



WP6

Deliverable 6.1 – Annexes 6, 7, 8 and 9

Macro-regional Workshop Reports

Highclere Consulting

Prepared under contract from the European Commission

Project number: 677363

Collaborative project

Horizon2020

Project acronym	SALSA
Project full title	Small Farms, Small Food Businesses and Sustainable Food Security
Duration	April 2016 – March 2020
Coordinating organisation	Universidade de Évora (UEvora)
Project coordinator	Teresa Pinto-Correia
Project website:	www.salsa.uevora.pt
Deliverable title	Preliminary assessment of the needs of small farms and the enabling conditions and policy instruments required for maintaining / enhancing their contribution to sustainable FNS
Deliverable number	6.1
Work package	WP6
Acknowledgements	With thanks to all workshop attendees who gave their time to participate in the four Macro-regional Workshops organised in WP6



Contents

Annex 6 - SALSAs Eastern Europe (EE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report	4
Annex 7 - SALSAs Southern Europe (SE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report	20
Annex 8 - SALSAs Northern Europe (NE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report.....	39
Annex 9 – SALSAs Africa (AFR) - Macro-regional Workshop	54

Annex 6 - SALSA Eastern Europe (EE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report

Overview of the workshop

The workshop was organized by Highclere Consulting (HCC) in the framework of the SALSA project (www.salsa.uevora.pt/en/). SALSA is a 4 year-long research project funded by the EU Horizon 2020 programme with the aim of developing **better understanding** of the contribution that **small farms** (and associated small food businesses) make towards the important goal of ‘**sustainable food and nutrition security**’. Partners in the SALSA project have researched **30 regional food systems** in four very broad **geographical ‘macro-regions’** of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), Southern Europe, Northern Europe and Africa.

According to data from Eurostat, it is estimated that CEE countries have lost around 1.1 million small farms during the last decade. This trend has continued in spite of policies and mechanisms designed to support small farms. Therefore, besides focusing on understanding the value and contribution of small farmers to regional food and nutritional security, the workshop had the following aims to:

- **Bring together** a diverse range of decision-makers and other key stakeholders familiar with – and active-in – rural policy-making at national, regional and local level;
- **Identify and prioritise** the needs of small farms based upon a) work undertaken in ten reference regions in Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania, and; b) the experience of the workshop participants;
- **Agree the most appropriate** multi-level (national, regional and local) policy tools / policy mix to address these needs; Opportunities provided by the post-2020 EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) would be given particular attention.
- **Provoke** deeper discussion on specific themes, such as advisory services, cooperation and community-based initiatives for small farms.



Presenting the findings of the SALSA project

A total of 46 people participated in the meeting from the three SALSA partners in the CEE macro-region - namely Poland (12), Latvia (6) and Romania (25) – plus 3 experts from Lithuania, Bulgaria and Croatia.

Participants included representatives from multiple levels of ‘governance’, including representatives of national ministries, regional government, farmer organisations, farm advisory providers, LEADER Local Action Groups, consultants, academics and farmers themselves. See **Annex 1** for the full list of participants.

The workshop programme had five main elements all of which focussed on engaging participants in an **active participatory process** for discussing ideas, options and sharing experiences and lessons learnt from their own contexts. Participants ‘got to know each other’ during the introductory session and listened to a **presentation of the main SALSA findings** from the CEE macro-region. The results of a macro-regional SWOT analysis and small farmer ‘needs assessment’ were then presented for **reflection, group discussion and prioritisation** using a simple voting system. Participants **worked in mixed groups** to discuss what **policy measures for supporting small farms** have worked well – and less well – in the four main areas of needs that emerged from the voting. After a short presentation on possible policy options for 2021-2027, participants worked in country groups to **formulate objectives** for supporting small farms in their own regions and to **identify the appropriate policy tools and mixes** that could help achieve these objectives. The findings and conclusions of the participatory sessions are summarized and commented on below, followed by a short section on conclusions.

What is a **small farm** in the SALSA project?

Establishing a definition for “small farms” that was appropriate to use in SALSA was a challenge and discussed extensively. Finally, it was decided to adopt a simple definition of “farms up to 5ha in size and/or up to 8 Economic Size Units (ESUs)”. However, each team had the flexibility to adapt this definition to their regional contexts (e.g. for small farms in Scotland where extensive livestock farming is common, then 5ha is tiny, while in an African context, 5ha is usually considered large).

