisal: Only 60% of the FF of the areas affected by Ebola benefited from the tools; FOs are not involved in their distribution.

LIBERIA

- **content:** SAPEC (improved agricultural productivity of small farmers and commercialization), inputs of technologies at the farm level. PDAI: marketing infrastructure.
- ***appraisal**: the same as those mentioned in relation to seeds and inputs (agriculture is not one of the Government's main priorities).

10. Coastal countries of the South Atlantic seaboard: support guided by different political priorities according to the governmental visions of agriculture

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

- Content: rehabilitation and maintenance of rural roads, creation of social infrastructures (PSAC)
- *appraisal: the limits are the same as those mentioned for seeds and inputs: no specific policy for FE.

GHANA

- **"content:** irrigation development program (significant increase in production from beneficiary FF). Agricultural Mechanization Centers Program (AMSEC) to complement the land consolidation program.
- **appraisal:** Providing large subsidies on highpriced tractors does not seem to be the appropriate solution in a country where small scale farmer farming dominates. The viability of the AMSEC business model seems to be problematic, despite their high subsidization.

TOGO

- **content:** support from PADAT to harvesting in dry savannah areas. Contribution of 1200 rice processing equipment (gins, husks) and cassava grater.
- **appraisal: identical to those reported for seed and input support (deficiencies in NAAHP

implementation, low representation of FOs in program monitoring/evaluation).

BENIN

- of whom are women) should benefit from support in the area of product processing (improved technology). Under the Agricultural Mechanization Development Program, subsidizing tractors. Encouragement creation CUMA (cotton zone)
- **appraisal : Low technical and financial implementation rate. According to the farmers who purchased tractors subsidized by the government, they broke down after 6 months. Most tractors and equipment made available to the CARDER have been abandoned to the weather. The needs of the FF, whose equipment is still rudimentary, are more concerned with supporting the harnessed culture.

(4) SPECIFIC POLICIES IN THE FIELD OF ANIMAL AND FISHERY PRODUCTION

11. Countries of the Sudano-Sahelian belt:

NIGER:

- **Preeding: Niger, where the livestock sector accounts for 11% of the national GDP and 35% of the PIBA and in which more than 1 million people work full-time, adopted in May 2010 a Pastoralist Ordinance A dominant breeding system on which livestock policy is based), which is considered as one of the most innovative means of securing livestock and pastoralism in the region.
 - →appraisal: The implementation process of this legislation is very slow and its effects are not yet clear. For its part, poultry farming is little helped.
- **fisheries:** low impact of fisheries policies

BURKINA FASO:

**Preeding: vision of the PNDEL well oriented towards FF (development of mini dairies) - creation of infrastructures (1,176 vaccination parks, 308 slaughtering areas, 105 butcheries, 5 cold cuts, 21 dryers, 5 industrial dairies, 27 semi industrial dairies 60 industrial livestock markets, 60 managed livestock markets and 176 undeveloped livestock markets, 2017 stores and 5 livestock feed manufacturing units, 11 stables, 61 boreholes, 5 pastoral wells, 9 livestock trails, 10 pasture areas). With a view to encouraging livestock producers to create

stocks of fodder for the 2015-2016 season, mowing, packaging and transport equipment was distributed to producers (2,745 sickles, 44 tillers, 830 caissons, 673 wheelbarrows, 1,820 rakes, 1,820 forks and 1,081 carts) For poultry, 90 breeders and adult feeders and 90 feeders and chick feeders, 700 rolls of mesh 50 and 300 rolls of mesh 30 are available to breeders.

Fishing: Burkina Faso has an annual fish consumption requirement of 100,000 tons on average. Its annual production is 20,000 tons on average. The overall objective of the fisheries policy defined in 2014 is to ensure sustainable management of fisheries and aquaculture and to improve production through entrepreneurship, while taking into account the sub-regional environment and internationally.

MALI:

- breeding: reported under the 2015 equipment subsidy program the support of forage processing equipment (200 motorized haulers, 200 motorized baling machines).
- Fisheries: Act No. 2014-062 of 29 December 2014 lays down the principles and conditions for fishing and aquaculture. The Aquaculture Development Program 2016-2020 and the national stocking program contribute significantly to the popularization of floating cage culture through the installation of young people and the provision of fish farming kits.
 - →appraisal: timely action because fisheries and aquaculture are constantly increasing

12. Coastal countries of the Western Atlantic coast:

SENEGAL:

- **"breeding:** (PROMOFA: sylvo-pastoral zone and basin groundnut). Intensification of milk and livestock-meat sectors, sustainable management of ecosystems, capacity building of professionals) PRODAF (poultry farming) in all regions: health, improvement of livestock and marketing conditions, genetic improvement and diversification of poultry farming: PRONAM Ovine) improvement of productivity and marketing of sheep, creation of infrastructures in priority areas of intervention) -
 - →appraisal: improvement of breeds (insemination ± appreciated), support increase forage seeds (multiplication of forage seeds), sanitary and food safety of livestock as well as access to water, effects against the theft of

- cattle. Below the needs of the FF, FONSTAB is more oriented towards intensive farming than towards pastoralism; Changes for the majority of breeders' FF.
- **fisheries: policy aims (1) integrated and competitive aquaculture sector structuring and integration (2) sustainable management fishery resources through fisheries management.
 - →appraisal: increase in aquaculture production; (EIG) - but PES does not target FF but encourages the arrival of new private actors in the fisheries sector.

GAMBIA: not available

GUINEA BISSAU:

- **"breeding:** The meat sector is fairly well organized and under the control of the Veterinary Service, whose regional sections control the vaccination and deworming of animals and provide advice to breeders 'farms in collaboration with the 3 existing breeders' associations. Beef and milk production are in the process of structuring at the FF level. A poultry policy defined by the General Department of livestock is in the start-up phase.
- **Fisheries:** artisanal and industrial fisheries are licensed by the Ministry of Fisheries

13.Forest-dominated countries: (Note: MVE impacts have affected livestock and fisheries)

GUINEA:

Guinea's animal production policy focuses on the development of improved livestock systems according to species and natural regions and on the improvement of the conditions of rearing in traditional systems through the valorization of products and sub-livestock products

SIERRA LEONE: not available

LIBERIA: not available

14. Coastal countries of the South Atlantic coast:

IVOIRY COAST: not available

GHANA: not available

TOGO:

"breeding: livestock production has received little support from PNIASA 1 as a whole. Nevertheless, the PASA project has enabled the vaccination of 1,824,122 small ruminants and 9,983,491 heads of poultry against plague and

- Newcastle disease, resulting in a significant drop in mortality. 903 ovine and caprine breeding stock 5 300 and poultry brood stockers (2 084 hens and 3 216 cocks) were distributed.
- Fisheries: fisheries as well as livestock farming are poorly supported by PNIASA 1. In order to support continental fisheries production, the COFREPECHE project conducted various training sessions and the acquisition and distribution of 2,265 improved breeders 2150 at three hatcheries, 447,661 fry out of 525,000 planned. 45.56 tons of subsidized feed.

BENIN

- ***breeding:** not available
- *fisheries: PADA has a fish component (content and effects not specified)

(5) SUPPORT TO THE MARKETING OF PRODUCTS FROM FAMILY FARMS

The dominant orientations for market opening and commercial competition have ambivalent effects on family farms. FOs are particularly concerned about the negative consequences for family farming of the ratification of the interim EPAs. Intra-regional trade still faces many obstacles despite progress in the development of infrastructure and measures to support its growth. Some sectors are threatened by persistence, seeing increased imports and competition of foodstuffs on the international market (rice, fish, vegetable oils ...). Initiatives developed by FF and their organizations to improve their positioning in domestic markets and / or take advantage of emerging institutional markets bring hope to farmers

15.Country of the Sudano-Sahelian belt: effects not very sensitive at the level of the family farms

NIGER:

- **content:** the objective of regular procurement of rural and urban markets of the i3N initiative (2nd axis of the strategy) should be favorable to a good marketing of the products of the FF.
- *appraisal: the national marketing policy favors imports that compete with domestic products on the markets

BURKINA FASO:

"content: national policy has given priority to investments that promote product access to national, regional and international markets.

- Effects felt by FF, in particular on the marketing of vegetable products.
- *appraisal: FOs do not see any positive impacts on FF of the national policy of creating growth centers around markets.

MALI:

- **"content:** through institutional markets, the government of Mali involved in supplying the two national stocks: the national food security stock (35 000 tonnes in millet / sorghum) and the national intervention stock of the State (25 000 tonnes In rice). There is also WFP's Small scale farmer Support Program (P4P) through over-the-counter markets for the purchase of millet / sorghum.
- ****appraisal:** existing opportunities, but requiring more organization from producers to be able to supply the 30% negotiated with the State in an over-the-counter market. Also requires a review of payment terms that do not help producers

16. Coastal countries of the western Atlantic seaboard: liberal orientation

SENEGAL:

- **"content:** stimulating effect of the multiplication of weekly markets; Support to the marketing of poultry (PRODAF) and sheep (PRONAM). Tendency to develop commercial agriculture by seeking to link FF to agribusiness.
- **appraisal: public investments more directly oriented towards agribusiness (Diamnadio platform, PDIDAS (Sustainable and inclusive development project for agribusiness in Senegal).) Taxation scheme more favorable to commercial agriculture than to family farming. Senegal is a net importer of food products and low tariff barriers are applied on basic necessities (rice, oil, milk meat an exception for onion and recently rice, as a result of the action of the FOs and the will of the government).

GAMBIA:

content: the development of trade in a "free and competitive" environment is the paradigm of the Gambian public policies.

The Gambia 2020 Vision

"Transforming Gambia into a shopping mall, tourist paradise, trade nation, export-oriented and industrial agriculture, flourishing in free trade policies and a vibrant private sector backed by a well-educated population, Trained, qualified, healthy, self-reliant and enterprising, and guaranteeing a well-balanced ecosystem and a decent lifestyle for all under a system of government accepted by all citizens"

The farmers platform has not identified specific measures to promote market access for FF.

*appraisal: This government vision itself acknowledges that "the development of the agriculture sector and natural resources continues to suffer from the lack of political orientation and strategy as well as the political will to transform the sector." The platform stresses that women suffer particularly from these deficiencies.

GUINEA BISSAU

content: not reported.

17. Forest-dominated countries: relaunching commercial activities after the epidemic

GUINEA

- **content:** the lifting of measures prohibiting the movement of goods and people during the MVE episode freed trade and allowed FF to resell their products to urban centers.
- The More generally, the government is promoting the physical infrastructure of agricultural and livestock markets, reducing tariff and non-tariff barriers, and developing information on market and price opportunities.
- ****appraisal:** sometimes the government takes decisions contrary to the ECOWAS Treaty, prohibiting the export of certain agricultural and fishery products (in particular potato, pineapple ...)

SIERRA LEONE

- **"content:** the Small scale farming Products Marketing Program (FAO) has built more than 190 new Agricultural Business Centers (ABCs) in the post-Ebola Campaign, Support farms in the creation of added value (product processing) and the marketing of their products.
- @appraisal: not reported

LIBERIA

- **content:** two programs support the commercialization of products: the Small scale farmer Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization SAPEC (Smallholder Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization Project, which operates in 12 counties and benefits women, Agricultural development and infrastructure (PDAI), which strengthens market oriented FOs and improves marketing infrastructure.
- ***appraisal:** same observation as previously (difficulty to appreciate).
- 18. Coastal countries of the South Atlantic

seaboard: few specific supports nor reported effects

IVORY COAST: no specific program for FF reported

GHANA: no specific program for FF reported

TOGO

- **"content:** support for the valorisation and marketing of agricultural products is part of the objectives of PADAT; 350 conservation and marketing infrastructures under construction.
- *appraisal: not reported

BENIN

- **content: PADA includes the creation of market infrastructure (storage and cold storage). WAAPP-BENIN plans to establish a National Corn Productivity Specialization Center, which aims to make Benin a center of excellence in maize production, processing and marketing technologies.
- *appraisal: not reported.

(6) ACCESS TO FINANCE

With financial liberalization policies, financial services are the responsibility of the market and private financial institutions. The farmers organizations are attentive to 3 developments:

19.the development of national and regional tools

Integration and harmonization from the top

- National and regional agricultural banks
 Peaseant farmers have not benefited greatly from the action of agricultural banks whose products are not adapted to the needs of family farms and which are often synonymous with indebtedness. Several of them have disappeared or have undergone changes (NIGER, BURKINA FASO, IVORY COAST).
 - FOs note the trend to erase their specialized role in favor of private banks which open decentralized agencies), and above all decentralized financing systems.
- National networks of microfinance institutions
 Associative in nature, they exist in all countries
 (see table below). Through the local funds of
 their members, they offer small loans that are
 of great use to FF and that often reach them
 through women but do not allow investment.

National microfinance policies are aligned with regional frameworks for the harmonization of standards and regulations (An Act to regulate MFIs in WAEMU countries, 2007, BCEAO guidelines of 2010 / 2011, uniform acts of the OHADA, 2010).

Some FOs have sought to establish their own national networks (SENEGAL, BURKINA FASO), but have encountered difficulties in tightening supranational regulation.

National and regional funds

Some national funds such as the FNDA (National Fund for Agricultural Development) in BENIN, or the FNFI (National Fund for Inclusive Finance) in TOGO, have a direct role in strengthening the capacity to grant loans to farms (AGRISEF - farmers' access to Financial services of the FNFI, refinancing of financial institutions by the FNDA) or to finance agricultural investments. Others, such as the FIRCA (Interprofessional Fund for Agricultural

Research and Consultancy) in IVORY COAST or the FNAA in MALI, provide financial support for services offered to family farms.

FOs have been very active in monitoring the design of these funds and paying attention to their inclusion in the Agricultural Guidance Laws. However, they find that in most cases their operationalization is slow to take place.

WAEMU created the FRDA (Regional Fund for Agricultural Development). ECOWAP has foreseen the establishment of a Regional Fund for Agriculture and Food (FRAA / ECOWADF), with three centers designed to directly or indirectly strengthen the production capacity of family farms (support for regional agricultural integration, Support for food security, support for innovation and capacity building).

This Fund suffers from not being fund realesed



TABLE B: MAIN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OPERATING IN RURAL AREAS

| | | AGRICULTURAL BANKS | Inclusive Financial Institutions |
|---|--|--|--|
| dano-Sa- d: | NIGER | BAGRI (agricultural bank – 2011) | AP SFD (Professional Organizations of Commuty financing Insitutions) 81 SFD in 2011 51 in 2012 |
| Country of the Sudano-Sa- helian band: | BURKINA FASO | BACB (Agricultural and Commercial Bank BF) bought back in 2009 by ECOBANK | APIM-BF (Professional Organizations of Commuty financing Insitutions): 465 IMF RCPB (Network of Credit Union offices of BF (103 pay-offices) |
| Coun | MALI | BNDA (Agriculture Development National Bank | APIM-Mali Professional Associations of Commuty financing Insitutions (125 SFD) |
| the western ooard | SENEGAL | CNCAS (Nationat Credit Farm) – BNDE (Banque nat. pour le dvt éco National aBnk for Economical development) | AP-SFD (Professional Associations of Commuty financing Insitutions) : 135 SFD |
| Coastal countries of the western Atlantic seaboard | GAMBIE (To Check if A National Agricultural Bank exists) | Village Savings & Credit association | NASACA (National Savings & Credit Association of Gambia) VISACA (Village Savings & Credit association in Gambia! |
| Coa | GUINEA BISSAU | no | Informal financing dominated by; Hundreds of Commuty financing Insitutions |
| nated :s | GUINEA | Creation Request (agricul- tural Chamber 2016) | CRG (Guinea Rural Credit) : 120 pay-offices – Active network during MVE |
| -orest-dominated countries | SIERRA LEONE | | SLAMFI (Sierra Leone Association Microfinance Institution) 10 IMF |
| Fores | LIBERIA | | NEMIL (Network of microfinance institutions of Liberia) – 18 IMF |
| the | I V O R Y COAST | Banruptcy of BFA (bank for the Development of Agri- culture) in 2015 | AP SFD (Professional Associations of Commuty financing Insitutions) – 47 pay-offices, union or Nework of Microfinance Institutions |
| itries of | GHANA | Agricultural Development Bank | GAMC (Ghana association of microfinances Companies) 100 IMF |
| 7Coastal countries of the south Atlantic seaboard | TOGO | Announcement of the creation of a National Agricultural Development Bank (2013) | APIM – Togo (TOGOLESE Professional Associations of Commuty financing Insitutions) - 190 SFD |
| 2Co Sou | BENIN | Announcement of the creation of a National Agricultural Devel- opment Bank (2013) | 3 Networks : FECECAM (33 local credit unions), UNACREP (13 unions for loan and credit), RENACA (8 pay-offices) |

20. Development of community financing systems

The financing of FF depends directly on the performance of these SFDs

spectacular growth of decentralized financing systems

Since the setting up of local funds or mutuals is done from the grassroots, the local basis of these systems and their flexibility have allowed them to establish in penetrating way into the rural world to reach family farms and to provide micro-credit services, especially to women, that have strengthened the implementation of the economic and social strategies of the FF.

- FOs, which cooperate closely with local credit unions and often create new ones, note the limitations of these systems, particularly in terms of investment credit (short-term, inadequate guarantees, high rate). They also note that these systems are currently experiencing a slowdown and are looking for a second wind.
- some public initiatives to promote local fundingHere, SIERRA LEONE is set up in village banks (Small scale farming Products Marketing Program).
 - FOs find that many of these village banks are dysfunctional and do not allow villagers access to credit.
- the majority of FF continue to use informal credit
- Credit of merchants, family or neighborhood loans, tontines.

21. The occurrence of mobile money products

A revolution with effects still difficult to

The success of using the mobile phone to make financial transactions and access credit has been very rapid in the rural world.

It appears, as illustrated by the LATA of LIBERIA, to change the data of the systems of social relations and economic exchanges of the FF, and calls on the FOs.

"Liberia Agriculture Transformation Agenda" (LATA)

LATA relies on innovative technology to finance the agricultural world. The program is based on the technology provided by Cellulant Nigeria Ltd. It connects input recipients (fertilizers and seeds) to financial services via mobile wallets. Farms and their owners are listed in a single database. The technology is able to calculate the required support with the information collected (land size, type of crop and demand). They can also receive alerts and information and simply exist with the financial system. Some 150,000 Liberian farmers are expected to be identified by the end of planting in 2016 as part of the Small scale farming Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization (SAPEC) project. At the same time, according to the ADB, the project will help finance SMEs by enabling agri-food operators to obtain funds from commercial banks at reduced interest rates, part of which is financed by the aovernment.

(7) LAND SECURITY

The explosive nature of land access and land tenure security issues, which are the source of many conflicts, prompts countries to seek to reform their land legislation. (BURKINA FASO, MALI, BENIN) and six are in the process of preparing them (SENEGAL, GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, LIBERIA, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, TOGO). FOs pay close attention to these reforms, which have a direct impact on the security of family farms, and in some cases are associated with their design.

22...Countries of the Sudano-Sahelian belt: in quest of legislation to secure operations and reduce conflicts

NIGER:

content: the 1993 RURAL CODE continues to govern access to and use of land. It has set up land commissions (COFO) at the level of departments, municipalities and villages (COFODEB).

appraisal: FOs find that the functionality of this Code is currently seized up by conflicts of competence between traditional chiefs and local authorities. COFOs, whose funding depends on the projects, operate very irregularly.

BURKINA FASO:

- was adopted in 2009 (ION N° 034-2009 / AN). Through the establishment of municipal structures for land management and support for the development of land charters, PNGT 2 (2014) contributes to the implementation of this law. The Project to Support Municipalities in Western Burkina Faso in Managing Land and Natural Resources (PACOF / GRN, 2014) also provides experimental support to 15 municipalities and village land commissions in the implementation of the Land law (land information system, formulation of agreements on land rights, issuance of land certificates).
- *appraisal: persistence of land conflicts (especially with the development of agropolises). Interest of the Observatory on land established.

MALI:

• content: an agricultural land policy was defined in 2014 in application of the Agricultural Guidance Law of 2006. In particular, it organizes the status and security of the family farm and the formalization of land deeds. It announces an Agricultural Land Act that will provide legal elements related to land management.

appraisal: this policy, including measures to ensure the safety of family farmers, women and young people, is in line with the aspirations of the agricultural profession, which was very sensitive to the negative consequences for FF land management in land grabbing By the sovereign wealth funds in the area of the Office du Niger.

23.Coastal countries of the West Atlantic seaboard: competition on land potentially or currently unfavorable to family farms

SENEGAL:

- **"content:** waiting for a land reform announced in the LOASP of 2004 and prepared by the new National Commission for Land Reform (CNRF), which was created in 2012 with a participatory and inclusive approach, associating with reflection FOs that had previously been excluded.
- **appraisal: In spite of some points of satisfaction, real concerns about the orientations that seem to be adopted include: (i) the strategic orientations of the land policy note proposed by the CNRF; (ii) land tenure issues; and (iii) Coherence with other

codes (pastoral, mining, etc.) and sectoral policies (health. water. etc.)

GAMBIA:

appraisal: Vision 2020 itself recognizes that agricultural sector development and natural resources continue to suffer from loopholes in the land system (a poorly know regulatory framework that does not allow FF to secure their land rights, land grabbing by Foreign companies and investment funds)

GUINEA BISSAU

- **content:** the land belongs to the State that allocates it to the farmers
- *appraisal: practice of attribution very unfavorable to small farmers - monopolization of the quarter of the land by a minority of absentee ponteiros.

24.Forest-dominated countries: new land legislation in preparation

GUINEA

content: governed by the Land and Domain Code (1992); A process of reflection is underway to arrive at a new land law reforming the legal bases of private investment and small-scale family farming in Guinean agriculture (Forum on rural land in Guinea, 2016)

appraisal: the platform notes the current negative impacts for the FF of the project to expand the Guinean Oil Palm and Rubber Company (SOGUIPAH) - expropriations. Women and young people have poor access to land.

SIERRA LEONE

- **"content:** dual ownership structure. In the Western Region, private ownership of land (freehold or franc regime) is allowed. In the rest of the country, land is subject to community ownership controlled by traditional chiefs who administer it in accordance with customary principles and practices. A national land policy is currently being drafted, providing for better protection of women's rights (provisional document 2015).
- *appraisal: current situation unfavorable for small-scale family farmers: unclear boundaries of family land, lack of access to land for women and young people, land grabbing by large oil palm and rubber plantations (Socfin.SL), Land disputes.

LIBERIA

- **"content:**Customary landlords. A proposed land law that strengthens the right of local communities to customary land and secures long-term occupation and use of land by family farms should reduce inequalities for women and other vulnerable social groups. The new land law is to be voted in 2016.
- ****appraisal:** emergency to resolve a tense and conflicting situation that is very harmful to the tenure security of the FF (400,000 farmers expropriated by the extension of the large oil palm and rubber plantations of the Liberia Agricultural Company Socfin.Ltd).

25. Coastal countries on the South Atlantic coast: the weight of inheritance and conflicts of interest that must be overcome

IVORY COAST

- **content:** the 1998 Rural Land Law, still in force, organizes the systematic titration of customary rights into private property rights by excluding foreigners from access to land ownership in a context of strong agrarian migration. New rural land law in preparation.
- ****appraisal:** the farmers platform notes the increasing number of land disputes, particularly between growers and rubber planters.

GHANA

Content: coexistence of a customary land tenure with diversified characteristics, generally unfavorable to women (ownership of land in common, 80% of land) and a public system opening the possibility to individual ownership (freehold). In 1999, Ghana published a national land policy aimed at addressing the many problems and land disputes. Since 2003, a land administration project (LAP) has been put in place to implement this policy (creation of land commissions).

☞appraisal: large-scale hoarding by multinationals or the diaspora (mining projects, biofuels) is threatening family farmers in some areas. Small-scale agrarian reorganization within the framework of the « Block Farming Program » linked to the Agricultural Mechanization Program (AMSEC).

TOGO

- **"content:** in a context marked with high insecurity of land governed by obsolete provisions (land code of 1906) or not applied (reform of 1974), a preliminary draft of a new land code codifying access to land and land transactions have been validated in 2015. It lays the foundations for a comprehensive land and property reform.
- @appraisal: strong centralization of land administration. Complexity of specific legal categories (customary land managed by customary communities, and national domain) alongside more classical categories (public domain, private domain of the State, private property). Special role and weight of traditional chieftainships Means of regulating pacifying social relations (arbitration, conflict prevention), but also an obstacle to the reform and modernization of land rights systems (large margin of maneuver left to the chiefdoms, but very close relations at the level of Cantons, with political power and state services, ambiguous role of chiefdoms in very opaque land markets).

BFNIN

- content: new land and federal code adopted in 2013, limiting the possibilities of land grabbing (high involvement of the FOs in its preparation).
- ****appraisal:** the current land reform must make land more available, but there is no information from producers on this reform

Chapter 3: The recent work of the farmers' platforms on national policies, and its main results

(8) THE ACTION OF THE FARMERS PLATFORMS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

26. The topics recently developed by the farmers farmers platforms

Feedback from the platforms enables to identify exactly 11 topics on which they have led actions to influence policies:

- 1. family farms access to inputs and equipment
- 2. the orientation of agricultural policies in favor of family farms
- 3. defending the family farming model
- 4. land security and access to FF, use of these

resources

- 5. the valuation and marketing of FF productions
- 6. funding for agriculture and FF
- 7. the agricultural council
- 8. support programs and vocational training for women and young people;
- 9. organization of the agricultural profession
- 10. climate change promotion of agro-ecology
- 11.sectors revitalization and structuring