Small Farmers’ Needs – Reflection, Enrichment and Prioritisation Results

What was the process and methodology?

In preparation for the workshop, a SWOT analysis and ‘needs assessment’ regarding the “maintenance and enhancement of small farm contributions to regional food security” was undertaken in six CEE countries (BG, HR, LT, LV, PL and RO) using a) the data and information collected via farmer questionnaires in a total of 11 reference regions in these countries; b) secondary data at national / regional level collected from various databases, and; c) expert opinion.



Discussing the list of small farmer needs for the CEE macro-region

The small farmer ‘needs’ from each country were compiled and aggregated into a single macro-regional (CEE) list – see **Annex 2 of Section 3.2**. This list includes a total of **50 discrete needs** clustered into **8 ‘themes’**. Similar needs were merged or conjugated depending upon the level of overlap and complementarity. All needs were anonymised by removing reference to specific countries, regions, products or institutions.

Participants were asked to discuss / review the list of needs and to **add any key needs that were missing**. Only five were added, but three of these emerged as very important (see below).

Each workshop participant received 5 “sticky dots” with which they could vote for the most pressing needs. The results of the voting procedure are listed in **Table 1** (the scores are in parentheses). Those needs marked with a “+” were added by participants.

What were the most pressing specific needs identified?

Three key clusters of needs emerged. The five most pressing specific needs receiving **11-14** votes were:

- New food supply chains, value added chains (**14** votes) – *added during workshop*
- Improved road quality for easier/quicker access to markets (**14** votes)
- Formal professional education (**13** votes) – *added during workshop*
- Finalize cadastral procedures in rural areas (**12** votes)
- Consumer education to create better links between SF and consumers (**11** votes) – *added during workshop*

These needs seem to indicate that **creating connections to relevant markets is the most pressing overarching need identified by the workshop participants**, which can be achieved by the addition of various elements including value added chains, good road infrastructures to markets, as well as increased consumer education to stimulate the demand for quality food. **The**

formal professional education of small farmers was also highly rated as a fundamental enabler of small farmers who need to be able to manage their farm and market their produce in an increasingly competitive market. Lastly, the finalization of cadastral procedures in markets seems to be preventing farmers in both Romania and Poland to formalize certain land deals.

The second group of priority needs receiving **5-8 votes** were:

- Comprehensive farm advisory services targeted at the real needs of small farmers (**8 votes**)
- Better rural services public (**8 votes**)
- Need for more “leaders” e.g. co-operatives to act like community leaders (**7 votes**) – *added during workshop*
- Advice/ training on adaptation to climate change (**7 votes**)
- Basic infrastructure/utilities for better standard of living and quality of life e.g. safe drinking water (**6 votes**)
- Improving legislation for direct sales from small farms (**6 votes**)
- Advice/ training on organic farming & agro-ecology (**5 votes**)
- Rural savings and loan associations that have local offices/services (**5 votes**)
- Public support for small farmers (**5 votes**) – *added during workshop*

This cluster seems to be comprised out of other enabling conditions for small farms, including **comprehensive advisory services targeted at small farmers and including advice on adaptation to climate change, organic farming and agro-ecology.** Furthermore, the need for **building strong community leaders, especially among cooperatives** was indicated by the participants as particularly important for inspiring small farmer communities towards a virtuous trend, and equally important for retaining young people in rural areas. Therefore, it should be discussed during the next Rural Network meeting to initiate a programme/measure that provides support for community facilitators helping and guiding small farmers and consumers. Such measure would function as a functional good practice model. Finally, the rural communities in which many small farmers are embedded seem to be in **need of basic infrastructure, utilities and local mutual savings and loans organizations to support small investments.**

The third group of lower priority needs with **less than 5 votes** were:

- Consumer education (**4 votes**) – *added during workshop*
- Continuation of Proximity Farmer Markets with ‘protected space’ for small farms (**4 votes**)
- Advice/training on markets and marketing (incl. short supply chains) (**4 votes**)
- Farm advisory services targeted at new production systems/ technologies for small farms (**4 votes**)
- Farmers wives and husbands! (**4 votes**) – *added during workshop*
- Encourage re-migration to rural areas (**3 votes**)
- Farm advisory services targeted at business development including cooperative structures (**3 votes**)

- Accessible funds for manure management systems for small farms (e.g. communal stores) (2 votes)
- Collaboration amongst small farms for sustainable water management (2 votes)
- Investment support for small farms to purchase additional land e.g. linked to young farmers support (2 votes)
- Reform of social insurance system in agriculture (2 votes)
- Social programmes for connecting rural unemployment with small farms (2 votes)
- Accessible funds for modernisation of small farms to meet EU production standards (1 votes)
- Promotional campaigns for quality products from small farms (1 votes)
- Support to diversification into non-agricultural activities e.g. rural tourism (1 votes)
- Demonstration trials/ farms for small-scale production (1 votes)
- New advisory approaches for small farms e.g. formal/informal knowledge networks (1 votes)
- Risk management schemes for small farms e.g. incentives for compulsory insurance (1 votes)
- Better regulations/ procedures for protecting and promoting fair access to land (1 votes)
- Small farms should have equal (or greater) opportunity to rent municipal/ state land (1 votes)

What were the priority ‘themes’ identified?

For the purpose of continuing broad and diverse discussions in the workshops (rather than focussing too narrowly on the five most pressing needs), the scores for each ‘theme’ were also calculated (see **Table 1**). The five most important ‘themes’ (receiving 83% of all votes) were:

- Products, Markets and Marketing (46 votes)
- Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) (35 votes)
- People and Communities (29 votes)
- Better Infrastructure and Connectivity (20 votes)
- Natural Resources and Climate (18 votes)

Table 1: Themes and needs identified and voted by workshop participants

Needs themes	Voting scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores <i>(needs with “+” are those added by participants)</i>
Products, Markets and Marketing	46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving legislation for direct sales from small farms (6) • Continuation of Proximity Farmer Markets with ‘protected space’ for small farms (4) • Advice/training on markets and marketing (incl. short supply chains) (4) • Accessible funds for modernisation of small farms to meet EU production standards (1) • Promotional campaigns for quality products from small farms (1)

Needs themes	Voting scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores <i>(needs with “+” are those added by participants)</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to diversification into non-agricultural activities e.g. rural tourism (1) + New food supply chains, value added chains (14) + Better links between SF and consumers (11) + Consumer education (4)
Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS)	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive farm advisory services targeted at the real needs of small farmers (8) on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Business development including cooperative structures (3) ○ New production systems/ technologies for small farms (4) • Demonstration trials/ farms for small-scale production (1) • New advisory approaches for small farms e.g. formal/informal knowledge networks (1) + Formal professional education (13) + Public support for small farmers (5)
People and Communities	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better rural services public (8) • Specific support for Young Farmers on small farms (6) • Encourage re-migration to rural areas (3) + Need for more “leaders” e.g. co-operatives to act like community leaders (7) + Farmers wives and husbands (4)
Better Infrastructure & Connectivity	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved road quality for easier/quicker access to markets (14) • Basic infrastructure/utilities for better standard of living and quality of life e.g. safe drinking water (6)
Natural resources and climate	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice/ training on adaptation to climate change (7) • Advice/ training on organic farming & agro-ecology (5) • Accessible funds for manure management systems for small farms (e.g. communal stores) (2) • Collaboration amongst small farms for sustainable water management (2) • Risk management schemes for small farms e.g. incentives for compulsory insurance (1)
Access to land	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize cadastral procedures in rural areas (esp. RO and PL) (12) • Investment support for small farms to purchase additional land e.g. linked to young farmers support (2) • Better regulations/ procedures for protecting and promoting fair access to land (1) • Small farms should have equal (or greater) opportunity to rent municipal/ state land (1)
Availability and Quality of Labour	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocational training schemes focused on small farms e.g. via agricultural high schools (6) • Reform of social insurance system in agriculture (2)

Needs themes	Voting scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores (needs with “+” are those added by participants)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social programmes for connecting rural unemployment with small farms (2)
Access to affordable credit	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural savings and loan associations that have local offices/services (5)



Participants voting on the priority needs of small farmers in the CEE macro-region

Reflection on what worked well/less well in previous programming periods

The third session on the day was designed to identify good practices, policies and measures which should be kept during the next programming period, as well as ones which require improvement from across the 4 priority need themes selected:

1. Products, markets & marketing;
2. Agricultural knowledge & innovation systems;
3. Better infrastructure & People and communities (the two themes have merged);
4. Natural resources & Climate.