COMPARATIVE TABLE C: RECENT POLICIES FOSITIONING OF ROPPA PLATEFORMS

| seaboard | PNOPPA BENIN | | Evalua- tion of agricultural policies LOA | | Pleading on land code | Advertising of original products |
|---|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| south Atlantic | CT0P T0G0 | Inputs Marketing | Document position- ing on sectorial policies | dialogue with gouvPTF and FF ds in the pol- icies and programs" | | Infrastruc- ture and marketing |
| Coastal countries of the south Atlantic seaboard | FONG GHANA | Subvsidy inputs, equipements Marketing | ODD 2016/30 Agri cultural progromme review agricultural policies pleading. | GMOconcerns | | Market trans- formation Fish and cantee suppy |
| Coastal | ANOPACI IVORY COAST | Improved | formulat. PND, PNIA; LOA | | Study land rural law | Product transorfa- tion and access to market |
| ıtries: | FUN LIBERIA | Access of EF to Inputs | | | pPleading against land mono- piliza- tion | |
| Forest-dominated countries: affected by Ebola | NAFSL SIERRA LEONE | Quality of seedings, Input cost non adapted to tractors | | | | |
| Forest-c af | CNOP-G GUINEA | Supply manage- ment, and use of inputs | participa- tion DPP (public or private dialogue policy) | AIAF | denunci- ation and expro- priations SOGUIPAH | |
| western d | QNOCPA GUINEA BISSAU | | reorien- tation of support FF | FF rice-grow- ing | Sensiti- zation of FF on the landed | |
| Coastal countries of the western Atlantic seaboard | NACOFAG GAMBIA | Policy and seeding law | Parliament pleading | Rural mobilization- bilization- AIAF;Na- tional Coordina- tion Comit- tee FF | Campaign on direc- tives and volontary governance F. | |
| Coastal co At | CNCR SENEGAL | Avail- ability of seeds | positpo- sitioning based on PSE, PRACAS | National survey. ff Farmers mobilisa- tion. AIAF | participat. Participa- tion. CNRF - eng- gagement on landed reforms. | actions protection onions, rice FIARA |
| elian band: | CN0P MALI | Sugges- tions on Agricultural equipement | Reply to Governmental, parliarment and PTF consultancy on.Policies topics | mobilistat. AIAF agroecology conference | Negociation landed reforms; Women access to lands | |
| Country of the Sudano-Sahelian band: | CPF BURKINA FASO | inputs and equipment | Reply to Governmental consultancy on Policies topics | Reply on the consultancy based on the Agricultural model | Reply to regular consul- tancy | consultat. Regular consultancy on the imple- mentation of product |
| Country | PFPN NIGER | Public purchase and Access to Inputs | Maputo treaty, APE | Agri- cultural defence. Domestic Agri-ecol- ogy | Registerer in PFPN strategy | ICam- paign for local com- sumption; price black- eyed pea; |
| Positioning Topics | | 1. access to inputs and equipement | 2.Agricul- tural policies Orientations | 3.Agricultural model : domestic agriculture | 4. land | 5.Volorization and Products Marketing |

COMPARATIVE TABLE C: RECENT POLICIES FOSITIONING OF ROPPA PLATEFORMS

| lue Sud | PNOPPA BENIN | Pleading for the imple- mentation of FNDA (Na- tional fund for agricultural developmnt | | | mémorandum paysan LOA | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Pays côtiers de la façade Atlantique Sud | CT0P T0G0 | Consult on Agricultural sector adapted financing et Creation of Agricutural bank. | | | | | |
| ers de la fa | FONG | | | Rural women promo- tion | cadre juridique OP OHADA | | |
| Pays côti | ANOPACI IVORY COAST | Agriculture long-term finance FIRCA | Funding of the council (FIRCA) | | LOA-CI; OHADA réorganisation chambres d'agriculture | Greenhouse gas reduction | |
| restière Ebola) | FUN LIBÉRIA | Access of FF to the devel- opment fund for produc- tivity | | | | | |
| Pays à dominante forestière (touchés par fièvre Ebola) | NAFSL SIERRA LEONE | | | Rural exodus of Young villagers | | | |
| Pays à do (touché | CNOP-G GUINÉE | | PAMEF | Establish- ement of women and youth in FF | | | channel affected by MVE |
| atlantique | QNOCPA GUINEA BISSAU | | Over multiplication / commercial. Seeds | communi- cation FF | | In relation with Agricultur- al climate change | Channel rice, Creation of new ridges |
| Pays côtiers de la façade atlantique Ouest | NACOFAG GAMBIA | | PAMEF | Women training on how to have access to land | | participa- tion to NCC | rice-grow- ing federation implemen- tation |
| Pays côtier | CNCR SENEGAL | | PAMEF | Women access to land | agri- cultural Chamber project | | |
| danienne | CNOP | operational- ization FNAA (National Fund for Agriculture support) | PAMEF | Professional training on deviation | | | |
| ande sahélo-soudanienne | CPF BURKINA FASO | Periodic consultancy on Agricultural financing | Periodic consultations on agricultural advice PAMEF | Women Access to land, Youth employment | the farmer's status | Regular consultancy and participation to COP 21 meetings | |
| Pays de la ban | PFPN NIGER | BAGRIcreation Iplementation FISAN (Food security fund.) | Support structure | | | | |
| Thèmes de positionne- | | 6. finance- ment de l'agricul- ture et des EF | 7. conseil agricole | 8. femmes, jeunes; formation profession-nelle | 9. organisation de la profession agricole/OP | 10. change- ment climatique | 11. relance filières |

27. Forms of political action by platforms

Lobbying towards decision-makers and consultations

Depending on the subject, consultations are initiated at the initiative of the public authorities, with the national platform (with other FO networks if there are any) to know the farmers sensitivity, or are provoked by the platform request hearing to present grievances. These exchanges are regular in BURKINA FASO or in GUINEA, almost nonexistent in SIERRALEONE or LIBERIA, punctual elsewhere.

On the other hand, such exchanges exist in all countries with TFPs and civil society, and informally with influential state actors (senior civil servants, parliamentarians, elected local authorities ...). It is through them that the lobbying of the platforms takes place.

participation in consultative and political dialogue frameworks or ad hoc national commissions

Farmers' platforms are now associated with multi-stakeholder dialogue frameworks on the delivery of development assistance programs and can make their voices heard. They co-preside over some of them (CÔTE D'IVOIRE, BENIN).

When they are well positioned at national level, they can be involved in the policy or legislative process in ad hoc committees (land codes, orientation laws - SENEGAL, MALI, BENIN)

organization or participation in events

Agricultural fairs, fairs or farmers days allow platforms to meet national decision-makers at the highest level (Head of State, Prime Minister, Ministers of the rural sector ...). The platforms of NIGER, BURKINA FASO, GUINEA, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, BENIN are particularly attentive to seize these opportunities. All the platforms participate in the FIARA organized every year for 17 years in Dakar by the CNCR and the ASPRODEB which proposes in the margin of the exhibition of agricultural products many debates of a political nature.

Topics of the last editions of FIARA

- 2013: "Agricultural investment, production systems and family farming"
- 2014: "food security and sovereignty"
- 2015: "food self-sufficiency"
- 2016: "role and place of FOs and FF in the implementation of the Emerging Senegal Plan"

The International Year of Family Farming (AIAF 2014) provided several platforms with the opportunity to organize events on family farming (MALI, SENEGAL, GAMBIA, GUINEA, TOGO). The Malian platform co-organized the International Conference on Agroecology in 2015 in MALI.

Advocacy campaigns, farmers' demonstrations, creation of coalitions

In order to make its messages heard and to influence policies, the farmers farmer movement has collective modes of action that can appeal to decision-makers and have greater visibility. The platforms of MALI, SENEGAL and GAMBIA thus organized in 2014 large mobilizations farmerss at the occasion of the AIAF. Advocacy campaigns on consumption, land grabbing, land grabbing and other issues have been mounted by the NIGER, MALI, SENEGAL, LIBERIA and BENIN platforms. MALI has created a coalition to combat land grabbing in all its forms (CMAT Malian Convergence Against Land Grabbing, which is made up of five major Malian civil society organizations: CNOP, AOPP, CAD MALI, UACDDD, LJDH).

Communication

Communication extends the watch on policies and is part of advocacy strategies: dissemination of position papers (MALI, SENEGAL, TOGO), memoranda; Statements to the press, participation in televised foras (GUINEA BISSAU).

(9) MAIN RESULTS OF THE NATIONAL PLATFORMS POLITICAL ACTION

28. Strategically, the types of results targeted by the platforms are gradually: (1) being heard; (2) positioning themselves in decision-making systems; (3) curbing unfavorable developments; (4) obtaining commitments

of principles (general guidelines ...); And (5) achieving tangible results for FF.

Actions of political influence of the platforms thus go in three directions:

- Most platforms participate in the development of policies and / or framework programs for the development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector. Their presence favors a better understanding of rural realities and FF in the definition of implementation strategies and mechanisms (Niger: PRAPS, FISAN, Burkina Faso: PAFASP, PAPSA, PNGT, Mali: Land Code, Senegal: PRACAS, Land reform, Benin LOA and regulations on the status of the farmers farmer, Côte d'Ivoire: PNIA, PAFARCI).
- On the occasion of policy reviews with which they are associated, platforms can make concrete proposals to reorient policies / mechanisms and strategies already developed by the State that have been unfavorable to family farming (Togo: Strategy for the implementation of PADAT and review of the guidance document for the harmonization of cooperative FOs in accordance with Ohada regulations Burkina Faso: coherence of certain strategic policies PNSR, PNDES, PNSAN, SNVACA Mali: FNAA National Fund for Food and Agriculture) Benin: FNDA (National Fund for Agricultural Development).
- Platforms can also carry out continuous monitoring and lobbying to advance farmers' interests. Thus, for example, CNOP Mali knew after the drafting of the land law to influence its direction and content by arriving to accept proposals that better target the concerns of land tenure security of family farms. It was also able to revisit the governance of the FNAA by integrating the FOs into the project selection committee. Similarly, PNOPPA Benin has fought and secured the establishment of a guarantee fund, which it found to be missing in the FNDA.

Four types of results benefiting directly or indirectly from family farms have been obtained in this way through the political action of the national platforms:

29. first result: Improving the family farms production capacity.

Actions carried out by the platforms on this issue of improving the productivity and incomes of small producers are articulated around three

strategic points:

- Facilitating access to public subsidies. Togo, Senegal, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Mali and Niger have developed strategies to inform their members on the processes and mechanisms for access to public subsidies in the framework of past agricultural campaigns. These subsidies have focused on the distribution of fertilizer and agricultural equipment.
- Establishing mechanisms for access to production inputs. In addition to the fertilizers subsidized as mentioned above, the effects of the political actions of the platforms concerned access to agricultural production equipment. In Benin, a farm mechanization project has been developed to facilitate small farmers' access to agricultural equipment. In Senegal, too, an almost identical strategy was identified, while in Togo and Guinea Bissau, access was restricted to seeds access
- Achieving hydro-agricultural developments.
 Following joint actions at the regional and national levels, the last two years have seen a strengthening of the irrigation schemes set up for the benefit of family farms and support for irrigated production. These interventions were mainly noted in Senegal, Niger; Mali, Burkina Faso and Benin.

30.second result: Improving the competitiveness of agricultural products from .family farms

By eliminating some tariff barriers, the introduction of periodic freezing mechanisms carried out by the FOs with the government, the support of the FF for participation in major commercial events. Special mention should be made for:

- The revival of the slogan " to consume local" in Niger. This approach aims to increase the sensitivity of consumers to products from family farms and locally processed, and to facilitate local production through measures to alleviate tax constraints.
- The elimination of non-regulatory taxes on fishing in Niger. The advocacy actions carried out by the platform have effectively led to the elimination of taxes that are unreasonably levied on inland fishermen in Niger. This action improves their revenues and reposition their products competitively in the market
- The valuation of rice and onion in Senegal

through market regulation and the elimination of premiums on electricity. The actions developed by the CNCR have led to the setting up of a mechanism for the development of production contracts and the definition for the freezing periods of imports. These strategies increase the marketing capacity of production from family farms. The abolition of premiums on electricity in the valley has led to a more competitive supply of products from family farms since production costs have decreased significantly.

31. third result: The setting up and development of appropriate agricultural financing mechanisms.

- The diversified actions of the platforms have improved the access of family farms agricultural credit, the governance of financing mechanisms and / or the effectiveness of financial tools / products in relation to the needs and demands of the FF. In Mali, where the agricultural development fund set up almost excluded small producers not only from the management of the fund but also from access to resources, advocacy by the platform made it possible to review this strategy and to include Small producers to this fund. In addition to agricultural credit. Togo, Senegal and Benin have also developed, through their lobbying, mechanisms allowing existing funds in their countries to support access to agricultural storage facilities.

32. Fourth result: Increasing the sensitivity of public authorities to family farms.

In most of the member countries of the network, this increased sensitivity, which has an indirect effect on government attention to family farms, was noted.

- The legitimacy of family farming: the involvement of national platforms in the management and implementation of agricultural policies. In Niger, Benin, Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire, there is a greater interest in FO interventions in the implementation of agricultural development policies. This has led to recognition of family farming as a model of production that ensures food security. In addition, producer orientations on agroecology and securing and consolidating the land market in Mali, Senegal and Niger clearly show the influence of FOs actions on strengthening the resilience of FF.
- The development of agricultural regulation laws. In the 7 countries involved in the definition of an LOA, the status of the farmer was not clearly defined. The advocacy actions maintained by the platforms have allowed these actors to initiate the process of drafting these laws, which should also make it easier for family farmers to access public resources through the various funds they foresee.
- The recognition of FOs and the strengthening of their positions. In Mali, for example, the platform has been recognized as an organization of public utility, which means that it is considered capable of carrying out actions of national scope for the benefit of the farmers. These results reinforce the sense of belonging of the family farms to the member platforms.

| Security: restit. Stolen Animals Persistent effects of previous actions (farmers days) |
|---|
|---|

| SU | GUINEA BISSAU | • FP has greatly influenced the orientation of programs and policies in that it has weighed for support and support for FF because what is being done is that the authorities oriented support based on political clientele | Production Improvement of the access of FFs to backing and support (< seeds – own services developed by the FP for the distribution of seeds) Opening, capacities building opportunity and participation capacities to trainings, fairs (for the leaders) representation: Benefit indirectly from their platform acknowledgement growing of and the legitimacy |
|--|---------------|--|---|
| Recent results obtained political actions of coastal/west countries' platforms | GAMBIA | On AGRI FAMILY SUPPORT: The Working Group on Agriculture and Natural Resources set up with the representatives of the FOs The Act and the Seed Policy implemented A proposal is developed to demonstrate and test the financing mechanism of family farming On LAND Training of Members of the National Assembly on the IFAD-financed Voluntary Guidelines on Land Governance through IPAR in Senegal and establishment of a parliamentary committee on land Land policy has been reviewed | Global production Avail fertilizer at social prices (+ seeds ?) Targeted FP actions: (AIAF) 16 female farmers got farms to cultivate cereals and gardening. Granting simple agricultural equipment (harness cultivation rather than tractors Access to natural ressources 77 forest parks have been handed over to the community |
| Recent results obt | SENEGAL | CNCR influence (entry 3 representatives in National Commission) Harmonization and federation proposals SOC.CIV (GRAFS creature, conservation of the national domain with possibilities of registration, on ease-by-case basis.) Go towards two land tenure regimes, the establishment of village committees. Women to land and land grabbing) Valuation proposals in guidance note reform On the AGROBU-SINESS competition on sustainable development (PDIDAS sustainable and inclusive program of agribusiness Senegal) Orientation scheme distribution of lands to be developed Great. Monitoring mechanism and consultation framework for mayors On agricultural policy: par. Finalisat. Doc progr PRACAS; Influenced integrat. Dry cereals (better recognition by actors Agricultural) | Access to subsidies and distribution. Agricultural equipment (+positioning of FOs in management / distribution mechanisms) Preservation of working tools (hydro-agri development) in the face of threats from foreign investors; Balance in the pattern of distribution of land to be managed which preserves the interests of FF in the face of agribusiness (PDIDAS) Regulation of rice / onion markets (price negotiation, freezing periods, production contracts) Suppression fixed premium on electricity in Vallée (lobby / FOs advocacy) |
| | | Results | achieved or expected impactsfor FF |

| | Recent results obtain | Recent results obtained through the political action of the forest-country platforms | ırms |
|---|--|--|--|
| | GUINEA | SIERRA LEONE | LIBERIA |
| Results | Taking into account the sectors impacted by Ebola in the UNDP, FAO, MRU (Mano River Union - Mano River Union) program projects. CNOP-G is the gateway to PNAAFA (national program to support actors in the agricultural sector, (member of the steering committee) | One has been able to improve development policies and programs through lobbying and advocacy to improve farmers activities But the influence of FOs is very low because there is no established link between the government and the FOs. The influence is more permanent on the programs | Einancing, improving productivity Successful advocacy and negotiations with the Central Bank to release a \$ 2.5 million Liberian loan to strengthen the capacity of FF for better productivity Fund for capacity building and productivity improvement (which had not reached the local level). Equipment, support for FF FUN in charge of coordinating the ASRP project (Agriculture sector rehabilitation project - IFAD, 2009) - 12-month contract 2015/16) 10 month contract with Ministry for capacity building of extension services. |
| achieved or ex- pected impacts for FF | Not described (implicitly:"taking into account concerns from FFs ") | We have set up producer groups that have been transformed into a School of Agricultural Practice, Women and Youth Cooperatives that have become a Trade Unit for Agricultural Products. We have been able to advocate for agricultural equipment with the government and FAO to support producers affected by Ebola so that they can return to their agricultural activities. | 180 FF benefited from the loan in 2016 280 pilot farmers trained in improved cultivation practices cassava, rice, market gardening (ASRP); Supposed to multiply on 20 EF Access equipment via agricultural tool banks Advanved hope to access to land and water (<women) access="" and="" property.<="" td="" to=""></women)> |

| | | Résultats récents obtenus à travers l | Résultats récents obtenus à travers l'action politique des plateformes des pays côtiers/Sud | pnS/sl |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| | IVORY COAST | GHANA | 1060 | BENIN |
| Results | IMPLICATION/ INFLUENCE ON: Content / adoption of the LOA-Ci LOA-Ci LUGA-Ci turing Chambers of Agriculture PND, PNIA Chairs the consultation framework for the agricultural sector and civil society (PNIA) Helped to obtain sectoral financing of food production activities (participatory discussions) Influence on: FIRCA (Interprofund for Agri- cultural Research and Consult- ing Fund - WAAAPP), PARFACI (SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR THE RELAUNCH OF AGRI- CULTURAL SECTORS IN IVORY COAST / AFD) | INFLUENCE on GVT action: in the rice sector from interventions related to: • Rehabilitation and expansion of existing irrigation infrastructure. • Development of structures for the regulation and collection of inland water valleys and plains (for improved water management). • Provision of adequate resources (including funding) from relevant institutions -DAES and GIDA to assist farmers in the use of collected water and regulatory structures. • TANGIBLE IMPACTS: • access to tractor services at affordable prices responded to FO advocacy by creating new AMSECs. • Process of fertilizer subsidy instalments changed as a result Fos advocacy | INFLUENCE on: | INFLUENCE through: Insertion in the new Land and Domain Code promulgated in 2014 of the provisions governing the purchase of agricultural land. The need to equip Benin with an Agricultural Guidance Law (perceived today by all the actors including the officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEP) who throw them out altogether any discussion in this direction. Entry into the MAEP budget of a line for the realization of the LOA. The adoption of the decree creating the FNDA and the effective start of its operationalization; The participation of PNOPPA in any strategic decision on the agricultural sector in Benin. (Vice-Chair National Steering Committee) |
| achieved or ex- pected impacts for FF | FF producers feel more secure in the implementation of their activities because their concerns are taken into consideration" | Previously the commercial farmers benefited more from the subsidized fertilizer than the small farmers for which it was intended. The advocacy pressure on the fertilizer subsidy has borne fruit as the trend has changed. 50% of the family farms interviewed in the coastal zones have certified that thanks to these actions they have been able to receive fertilizers by instalments | Increase in the market for cereal products, increase in the sale price of cereals on domestic and foreign markets, Increase in EF revenues The FF of the beneficiary FFs will benefit from PADAT investments to improve the conservation and marketing of their products FOs. relief procedures and compliance procedures OHADA | Improving access for rural producers to rural land land better direction in the FF direction of national policy Protection of products of local origin Expected LOA: farmers status |

34. Conditions which favored the production of these results through the national platforms and the ROPPA's political action:

With the advent of structural adjustment programs, the States of the region disengagement from 1994 from the agricultural extension sector. This situation has led farmers to take charge of their problems directly.

This is how a structured farmers movement has developed, starting with the family farmer who defines his needs and takes them to the FOs (groups, associations, cooperatives, etc.), which have gradually consolidated and to defend the interests of the farmers. The results highlighted in this first FFO report demonstrate this effectiveness.

Over the years, the West African farmers movement has taken on a scale that has facilitated the improvement of farmers leadership, particularly within the ROPPA around its directors. One of the strengths of the

network is the strengthening of mutual capacity developed by the various stakeholders. It has allowed the emergence of a critical mass of committed and competent leaders, determined to protect the interests of the farmers: it is for them a question of survival. These leaders have been able to draw on resource persons who have made themselves available to accompany them and technically support farmers movement.

These results could only be produced in a favorable political environment, marked by the impetus given by the Maputo and Malabo agreements, the will and the vision of certain political decision-makers, notably at the level of regional institutions (ECOWAS, WAEAM, CILSS) which have created a strategic opportunity reinforcing the action of the farmers movement.

Finally, the openness of the partners and their availability of support remains one of the important factors for the success of the action of the FOs and the results that it has recorded.







Chapter 4: The general framework for regional public policies

The analysis and exchanges within the ROPPA reveals a clear break by the African States in formulating and implementing the development policy for of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector since the adoption of NEPAD / PDDAA and the Maputo Declaration in 2003.

(10) FOS PARTICIPATION IN THE DEFINITION OF THE REGIONAL POLICIES GENERAL FRAMEWORK

- 35. The regional policies general framework for agriculture and FF is almost the same as for national public policies. This framework is characterized by the same major initiatives that bring together common national priorities at regional level and are implemented in countries through tools and programs.
- 36. ROPPA and various FOs and CSOs took part in several policy reforms which constitute the background of this regional framework. These reforms had issues related to agricultural development and compliance with commitments made in regional, continental and international declarations in which African States were stakeholders (Maputo, EPA, WTO, ODA). They have materialized in:

The PAU adopted in 2001 by the 8 member countries of the WAEMU

 The NEPAD / PDDAA adopted in 2003 by the AU Heads of State and Government. ROPPA has been very active in the consultation

- between African FO networks (ROPPA, SACAU, EAFF, PROPAC) to define a position to be defended at the summit of head of states;
- ECOWAP / PDDAA adopted in 2005 by the Summit of Head of Stateand Government of the ECOWAS. Building on its experience during the previous political reforms (PAU, NEPAD / PDDAA, etc.)

ROPPA participated, in the ECOWAP / PDDAA formulation process, as a member of the regional steering committee, which is the degeneration of PDDAA in West Africa.

This regional space is also the subject of other major strategies, especially the CILSS strategic framework for food and nutrition security, to which farmers' representatives have been involved.

37. Since 2010, the implementation of ECOWAP / CAADP has been based on regional PRIA and NAIPs in the 15 countries. ROPPA was a party to the pact, which involved the stakeholders (States, ECOWAS Commission, development partners) in the first-generation PRIA (2010-2015). This regional agricultural investment programme has been implemented through programs, measures / regulations and various tools and ROPPA has been involved in the formulation and implementation of some of these tools.



TABLE E: VARIOUS PROGRAMS, TOOLS, MEASURES OF THE PRIA 1 IN WHICH ROPPA IS INVOLVE

| Projects/programs /tools/measures | field of interventions | Implementation modality | Geographic area |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1.Project portfolio ARAA (Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food) | Agriculture, livestock, pastoralism, environment, CV development, sustainable production systems | Competitive Funds | All ECOWAS countries |
| 2.Regional reserve of food security | Regional Stock of food security to reinforce nationals and emergencies stocks Buying and distribution of food | International call for tender for the store supply Capacity building | All ECOWAS countries |
| 3.Programs of development of priority sectors (WAEMU) | Livestock, maize, rice, cotton, poul- try farming through infrastructure development, capacity building of actors | Support to national programs / projects and stakeholders | 8 WAEMU countries |
| 4.PRAPS (Regional Program for Support to Pastoralism in the Sa- hel, supported by the World Bank) | Pastoralism | Soutien à des programmes/pro- jets nationaux et des acteurs | 4 pays du Sahel en Afrique de l'Ouest + Tchad et Mauri- tanie |
| 5.PRIDEC (regional livestock investment program in coastal countries) | Breeding | Support to State and stakeholder projects | Coastal countries |
| 6.GAFSP (global agricultural food security program) | Food and Nutrition Security and Poverty Reduction | Support to projects / Public Programs (PNIA), private and FOs through 3 windows: public, private and small pro- ducers | Several West African countries . |
| 6.PPAAO / WAAP (West Africa Agricultural Productivity Program) | Agriculture, livestock, environment, CVs / sectors, sustainable production systems, technology diffusion | Competitive Funds, Project Submissions | 11 countries |
| 7.PARIIS-SIIP (Regional Support Project for the Sahel Irrigation Initiative) | Irrigation in agriculture | Public projects / programs | 4 countries in West Africa + Chad and Mauritania |
| 8. PAPROSEM (project to support the production and sustainable distribution of certified seed in West Africa | Production and distribution of certified seed | Soutien à des initiatives des acteurs | 7 ECOWAS countries |
| 9.Support project the offensive for the sustainable and sustained revival of rice cultivation | Production and distribution of certified seed | Support for stakeholder initiatives | 4 ECOWAS countries (BF, Mali, Senegal, Nigeria) |
| 10.WASP (West African Seed Program) | Promotion of the use of certified seed | Support to stakeholder projects and capacity building | All ECOWAS countries |
| 11.PATAE (Agro-ecological Transition Support Project in the Sahel and West Africa) | contering population poverty - im- proving resilience and food and nu- trition security - strengthening the resilience of family farms | Support to the capitalization and actors projects scaling and to their capacities reinforcement | All ECOWAS countries |

| 12.PREDIP (Regional Project for Dialogue and Investment in Pas- toralism and Transhumance in the Sahel and West African Coastal Countries) (PREDIP) | Pastoralism - cross-border transhu- mance - food security | Support to public programs and policies - capacity building and stakeholder initiatives | Sahelian countries and of hosting transhumance in West Africa |
|---|--|---|--|
| 13. PASANAO (Food Security and Nutrition Security Program in West Africa) | Food Safety: Regional policies - innovative food security operations - capacity building ECOWAS and stakeholders | Support for capacity building ECOWAS and stakeholders - call for projects | All ECOWAS countries |
| 14. PRAOP / ECOWAPP (Regional Support Program for FOs in the framework of the implementation of ECOWAP) | Strengthening the capacity of FO networks for the implementation of ECOWAP | Support to OP networks (ROPPA, APESS, RBM) | 15 ECOWAS countries |
| 15. Regional Offensive for Sustainable Rice Development | Promotion of West African Rice Sectors | Improving the environment of rice production - enhancing competitiveness | 15 ECOWAS countries |
| 16. RPCA (Food Crisis Prevention Network) | Food crisis | Concertation — Dialogue - Promotion Harmonized Framework of Analysis | All ECOWAS countries |
| 17. AGIR (Global Agency for Resilience) | Fighting Vulnerability | Strengthening the resilience of public policies - building the capacity of stakeholders | All ECOWAS countries |
| 18. AIC (West African Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture) | Sustainable production system - resilience to climate change | Reflection on policy tools and tools | 15 ECOWAS countries |

(11) ROPPA'S OVERALL ASSESMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATIONOF REGIONAL POLICIES

38. Most national policies which farmers' organizations appreciated the effects on family farms are within the framework of the NFPs supported inter alia through the programs and tools of implementation of the first generation PRIA. Through its policy watch, ROPPA has monitored and assessed the effectiveness and effectiveness of these regional tools and programs and / or the modalities of implementing a number of regional programs and tools for their implementation

39. The ROPPA assessment of the ECOWAP + 10 process, based on review workshops in 4 national platforms (CNOP Mali, CPF, CTOP, CNCR) and a regional workshop, notes that many programs / initiatives, Measures and

tools provided for under the PRIA, were not implemented effectively: FRAA, Rice offensive, AIC. credit enhancement

Slow mobilization and / or resource allocation impacts the effectiveness of the PRIA response to the demands and needs of family farms to ensure their transformation / modernization and increase their resilience.

Other programs and tools on topics considered to be priority and urgent were partially implemented and / or initiated very late after their adoption: RRSA, seed programs.

The PRIA 1 has not sufficiently taken into account the livestock, pastoralism and fisheries sectors. Under the high demand of the FO networks, a Livestock Action Plan and a Task Force on Pastoralism were implemented in 2010. This dynamic aimed at strengthening the livestock and pastoralism sector support has continued

with the formulation of a number of regional programs to support this sector (PRAPS, PRIDEC ...)

The PRIA process, unlike national 40. PNIAs, has improved the level of mobilization financial resources to support the development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries sector. Having a successful process in formulating and implementing ECOWAP / CAADP with some legitimacy through its participatory and inclusive approach has postered the interest and interventions of partners in the region. However, this trend did not allow mobilizing the level of financial resources planned for the PRIA. The effective engagement of TFPs in a common PRIA implementation fund has been well below expectations. This financing problem is particularly a problem with the partial implementation of the WAEMU Regional Agricultural Development Fund (FRDA) and the failure to implement the Regional Fund for Agriculture and Food (CDAAO) which are the financing tools adopted respectively in the PAU and ECOWAP.

ROPPA's analysis of the PRIA highlighted the low level of specific and ambitious consideration of issues related to women and youth. It constitutes an important limit in the transformation and modernization of FFs.

(12) ROPPA'S ASSESSMENT OF THE MAIN PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTATION

42. ARAA (Regional Agency for Agriculture and Food) project portfolio:

- **"content:** launching of several calls for projects (3), Implementation actions to improve the capacities of the actors in various topics for the benefit of the actors involved in the implementation of the ECOWAP implementation programs and tools;
- **appraisal: Late implementation of ARAA; Poor performance in the use of resources devoted to the implementation of the project portfolio due to administrative challenges but also to the procedures and conditions related to the support of financial and technical partners.

42.Regional Food Security stock

- **"content:** regional food security stock based on stores located in several zones. A process of information and capacity building of stakeholders has been implemented. Two calls were made to supply the reserve.
- *appraisal: Slow process. Current level of performance in project / program management that remains low

43 Priority program development programs (UEMOA)

- **content:** Support mainly for public projects / programs; To some extent, direct support for capacity building.
- **appraisal: weakness in the follow-up of the initial orientations (chain approach) and reorientation towards a global approach aimed at food security (PCD-TASAN). Weakness in monitoring and evaluation of results.

44. PRAPS (Regional Programs of Support to Pastoralism in the Sahel, supported by the World Bank

- **"content:** training of stakeholders, support for public programs / projects, contracting with APESS and RBM for carrying activities, implementation of activities aimed at improving the institutional environment of pastoralism
- *appraisal: delays in the implementation of the program, the lack of relevance of the program established by the regional actors, including ECOWAS and WAEMU, with regard to the reality of livestock farming and the actors involved in the program

45 PRIDEC (Regional Livestock Investment Program in Coastal Countries, 2016)

- **content:** formulation in the process of completion; process carried out by RBM on behalf of all the networks
- *appraisal: project remains focused on pastoralism and does not take into account livestock as a whole

46 GAFSP (World Program for Agriculture and Food Security, World Bank, 2010)

content: support to several public and private projects / programs in West Africa; Support to

- projects of small producers carried out by their organizations
- **appraisal: promotion of a participatory and inclusive approach favoring the participation of Fos in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of public programs; tool to support the implementation of NFPs in several countries; Procedures of the Monitoring Bodies (WB, IFAD, FAO, AfDB, IFC) and capacity constraints of national GAFSP support mechanisms have resulted in a number of countries repaying funds at the end of the programs. Representation of ROPPA and other CSO and FOs networks in the COS. Divergences within the group of partners regarding the model of agriculture to be supported

47. PARIIS-SIIP (Regional Support Project for the Sahel Irrigation Initiative)

- **"content:** Formulation of the project at the finalization phase after a long consultation in the region; Conducted many studies. Vision based on a renewed approach to irrigation projects / programs, among others, sharing and valorisation of the experiences of different countries and actors in irrigation and taking into account all the services needed to the achievement of the objectives of irrigation projects / programs
- ****appraisal :** Willingness to ensure good participation of FOs, CSOs and communities. Project is slow to materialize

48.PAPROSEM (project to support the production and sustainable distribution of certified seed in West Africa)

- **"content:** Support for the production and marketing of certified seed in 7 countries; Capacity-building and support for the structuring of certified seed-producing farms; Capacity building of FOs involved in the production and distribution of certified seed
- **appraisal: Emphasizing the important role of FOs in the production and distribution of certified seed and effective reinforcement of the capacities of the FOs involved in the production and distribution of certified seed, but delay in the execution of the program linked mainly to the procedures of the partner Financial institutions and the organization of research institutions responsible for monitoring the implementation of the project. Poor ownership of the project by some national platforms. Results vary widely from country to country.

49. Support project for the regional offensive for sustainable and sustained rice-farming

- **"content:** Support to the production and distribution of certified rice seeds in 4 countries (Burkina Faso, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal) by AFSTA and ROPPA members. Support to the action plans of FOs in 4 countries aimed at strengthening the capacities of the structures of the FOs (cooperatives, associations, unions ...) producing certified seeds and the adoption level of certified seeds; Support to strengthen the production capacities of seed companies.
- *appraisal : Slowness in the implementation process



Chapter 5: Recent ROPPA action on regional policies and key results

(13) ROPPA'S INTERVENTION APPROACH

50. Contribute to policy formulation

various strategies developed by ROPPA, in collaboration with other FOs and CSO networks (APESS, RBM, SOS Faim, CSA, CORET, Oxfam, ...), partners and allies, made it possible to take into account certain Proposals of the farmers' organizations in the various rural and agricultural development policy documents. ROPPA and partner CSOs have often begun their process of influencing regional agricultural and rural development policies from the start of their formulation process. The arguments put forward by ROPPA are based on concrete proposals which aimed at taking into account the concerns and needs of family farms. The expertise and anticipatory capacity developed by ROPPA and its partners in this field, coupled with the will of regional policy makers, means

 ECOWAP / CAADP and the first generation (PRIA) and 2nd generation (PRIASAN)

that the formulation of most sectoral policies

is genuinely involving FOs / CSOs. The most

illustrative examples include:

 PAU with its various implementation programs (Strategic Chain Development Programs, PCD-TACSAN).

51.Raising awareness among decision-makers outside the consultation frameworks.

ROPPA was also very active in hearings and consultations with policy makers to raise awareness, in less restrictive spaces on their analysis of the issues and their proposals. During the ECOWAP formulation process, ROPPA's administrators could meet with ECOWAS, WAEMU, ACP secretariat authorities to present the farmers views of the world to ECOWAP and its Content. As part of its plea against the EPAs, ROPPA, its national platforms and partner and allied CSO networks met on several occasions with ACP ambassadors and European parliamentarians in Brussels.

52.Influencing policy reviews

ROPPA and its partners and / or allies have also contributed to a strategic review of some ongoing policies, strategies and / or programs that did not adequately address the concerns of family farm development. This has been done through strengthening their orientations. strategies. content or bν developina complementary measures. Thus, ROPPA and its national member platforms have contributed to strategic reviews of several policies, programs and policy tools. An example of its action combined with that of Action Aid is the creation of a third "missing link" GAFSP window dedicated to the direct financing of family farms and their organizations.

(14) THE MAIN RESULTS OF THE NETWORK AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL

Over the past three years, the influence of the network at the regional level has led to three main categories of results:

53. Increasing the accountability of FOs in the implementation of regional sectoral policies and programs.

We note in this plan:

- o The attentive and structured policy of the FOs in the steering of ECOWAP and the PAU, which contributed to the implementation of policy tools favorable to family farms. They have thus influenced the orientation of the constitution of the regional food security reserve and its functions. Its role of markets regulation has been defended by the FOs likewise its supply prioritarily focused on the offer of production of the region.
- o Responsibility of fisheries stakeholders for the establishment of a framework for the exchange and steering of sector development policies in West Africa (October 2016). By appealing to the NEPAD Secretariat, ROPPA has been able to reduce the decision and the direction of setting up

a framework of players in the fisheries sector in West Africa linked to an African Union program. The actors of the sector of fishing of the region were empowered through a steering committee and a consensual agenda to deepen the relevant missions and the modalities of setting up such a framework.

54. Negotiating and obtaining mandates for the implementation of regional programs sensitive to family farms

Thus:

- o On the proposal of the FOs networks (APESS, RBM, ROPPA) a livestock program was developed in addition to ECOWAP. In addition, after the adoption of the PRAPS (2015), the FO networks negotiated and obtained from the ECOWAS and the partners the PRIDEC preparation, led by RBM on the mandate of the other networks, which complements the PRAPS in Taking into account livestock in coastal countries.
- In relation to the defense of the rights of family farms for the production of their seeds and the conservation of their genetic background:
 - ROPPA and its partners negotiated obtained the mandate for implementation of two seeds production and distribution projects certified by the family farms themselves, emphasizing their principal and priority role in the production and Consumption of seeds. These two projects, PAPROSEM and Rice Offensive Support Projects, are being implemented with the technical coordination of CORAF. PAPROSEM and the Rice Offensive Support Project are supported by the World Bank and USAID respectively in the implementation of ECOWAP. They aim to improve the access to certified seed to family farms and thus increase their production capacity.
 - (ii) By highlighting the work of some local communities in West Africa to develop and

preserve the local cattle breed "Azawak", ROPPA obtained the AU's commitment to establish with its FOs members and under the coordination of the ROPPA, a Cultural Biological Protection Protocol (PCB) to defend and promote the rights of these communities in Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger on an endemic bovine breed (adapted to the Sahelian-type ecosystem) Good productive capacity of meat and milk.

55. Defending the concerns and demands of family farms in trade policies and strategies In particular, one note:

- o Obtaining an ECOWAS commitment under the 2nd generation PRIA to monitor the impact of the application of the new ECOWAS-WAEMU TEC on West African agriculture. Having assumed CSO leadership in influencing the content of the region's new CET, ROPPA continues its advocacy for better protection of West African productions and markets through PRIASAN and the EPA negotiations. PRIASAN recommends monitoring the impact of the TEC.
- o The defense of a commercial environment favorable to the access of family farmers to domestic markets in West Africa, by not signing the APE agreements. The action taken by ROPPA and other CSO
 - networks in Africa and Europe over the last few years against the signing of the EPAs has been marked by the non-conclusion to date of this negotiation between the EU and ECOWAS And Mauritania. The non-signature of the EPAs will ensure protection of regional family farms and improve their access to domestic markets. ROPPA has taken action with the Presidents of Nigeria and the Gambia to support their position not to sign the EPAs.
- o Obtaining the research institutions commitment to develop a permanent zone of consultation with the FFs. ROPPA has achieved the commitment of CORAF and the national agricultural research systems in some countries to establish with it and other

networks of FOs and CSOs a fr amework for consultation between researchers and family farmers with With the aim of ensuring a better articulation of research topics with the actual needs of the latter. In Benin, for example, this space has facilitated action research on the biological control of white flies in 2015.

o Development of a zone for consultation, farmers exchanges and support to the governance of IFAD's strategies with IFAD: IFAD's farmers' forum developed under the ROPPA proposal now allows exchanges in between FOs members in IFAD's intervention areas, improved dialogue and co-operation with IFAD officials at different levels, including the Governorate. The Forum contributes to improving the quality of IFAD interventions for family farms.

(15) ROPPA's more specific action on the defined policies within the ECOWAS framework and their national distribution

ECOWAP2005

56. One of the issues that prevailed at the creation of the ROPPA is the the FOs participation in the political decisions affecting the lives of the farmers and their trades. Therefore, has ROPPA embraced and supported the participatory and inclusive processes that have prevailed in the formulation of most regional sectoral policies related to the development of the agro-sylvopastoral and fisheries sector:

The first projects of the ROPPA'

- ROPPA's first project was the conduct of the process of consultation with farmers' organizations (FOs) within the framework of the formulation of the UEMOA Union Agricultural Policy (PAU) in 2001. Consultations were organized In the 8 countries of the WAEMU with workshops that allowed the FOs to participate respectively in the national and regional consultations with a vision and consensual proposals.
- This work was followed by that of NEPAD, which ROPPA initiated in 2003 in collaboration with networks of FOs from other regions of Africa

Based on its early experience, ROPPA has been a major stakeholder at all stages of the ECOWAP formulation process. ROPPA was a member of the Task Force that led the process. It supported the national FOs in several groups of countries to define their own reflections and proposals in relation to the scenarios proposed by the ECOWAS consultants, ROPPA has also helped to connect with FOs in Nigeria, Ghana and Sierra Leone who were not yet statutory members of its network, as well as the chambers of agriculture. Thus, through national and regional consultations of the FOs and the chambers of agriculture, ROPPA made it possible to consolidate consensual positions and proposals of these actors which were defended during the meeting of experts and that of the ministers held in Cotonou in 2005 to prepare and validate the ECOWAP document draft to be submitted to the Summit of Heads of State.

The 5 topics advocated by the ROPPA in the definition of ECOWAP

- the recognition of agricultural family farming as a basis for the development of West African agriculture (integrated into the ECOWAP vision):
- the promotion of food sovereignty (ECOWAP's stated objectives of ensuring food security for populations and reducing dependency on imports);
- 3. priority to the regional market and border protection (creation of a 5th tariff band at 35% customs duties):
- 4. Securing land tenure and guaranteeing the sustainability of production systems,
- 5. the involvement of FOs at all stages of the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policy and programs (participation of ROPPA in the ECOWAS Task Force, FOs signatories to the pacts, Consulting Committee on Agriculture and Food)

As part of the ECOWAP implementation process, ROPPA became a member of the Consulting

Committee on Agriculture and Food set up in 2011 and a signatory of the regional compact.

57. These guidelines guided in 2010 the contribution of the national farmers farmers platforms to the development of the NFPs and led some to express reservations regarding the conduct of the process and / or the options of these plans (CNCR in Senegal, CNOP in Mali). In addition, six other national platforms that are members of the ROPPA have signed the national multi-stakeholder pacts setting out the commitments of each NAIP stakeholder.

ECOWAP + 10 and PERSPECTIVE 2025

58. Participation in the balance shet of the first ECOWAS agricultural policy

ROPPA and the national platforms involved in the implementation of ECOWAP adopted in 2005 actively participated in the process of reviewing this policy in 2015.

In this review, ROPPA highlighted the notable progresses (stakeholder's involvement at the regional level, comparative increase in animal and plant production, upward trend in the mobilization of financial resources, etc.) but also of the structural weaknesses that should be noted. Thus, some of the challenges identified while formulating the policy remain: to adequately feed West African populations; strengthen the productive capacity of FF; and strengthening the West African market for agrofood products.

At the Dakar conference in November 2015 on the conclusions of the ECOWAP + 10 process and the prospects for the next 10 years, the positions and joint proposals of ROPPA, APESS and RBM prepared in October in Lomé were presented by the Director of Agriculture of ECOWAS and taken into account. These included:

 The fundamental role of FF in achieving the objectives of sovereignty / food and nutrition security, poverty reduction, job creation and peace. Implementation of the PRIA and NAIPs was characterized by a discrepancy between the importance and interest of FF in the ECOWAP policy document and the propensity of States to support agrobusiness in place of family farming. The risks associated with this drift were noted by ROPPA, who stressed the need to support a transformation and modernization of the FF, mastered and conducted by them. These FF continue to play a fundamental role in the production, procurement and management of natural resources.

- Support for intensification, enhancement of productions and access of FF to the market. The limits of the first generation of the PRIA are the inadequacies in the targeting of relevant, adapted and sustainable tools to accompany the process of intensification, market regulation and access to FF funding. ROPPA offers better targeting of these tools. It also supports the need to define specific tools to promote agro-food processing initiatives, in particular those promoted by women and young people, with a view to ensuring greater adaptation of the products of the FF to the markets and their widespread dissemination.
- Governance of the implementation of ECOWAP (PRIA, PNIA). ROPPA and other FO and CSO networks note the fragility of the participatory and inclusive process that prevailed when ECOWAP was formulated in 2005, particularly in national processes for the implementation of NFIPs. He called on ECOWAS to take the necessary steps to rebuild and / or ensure the effective functioning of this approach, which has become a "mark" of the ECOWAP process in different countries. This is the only convincing way to ensure that actors continue to mobilize around national policies, legitimacy and the interest they can have for them and for the TFPs.
- Implication of women and youth. The trend in the changing demographic characteristics of the region requires more attention in addressing the concerns of women in the agricultural sector and in transforming it to make it attractive enough for the growing number of young people and more educated

than their elders. The future of FF and the resolution of food and nutrition security issues and poverty reduction depend largely on this.

 Financing agriculture. ROPPA and other FO networks have invited ECOWAS, UEMOA and all stakeholders to reinvent the financing of the sector to improve FF access to finance. This involves the introduction of innovative and inclusive financing that takes sufficient account of the realities and dynamics of FF and that integrate the expertise and roles of the different types of actors involved in this field. ROPPA highlighted the need for regional institutions (ECOWAS, WAEMU) to make a commitment to contribute in financing the development of the sector in view of its strategic feature in the regional and countries economies. It also asked TFPs about the constraints related to the non alignment of their interventions to the frameworks of the priorities defined by the actors in the countries and at the regional level (PNIA and PRIA).

59. The formulating process of the 2nd aeneration of NAIPs and the PRIA

ROPPA and national platforms are also involved in the process of formulating the 2nd generation of NIPs and the PRIA (which becomes PRIASAN - Regional Plan for Agricultural Investment and Food and Nutrition Security). Since 2016,

ROPPA has participated as a future party of the 2nd generation PRIA pact on behalf of the regional FO networks to the formulation and implementation of a construction agenda for PNIA and PRIA 2nd generation.

At the same time, ROPPA continues to hold its position in the implementation of the regional PRIA programs1 under way. An orientation has been taken by ECOWAS to ensure linkage / synergy between NIPs and PRIA 2nd generation with these programs.

Under the steady advocacy of the ROPPA and the other networks of OPs and CSOs, provisions have been made in the methodological guide to ensure that certain concerns or limitations of the first generation of PNIAs and PRIAs are taken into account, in particular (i) The effective participation of FOs in the countries; (ii) gender; (lii) financing of agriculture; (IV) family farms. Proposals were made to clarify the roles of the various actors in the institutional framework for the implementation of PRIASAN.

Some ROPPA tools, such as the FFO, are taken into account in the actions to be supported (although the approach and content of the recommended support will need to be further developed).

ROPPA is pleased to note that the fisheries sector is included in PRIASAN and in the priority orientations for PNIAS.



TABLE F: POLITICAL ACTION OF THE ROPPA AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL AND ITS MAIN RESULTS REGARDING FAMILY FARMS

| LEVELS AN | ID FIELDS | | MAIN RESULTS OF ACTIONS FOR FFS |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| ECOMA | | PAU and ECOWAP | ROPPA's implication in the implementation of regional policies, ECOWAP/PDDAA and PAU strengthened the consideration of matters related to food sovereignty, recognition of family farms and their access to public findings. This allowed (i) growing participation of farmers in the implementation of PRIA/PNIA through their grassroots organizations, (ii) Inclusion of local fishery in agendas; (iii) a better consideration of breeding and pastoralism (iv) more intense participation of OSC in task force and gender group: (v) I the decision to capitalize agro poles experiences before starting the projected investments. |
| | ECOWAS | Rice Offensive | ROPPA actively participated in the formulation of the offensive rice. Thanks to its regional leadership framework of FO consultation of rice growers, a production program and of dissemination of ameliorated seeds within the family farms has been elaborated and financed by USAID. |
| | Regional level CORAF | PRAPS- PRIDEC | ROPPA's different actions advocacy, in alliance with RBM and APSS netwoks, APSS and other organisations of civil society, caused its progressive integration in the process of PRAPS and PRIDEC and helped affirm and defend its global vision of taking breeding into account in ECOWAP. |
| | | Irrigation Initiative in Sahel | ROPPA has been the member of task force on irrigation in which it shared and defended its vision and its propositions that are taken into account in the strategy that was adopted by the Heads of governments during their conference on the matter. ROPPA is member of the piloting committee for the implementation of the launched strategy under the auspices of ECOWAS, WAEMU and planed by CILSS. ROPPA defended an implication and the effective liability of FO and CSO concerned with the irrigation in countries covered by the implementation project of the strategy. A mandate is noted to the OP and CSO networks and a support program to their activities in regard to the project. |
| | | The support project to the production and distribution of certified seeds (PAPROSEM) | This project is negotiated at the USAID by ECOWAS following regional consultation actions of rice growers' organizations of ROPPA.Yet, the project is in its first year but its impacts in dissemination of certified seeds of rice within growers is noticeable and promising, mainly in Mali. Moreover, sensitizing activities from farmer to farmer for intensifying the use of certified seeds are just bearing fruits, namely in Burkina Faso. |
| | | The seed sup- port project rice offensive of ECOWAS | Ce projet a été négocié auprès de l'USAID par la CEDEAO à la suite des actions du cadre régional de concertation des organisations des producteurs de riz du ROPPA. Certes, le projet est dans sa 1ère année mais son impact sur la diffusion de semences certifiées de riz au niveau des producteurs est perceptible et promoteur, principalement au Mali. Aussi, les activités de sensibilisation de paysan à paysan pour l'intensification à travers l'utilisation de semences certifiées portent déjà leurs fruits, notamment au Burkina Faso. |
| Conti- nental level | | UA/NEPAD | In 2016, I\ ROPPA valorized its position regarding the regulation of the sub sector of fishery, the definition of the piloting framework of fishing policies. This allowed local fishers recognition of their activity and its consideration into projects and programs. Regarding advocacy at the continental level, ROPPA obtained the genetic protection of the « Azawad » specie, highly suitable for sahelian ecosystem-baed and source of income for the breeders in the region. Though initiated by ROPPA, these actions born fruits thanks to the alliance with other organizations of civil society (local), RBM, APESS etc |

| Interna- tional level | APE/OMC (TEC) | Through its actions at regional and international level, ROPPA's efforts upheld by all the actors of regional civil society led to the review of TEC with addition of a 5th band(properties specific to the economic growth — sensitive products based on their strategic characteristic to the development of the region: Product vulnerability, regional integration, promotion of the sector and the production potential), more favorable to farmers. ROPPA's advocacy efforts and its FO and CSO partnering networks at the regional and international level I (EU parliament and EU member countries) impacted the conclusion of deals in their current orientations. ROPPA supported the FOsitions of West African head of States showing their worries for APE. |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | ROPPA negotiated and got many times from WTO the organization of thematic discussions during public fora. During discussions organized in Geneva, ROPPA shared its visions and propositions related to multilateral commercial negotiations and the potential risks for food sovereignty, economic integration of West Africa. ROPPA wrote a booklet that give an analysis of WTO laws and assesses their impact on the development of the agro-sylvio-pastoral and halieutic sector in West Africa, food security and the reduction of poverty. The positions and strategies of ROPPA contribute to mobilize actors and decisions makers for the defended cause. EU parliament showed via a press release its worries about the orientations of the APE negotiations being discussed between EU commission and the ACP. |
| | CSA (World food security committee) | As a coordinating member of CSA, ROPPA and other networks of CSO contributed to the adoption in 2014 of the voluntary guides on property (that favored farmers investment) and in 2016 the recommendations on access of small scale growers to market. The two aimed at orientating the elaboration of property policies (Voluntary guides) and the marketing (small scale growers' access to market) at national, regional, continental and international level. Follow-up and assessment mechanisms are put in place to monitor their respect in CSA member countries |
| | FIDA (Farmers farmers Forum) | ROPPA's participation in the Governing meeting of contributed to the better approach between small growers and Governors, easing the strengthening and the effective consideration of their worries in the strategic orientations of FIDA's interventions. |
| | FARA/ PAEPARD | Since 2010, ROPPA partnered with European and African research organizations. The goal of this partnership for ROPPA is to influence research actions in order to direct them to the worries of beneficiaries (EFA). This process led to the setting of dialogue framework between FO and agricultural research. The results of these works led to a study of rice chains values, capacity strengthening of actors of different links and the valorization of local animal species. |
| | GAFSP | ROPPA is member of the international piloting committee of GAFSP. In this regard, it influenced other PO and CSO networks members of the committee, the implementation of the 3rd counter « Missing component counter » dedicated to the funding of family farms and their organizations. The elaborated projects in this regard benefit directly to AFF. |

(16) ROPPA'S CHALLENGES REGARDING THE MONITORING OF PUBLIC POLICIES AND THEIR INFLUENCE IN FAVOR OF FF

60. The observations made on the monitoring practices of the ROPPA¹ member FOs in the preparation of the first report of its FFO show with enough hope that FOs at different national and regional levels have made great strides in monitoring and increased their

1 See booklet 4 of this report: ROPPA FO MEMBERS MONITORING PRACTICES

influence on them, but they are also aware of the challenges that remain at their level.

61. Exchanges on ROPPA's advocacy strategy show that these challenges lie mainly in the ability of the network and its national platforms to monitor the implementation of these medium- and long-term public policies on different topics, different geographical levels and with different tools. The processes of policy implementation through programs and

tools defended or not supported by the network are not documented in a structured way to serve again in the strategies of influence.

62. The challenge is also about mastering the issues which are increasingly complex and varied in the policy implementation period: knowledge of policy tools, their potential advantages and disadvantages.; the stakes related to the proposals of tools and measures made by the consultants and / or the public administrations to decline the public policies....

63. The multiplication of consultation zones is also another challenge given the insufficient number of managers capable to understand and defend their structures positions and proposals.

64. FOs often lack consensual public policy reading tools / keys. How can a farmer leader assess whether a proposal for policies and tools is favorable for FF? The concern is all the more important as the dialogue time is shorter and the policy documents dense.

65. Finally, there is also the problem of articulating the FOs political action at the local, national and regional levels. How to ensure this geographic articulation and strategic / political and economic issues?



Improvements called by the political issues arisen by the observatory

Chapter 6: Cross-cutting issues to which ROPPA should pay particular attention in relation to public policies

The information produced by the national platforms made it possible to identify different topics on which ROPPA should be particularly attentive to itself and to public policies.

The Executive Bureau and the team of the Executive Secretariat, while undertaking a collective rereading of the Observatory's report, identified nine points raised in the majority or even all the reports of the platforms. They are all sensitive questions because they are transversal and the answers remain to be found in relation to them.

ROPPA should seek to clarify its positions and anticipate these issues because the future of family farming is heavily dependent on the responses that will be provided.

(17) QUESTION 1: WHAT MODEL OF AGRICULTURE MUST BE PROMOTED?

66. Findings:

In most West African countries, Governments are often tempted to favor the industrial agriculture model, yet it is known that the first objective of the industrial sector with a high capital injection is not security, neither the fight against poverty, nor sustainable development, but profit.

In the contributions of the platform, one see where this temptation is most sensitive:

- SENEGAL (PES, PDIDAS, fisheries agreements)
- GAMBIA (Vision 2020, land release, subsidies)
- GUINEA BISAU (land distribution)
- SIERRA LENE (land transfer) v
- LIBERIA (lack of agricultural policy, land transfer))
- GHANA (AMSEC model)
- CÔTE D'IVOIRE (cash crops)
- BENIN: PSRSA (business model, access to facilities)

Policy priorities that are unfavorable to FF are:

- foreign investors (Gambia, Sierra Leone, Liberia to be completed)
- large national farmers or absentee farmers (The Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Côte d'Ivoire)

67. Detailed information

This "trend" of some policies to favor industrial agriculture with a high capital injection to the detriment of family farming calls ROPPA to clarify its positions regarding the following aspects:

- a. All initiatives that have emerged in recent years that support the development of industrial agriculture to boost production are stimulated by a loss of knowledge about the performance of family farming. ROPPA should help renew the approach to FF's performance. This performance must not be measured solely on the economic level but also on all the functions performed by the FF and which make it attractive to all its members.
- b. Performance and income growth in family farms depend on its **investment capacity.** ROPPA needs to better inform the current capacity of FF in this area and identify actions that can help to strengthen it. This question raises the issue of **financing family farming** (self-financing, credit, subsidies ...).
- c. Exploitation of platforms' contributions shows that good **marketing** contributes to increasing incomes (Mali, Burkina Faso, Senegal, and Ghana). ROPPA will continue to advocate for the unlocking of the system in an environment made complex by liberalization, particularly with regard to market access, in order to foster **intraregional trade**, institutional purchases and curb product invasion Imported. It must define a position in relation to the control of public / private partnerships currently advocated in the policies so that they are really favorable to family farming.
- d. ROPPA must reaffirm its convictions and commitment since the launching of its "Africa the Mother Country" campaign in 2005. This campaign by the women's colleges aims to build on the continued growth in food demand driven by the demographic transition in the region to promote the consumption of local products from family farms. The aim is to promote the consumption of family farms agricultural and food products for the recovery of domestic markets, especially urban markets.

ROPPA must therefore commit itself to developing initiatives to influence the implementation of genuine food policies to ensure: (i) the production, processing and distribution of agricultural and agro-food products from family farms, to domestic (local, national and regional) markets; (li) orienting consumers' choices in the region towards a preference for local agricultural and food products; (lii) the defense of local products and the regulation of domestic markets

ROPPA's work should seek to improve the capacity of FF to meet the qualitative and quantitative needs of consumers and to promote the emergence of a consumer preference for agricultural products and Food products.

- e. ROPPA must ask itself what role the family farming model gives on **young** people, knowing that the latter dream of an agriculture that allows them to have decent incomes and better living conditions than their parents. They dream of a modernized agriculture, less painful, more productive and remunerative. Family farming integrates them and involves them in decision-making, benefit sharing, entrepreneurship and freedom of action.
- f. ROPPA should emphasize that what is involved in the family farming model and that does not encourage young people is not fundamentally linked to its own features but to the inconsistent and inconsistent agricultural policies that do not successfully put adequate investments, tools and measures in place to ensure modernization and intensification of production. Access to local markets for remunerative markets, community preference, decent incomes for self-investment Farmers' securitization, a land law securing the use of land and allowing investment and innovation, innovative financing and agricultural credit institutions.
- g. ROPPA needs to clarify its vision of **modernizing** family farming.

(18) QUESTION 2: WHICH SPACE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING OF THE TERRITORY?

68. Findings:

The implementation of each model of agriculture

involves the question of the space on which it is implemented. The observations made by the countries update two very revealing aspects of practices or policies for family farms stakes related to the allocation of space:

- The risk of land grabbing by firms or large operators, particularly in river basins or managed areas in Mali, Burkina Faso, Senegal, The Gambia, or on fertile land in Guinea Bissau, Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia.
- The ongoing definition in several countries (Burkina Faso, Senegal, Benin, etc.) of spatial planning schemes around "development poles" whose targeting and priorities for the infrastructures creation will have important consequences for family farms.

69. Detailed information

ROPPA must develop a monitoring and proposal capacity to safeguard the interests of family farms. For this purpose:

- a. It needs to deepen its reflection on the spatial, economic, social and political dimensions and on the contours of the "living space" necessary for family farms.
- b. It is necessary to develop its competences on land-use planning issues (which are new to FOs: they are more trained to work on land management issues).
- Farmers' organizations that are members of ROPPA must be able to formulate proposals for common property management and land use planning.

(19) QUESTION 3: HOW TO RENEW NATURAL RESOURCES AND ANTICIPATE CLIMATE CHANGE?

70. Findings:

Observations on the family farms behavior show that even in a campaign with rather favorable conditions and generally encouraging results, the effects of climate change are felt in all countries. There is a downward trend in fertility in countries that were once reputed to be fertile: this alerts the consequences of man's action on nature and calls for the share of responsibility that farmers place on their own practices.

71. Detailed Information

This concern is not new to ROPPA, but invites it to

clarify its positions on several issues:

- a. clarify its position in relation to the management of shared resources
- b. clarify its analysis and position in relation to destructive resource practices (forest destruction - often linked to poverty, excessive use of chemical fertilizers, and agro-ecological practices.
- c. clarify its position in relation to GMOs, the development of agro-fuels
- d. building links with research on the emergence of new health attacks on crops and animals

(20) QUESTION 4: WHAT TO DO IN FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE?

72. Findings

The generation of this first report enabled ROPPA to become more aware of the lack of information on the fisheries and aquaculture sector. However, the importance of these sectors, which contribute significantly to the feeding and supply of animal proteins in the diet of the families, is no longer to be demonstrated and is noted in SIERRA LEONE or LIBERIA contributions. The fisheries sector has a definite attraction for young people and generates jobs through fishing and resulting activities such as the processing of products, which is most often the prerogative of women. However, the sector is also one of the areas where competition between industrial and artisanal fisheries has the greatest negative impact on both the depletion of fisheries resources and the destruction of family fishing, this is noted from the contributions of SENEGAL, GUINEA BISSAU, BENIN and TOGO

73. Detailed information

These findings lead ROPPA to seek to:

- a. extend its reflection on the management of shared resources to the maritime domain
- b. develop its monitoring capacity in the fisheries and aquaculture sector
- c. increase its proposal capacity, particularly on inland fisheries and aquaculture

(21) QUESTION 5: WHICH LIVESTOCK POLICIES AND PASTORALISM MANAGEMENT?

74. Findings

The generation of this first FFO report enabled ROPPA to deepen its analysis of the issue of livestock and pastoralism, which are strategic sectors of activity for many countries in the region (in particular those of the Sudan group - Sahelian) and an important source of densification and dynamization of the local economies. It also made it clear that this sector was unequally informed by the various platforms of the network and that progress should be sought in relation to this.

Herd mobility and pastoralism are at the heart of current debates on livestock and deserve special consideration from ROPPA because of the conflicts it provokes, as well as its positive aspects with respect to resilience, the emission of Greenhouse gas effects, exploitation and renewal of resources, or cross-border trade. It is addressed by some platforms.

The issue of the mobility of herds in the contributions of the platforms

It is taken into account in NIGER (pastoral law), study in BENIN (pastoral code) and SENEGAL (in progress). MALI, BURKINA FASO, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, TOGO, GHANA are also concerned by it

75. Details

ROPPA feels the need:

- a. to define its position in relation to the direction of livestock policies
- b. to formulate proposals for the management of common / shared resources for pastoral use (land, water)
- c. to clarify the FOs responsibility in the farmers / breeders' report
- d. To deepen the issue of cross-border herd mobility and how to discuss pastoralism at the inter-country level
- e. To formulate proposals for the valorization of grazing areas (interpellation on investments in terms of pastoral infrastructures, notably pastoral water supply)

(22) QUESTION 6: WHAT CONTRIBUTION MAY ROPPA HAVE TO BETTER CONSIDER WOMEN IN THE POLICIES?

76. Findings

One see in the contributions of the platforms on the functioning of family farms that the role of the woman is observed through her active participation at all levels of agro-sylvio-pastoral and fisheries production in the family farm. In the field of agriculture, women are present in all activities of seeding, harvesting, storage, processing, marketing, etc. They also play a major role in artisanal fisheries, particularly in the field of aquaculture, fish trade and the upgrading of fishery products (processing in the artisanal fisheries sector). In the livestock sector, they take care of the hut and play a central role in the production, processing and marketing of milk.

However, in terms of gender relations, family farming in Africa reveals a paradox: despite their many roles, the capacity and means of production remain too limited. The reports of the platforms evoke the difficulties of women:

This issue is mentioned in the contribution of platforms

- In SENEGAL: access to land for women
- In IVORY COAST: Women have difficulties accessing lands
- In GAMBIA access to land; Misappropriation of the gender policy
- In GUINEA: women's role in FF, access to land
- n LIBERIA (access to land for women)
- In BENIN (low level of gender mainstreaming in programs,
- especially in the information and monitoring / evaluation systems)

Despite the difficulties, almost all governments have adopted policies to give equal opportunities to men and women to access resources.

This issue is also mentioned in the contribution of platforms

- In BURKINA: setting a quota for women granting them 30% of plots in
- hydro-agricultural schemes
- In MALI (FIER project)

- In IVORY COAST (gender dimension in the LOA-Cl, support for food
- crops PAFARCI)
- GHANA (promotion of rural women)
- In TOGO (contribution of improved technologies / PADAT)
- BENIN (low level of gender mainstreaming in programs, particularly
- in information and monitoring / evaluation systems

However, the implementation is experiencing some difficulties. Removing obstacles to the advancement of women requires a dialogue that must conceive things as complementary relationships between women and men and not as a struggle. It therefore appears that the issue of gender equity is a human rights issue but also a requirement for socio-economic development.

77. Detailed information

In this way,

- a. ROPPA should propose an analysis on the evolution of the women's condition in the FF
- b. ROPPA should propose something new about the status of FF members. FOs have already recognized the importance of defining the status of the FF. He must now reflect on the question of the status of family members in the FF, and
- c. Link this issue to the democratization of society

(23) QUESTION 7: HOW TO ACT FOR A BETTER CONSIDERATION OF THE YOUTH IN IN THE POLICIES?

78. Findings

Nowadays young people are not only growing but their level of education is also growing and they are a potential, an opportunity for economic and social development. However, the youth employment gap is a source of problems, and many young people are often unemployed or unemployed or, more frequently, underemployed in the informal sector, where wages are low and often uncertain. It is also in this group that the disturbing increase in drug use, illegal emigration or enlistment in the terrorist organisations have arisen. However, the policies defined in the youth

directorate are not up to the challenge.

In the platforms contributions

Observations on the position of the youth in policies and programs are found in the contributions of `

MALI: In the platforms contributions `

SENEGAL: development of activities for young fishermen (PES / fisheries)

GUINEA: consultation on FO the issue of youth settlement

SIERRA LEONE: promotion of youth cooperatives

GHANA: Block Farm program: youth oriented

IVORY COAST: young people in agriculture (PAFARCI)

TOGO: effects on the setting up of young people from PADAT support in the field of livestock and processing (central and Kara regions)

The most worrying issues emerging from the inputs of the national platforms include (i) worry for farmers to know what will happen to family farms when they departed from this world, and (ii) Half of the platforms concerning the disinterest of many rural youths in agriculture, which is helping to accelerate the flow of exodus to the cities and to reduce the family labor force.

79. Details

The observations and analyzes made through the family farms observation encourage the ROPPA to:

- a. deepen the analysis of the evolution of the situation of young people in family farms
- b. carry out a critical analysis of youth policies (employment policies, training policies, accompanying measures for young people).
- c. develop a better understanding of why young people leave the family farm
- d. ROPPA should think on how to make FF more attractive, identify successful integration and capital

Inputs from platforms

The main elements of the youth issue are introduced in the platforms insights of SENEGAL, GUINEA, SIERRA LEONE, LIBERIA, CÔTE D'IVOIRE, GHANA, TOGO and BENIN on the attractiveness of FF (see chapter IV: Status, access to family patrimony, income, training and support).

(24) QUESQUESTION 8: ON WHICH PERSPECTIVE SHOULD THE ISSUE OF SECURITY ADDRESSED IN THE RURAL WORLD?

80. Findings

With the increase of conflicts, theft and aggression, growing concerns about land tenure security, the issue of insecurity becomes central to the lives of rural people, and its consequences for family farms are evoked in most countries contributions.

ROPPA is concerned about this issue. It notes that farmers memory remembers forms of insecurity that were equally traumatic in the pre-colonial past: insecurity has always been a threat to farmers; it is its forms that have evolved. It concludes that ROPPA has a reading to propose the evolution of the forms of insecurity and the answers that the farmerss have already given it, and that this issue must be approached from the perspective of the responsibilities that the farmers can take by in parallel with those to be assumed by the State.

It should identify current types of insecurity in the rural world and identify in which forms FOs can contribute in reducing insecurity.

81. Detailed information

It has to decide in particular on the following aspects:

- a. Insecurity related to armed conflict: how to help FF rebuild during Post-conflict situations?
- b. Land insecurity: how to reinforce land security, ownership of FF (especially with respect to land grabbing)?
- c. Insecurity linked to farmer / livestock conflicts: what is their responsibility in the farmers /

breeders' report nsecurity of goods and people: how can ROPPA address this issue? (To draw the attention of the authorities on the question of the relationship between poverty and the rise of delinquency)

- d. Health insecurity: what is the FOs' share of responsibility in prevention? Coverage of health risks?
- e. Finally, it has to ask itself how to call the government on these different situations of insecurity.

(25) QUESTION 9: HOW TO IMPROVE ROPPA'S CONTRIBUTION TO POLICY DEFINITION AND IMPLEMENTATION?

82. Findings

Despite the progress made, there remain inconsistencies and some major gaps in the policies implementation. Most of them, if they do not favor the development of commercial agriculture with a productive logic to the detriment of family farming, have deficits in the way they are implemented.

83. Detailed information

It will require, to achieve this impact among other things on,

- a. Training and capacity building of ROPPA leaders and FOs to analyze policies to better understand them.
- b. The functionality of its political watch mechanisms and their ability to monitor them over the long term.
- c. The renewed strengh of the platforms so that they are present on the ground especially during the crop year.
- d. The precision of what should be monitored.



| | Α | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| ABC | Agricultural business center | | |
| ADB | Agricultural development bank | | |
| AFGE | Farm Management Training Workshop | | |
| AFP | AgAgenda for prosperity | | |
| AGIR | AgeGlobal Agency for Resilience | | |
| AGRISEF | Farmers Access To Financial Services | | |
| AIAF | International Year Of Family Faming | | |
| AIC | West Afrian Ally for climate smart-agriculture about climate | | |
| AMSEC | Agriculture mechanization enterprises centers programme | | |
| ANOPACI | National Association Of Professional Agricultural Organizations In Ivory coast. | | |
| ANR | Agricultural and Natural Ressources | | |
| ANRP | Agricultural ad Natural Resource Policy | | |
| AOPP | Association Of Professional Farmers Organization | | |
| APE | Economic Partnership Agreement | | |
| APESS | Association for Breeding Promotion In The Sahel And The Savannah | | |
| APIM-BF | Association professionnelle des institutions de micro finance au Burkina Faso | | |
| APIM-Mali | Professional Association of Microfinance institutions in Mali | | |
| AP-SFD | Professional Association of decentralized financial systems | | |
| ARAA | Reginal Agency for agriculture and Food | | |
| ASPRODEB | Senegalese-Association For The Promotion of local-based Development | | |
| ASRP | Agriculture sector rehabilitation project | | |
| | В | | |
| BACB | Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Burkina Faso | | |
| BAD | African Development Bank | | |
| BAGRI | Agricultual Bank | | |
| BCEAO | West African States Central Bank | | |
| BM | World Bank | | |
| BNDE | National Bank for Economic Development | | |
| BOAD | West African Development Bank | | |
| | С | | |
| CAD/MALI | African Alternatives Debts and Development Coalition | | |
| CARDER | Regional Action Center for rural development | | |

| CEDEAO | Economic community of West African States | |
|------------|--|--|
| CFDT | French Company of Textiles fibres development | |
| CILSS | Inter-States committee for fight against drought in sahel | |
| CMAT | Malian convergence for the fight against lands grabbing | |
| CNCAS | Senegalese National Agricultural Fund | |
| CNCR | Senegal National rural Council of cooperation | |
| CNOP-G | Guinea confederation of Farmers Organizations | |
| CNOP-M | National Coordination of Farmers Organizations of Mali | |
| CNRF | National commission nationale of Land Reform | |
| COFO | Land commissions | |
| COFODEB | Province —based Land commissions | |
| COFREPECHE | Fisheries, aquaculture and marine environment International design firm | |
| CORAF | West and Central African Council for agricultural research and development | |
| CORET | Traditional Breeding organizations confederations | |
| COS | Follow up and Guidance Committee | |
| CPF | Faso Farmer Confederation | |
| CRAFS | Action and Research Framework on Land in Senegal | |
| CRG | Guinea Rural Fund | |
| CSA | World Food Security Committee | |
| СТОР | Coordination of Togo producers and farmers' organizations | |
| | D | |
| DAES | Department of agricultural extension services | |
| | E | |
| ECOWAP | West Africa Regional Agricultural Policy | |
| EF | Family Farm | |
| F | | |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization | |
| FAPS | Food and agriculture policy and strategy | |
| FARA | Forum for agricultural research in Africa | |
| FASDEP | Food and agriculture sector development project | |
| FECECAM | Benin Mutual Savings Bank and Agricultural Credit Fund Federation | |
| FED | Food and entreprise development program | |
| FIARA | Internationale Agriculture and Animals Resources Fair | |

| FIDA | International Fund for agriculture development | | |
|---------|--|--|--|
| FIER | Vocational Training, insertion and support to youth rural entrepreneurship project | | |
| FIRCA | Research and agricultural counselling Interprofessional Funds | | |
| FISAN | Nutritional and Food Security Investment Funds | | |
| FNAA | Food and Agriculture National Fund | | |
| FNDA | Agriculture and Development National Fund | | |
| FNFI | Inclusive Finance National Fund | | |
| FNS | Food and nutrition security | | |
| FONG | Farmers organization network in Ghana | | |
| FONSTAB | Lairaige support Fund | | |
| FRAA | Agiculture and food regional fund | | |
| FUN | Farmers union network of Liberia | | |
| | G | | |
| GAFSP | Global agricultural food security program | | |
| GIDA | Ghana Irrigation development authority | | |
| GNAIP | Gambia National Agricultural for Investment | | |
| GVT | Gouvernement | | |
| | | | |
| i3N | Niger people's self-feeding Initiative. | | |
| IMF | Institute of Micro finance | | |
| IPAR | Rural and Agricultural prospective Initiative | | |
| | L | | |
| LAP | Land administration project | | |
| LASIP | Liberia agriculture sector investment program | | |
| LATA | Liberia agriculture transformation agenda | | |
| LJDH | Justice, developement and Human Rights League | | |
| LOA | Agricultural orientation Law | | |
| LOASP | Agro-forestry-pastoral orientation Act | | |
| | M | | |
| MAEP | Ministère of agriculture, livestock and fishering | | |
| METASIP | Medium term agriculture sector investment plan | | |
| MVE | Ebola Virus Disease | | |

| | N |
|-----------|---|
| NACOFAG | National coordinating organisation of farmer associations the Gambia |
| NAFSL | National association of farmers of Sierra Leone |
| NAIP | Investment plan of Sierra Leone's national agricultural investment programme |
| NARI | National agricultural research institute |
| NASACA | National savings and credit association of Gambia |
| NEMA | National agriculture land and water management development project |
| NEMIL | Network of micro finance institutions of Liberia |
| NEPAD | New partenarship for Africa development |
| | 0 |
| OEF | Family Farm Observatory |
| OGM | Genetically Modified Organism |
| OHADA | Business Law uniformisation in Africa Organization |
| OMC | World Trade Organization |
| OMD | Millenium Development Goals |
| OMVG | Gambia river exploitation organization |
| OP | Farmer Organization |
| OSC | Civil Society Organisation |
| Oxfam | Oxford Committee for Famine Relief |
| | Р |
| P4P | Purchase for progress |
| PACOF/GRN | Support Project to West of Burkina Faso Communes in rural land management and natural resources |
| PADA | Agricultural Diversity support Project |
| PADAER | Agricultural development support and rural entrepreneuship programme |
| PADAT | Togolese Agricultural Development support project |
| PADSE | Improving and operating systems diversification Project |
| PADYP | Programme d'appui aux dynamiques productives |
| PAEPARD | Afrcia-Europe partnership plateform for agricultural reseach and development |
| PAFARCI | lvory Coast agricultural sectors relaunch support project |
| PAFASP | Agro-sylvo-pastorales sectors support program |
| PAM | World Food Program |
| PAPROSEM | Production support and to sustainable dissemination of certied seeds in West Africa project |
| PAPSA | Agricultural productivity Improving and of food security Project |

| PA-PSTAT | Agicultural Policy / Togolese Agriculture transformation strategic Plan |
|----------|---|
| PASA | Agriculture structural adjustement policy |
| PASA | Agricultural sector support Projetc |
| PASANAO | West Africa food security and nutritional support program |
| PATAE | West Africa and Sahel agroecology transition support projet d'appui à la transition agro-écologique au Sahel et en Afrique de l'Ouest |
| PAU | West African Economic Monetary Union Agricultural Policy |
| PCD-TSAN | Agriculture transformation for food security and nutritional decade community program |
| PDA | Agricultural Development Policy |
| PDAI | Agriculture and infrastructure development program |
| PDDA | Agricultural sector development Master Plan |
| PDDAA | Detailed program for the development of agriculture in Africa |
| PDIDAS | Inclusive and sustainable agribusiness development project in Senegal |
| PDIRV | Small Scale village irrigation development Project |
| PEASA | Emergence and support to food security Project |
| PF | Plate-form |
| PFA | Agricultural Land Policy |
| PFPN | Niger Farmer Plate-form |
| PIB | Gross National Product |
| PNAAFA | Agricultural sectors actors support national program |
| PND | Development National Plan |
| PNDA | National Agricultural development policy |
| PNDEL | National Livestock sustainable development policy |
| PNDES | Social and economical development national plan |
| PNDL | Local development National program |
| PNGT | Soils management national program |
| PNIA | National Agricultural Investment Program |
| PNIASA | National Agricultural Investment Program and Food Security |
| PNISA | National Investment plan for agricultural sector |
| PNOPPA-B | Benin National Platform of Farmer Organizations and Agricultural Producers |
| PNSAN | National Policy of food and nutrional security |
| PNSR | Rural sector National Program |
| PNUD | United Nations Development Program |

| PPAAO/WAAP | West Africa Agricultural Productivity Program | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| PRACAS | Acceleration Program of Senegalese agriculture rate | | |
| PRAOP/ECOWAP | Regional Program Support to OPF in ECOWAP implementing framework | | |
| PRAPS | Regional Program support to sahel pastoralism | | |
| PREDIP | Dialogue and investment Regional Project for pastoralism and transhumance in sahel and West African seabord | | |
| PRIA | Regional program for Agriculture investment | | |
| PRIASAN | Regional Program for Agriculture investment and nutrutional and food security | | |
| PRIDEC | Regional Program for investment for livestosk in seabords countries | | |
| PRODAF | Family poultry farming devellopment project | | |
| PRODRA | Rural and Agriculture development program | | |
| PROMOFA | Animals sectors modernization support project | | |
| PRONAM | National Program in sheep self-suffiency | | |
| PSAC | Agricultura sector I support in Ivory Coast | | |
| PSDEPA | Development livestock, fisheries and aquaculture strategic plan | | |
| PSE | Emergent Senegal Plan | | |
| PSRSA | Agricultural sector relaunch strategic plan | | |
| PTF | Financial and Technical Partner | | |
| PU-APA | Emergency support to agricultural productivity Projet | | |
| PUDC | Emergency community development Program | | |
| | Q | | |
| QNCOCPA-GB | National Consultation Framework of farmer Organizations and Agricultural Producers in Guinea Bissau | | |
| | R | | |
| RBM | Billital Maroobe Network | | |
| RCPB | Burkina Faso Credit Union Network | | |
| RENACA | National village savings and credit self managed | | |
| ROPPA | Farmer and agricultural producers Network Organizations in West Africa | | |
| RPCA | Food cris es prevention and management Network | | |
| | S | | |
| SAPEC | Smallholder Agricultural Productivity Enhancement and Commercialization Project | | |
| SDR | Rural development Strategy | | |
| SFD | Decentralized Finacial Systems | | |
| SLAMFI | Sierra Leone association of micro finance institutions | | |
| | | | |

| SNAAP-EF | National systems of accompaniement and support to proximity Family Farm | |
|----------|---|--|
| SNAP | Sustainable nutrition and agriculture promotion | |
| SNDR | Reviewed National Strategy for rice sector development | |
| SNVACA | National System of dissemination and agricultural consulting support | |
| SOGUIPAH | Guinea palm oil and heva company | |
| SONAPRA | National Company for Agriculture promotion | |
| T | | |
| TEC | Common External Tariff | |
| | U | |
| UACDDDD | Union of Associations and Coordinations for the Development and Defense of the Rights of the Poor | |
| UEMOA | West African Economic and Monetary Union | |
| UNACREP | Rural Fund for savings and Ioan National Union | |
| USAID | United States agency for international development | |
| V | | |
| VISACA | Village savings credit association in Gambia | |
| W | | |
| WASP | West African Seed Program | |
| | | |







Rue Kanti Zoobré

09 BP 884 Ouagadougou 09 Burkina Faso
Tél.: 00226 25 36 08 25
Email: roppa2000@yahoo.fr
Email: secretariat@roppa-afrique.org
Facebook: roppawestafrica
Twitter: roppainfo
www.roppa-afrique.org