An important part of the participatory process in the workshop was to encourage the 'cross-fertilization' of ideas and experiences by having mixed groups of participants around the tables

Theme 1: Products, markets & marketing

Worked well (positive feedback)	Not worked well (require improvement)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local farmers and crafts markets each weekend in a beautiful city square (RO/LV) • Diversification among small farms • Popularity of small foods among urban dwellers – social media influencers (RO/LV) • Farmer markets existence • Consumer driven initiatives, direct buying groups, CSA • Short Food Supply Chains (on farm PYO, shops, online, including FB) • Small associations work (RO/LV) • NGOs, LAGs, foundations who promote and help SF to sell their products • SF sell their products on rural tourism routes • Infrastructure is not good yet but improving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey areas in farmer markets due to a lack of flexibility in applying regulation, issues of trust with consumers, competition between SF/SFB • Lack of information about SF products (would need mobile applications on SFs and their products) • Lack of marketing knowledge and traceability • Storytelling is not a strong skill for SF • Willingness to cooperate is still low (but on the right track) (RO/LV/PL) • Farmers are afraid of bureaucracy and fiscality (RO/LV/PL) • Climate change innovative crops

Theme 2: People & Communities / Better Infrastructure and Connectivity

Worked well (positive feedback)	Not worked well (require improvement)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital skills for old farmers (PL) • Internet access (LV/RO/PL) • Young people are better educated (LV/RO) • Support for young farmers and small farmers (PL/RO) • EU Support for young farmers (PL/LV) • Community Centres (PL) – computers, communal spaces, social services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transportation between villages (RO/PL) • Lack of easily accessible facilities (PL/LV) • Digital skills and tools (RO/PL) • No tools that would encourage young people to stay and live in rural areas (PL/LV) • Gentrification of rural areas (PL) • Lack of cooperation/trust (RO/PL/LV)

Theme 3: Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems

Worked well (positive feedback)	Not worked well (require improvement)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-to-peer for farmers from FAS in Lithuania, on quality food coop (LT) • LEADER, but needs more visibility (LV) • <u>NGO</u> involvement in education (LV) • <u>NGO</u> Initiatives to link small farmers with consumers (RO) • FAS Croatia – LRATC Latvia, rural community centres • CAP support for those who leave the farm • Access to internet and education • Workshops with obligation for attending also helped farmers (PL) • Digital Advisory System (LV) • Cooperation between SF and the university in developing new products (LV) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advisory services in research and education (PL) • CAP measures on ecology, environmental farming, producers... (bureaucracy) (PL) • Lack of services (PL) • Professional schools not popular and prestigious – no interest from students (LV) • Farm Advisory System (FAS) – monopoly on providing advice, very broad focus, only beneficiaries of M1 and M2 • No innovative tools and approaches (e.g. digital tools, knowledge networks, no research pilot for SF) (HR) • No use of M16 cooperation (HR) • SF are afraid to taking risks despite many good ideas they have • Young people have a lack of local knowledge based on scientific research (S) -> The consultations based on big sellers needs (fertilizers, tractors, very subjective) • Late launching of measures on knowledge transfers and advisory services • The quality of the trainers and modules provided to farmers • Gap between the researchers and the SF articles in the English language

Theme 4: Natural Resources and Climate

Worked well (positive feedback)	Not worked well (require improvement)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HNV products promotion and integration to market (RO) • Government support for crisis weather • NGOs active in promoting and disseminating natural resources protection (RO) • Potential for organic farming • EcoTourism as a viable source of income in rural areas • Vegetables producers adapted rapidly to water saving devices (RO) • Farmers in Bucovina producers uptaking for green energy devices on sheep stables (RO) • A statutory ban on turning pastures into arable land & legal protection of grasslands (RO/BG) • Integration of agro-tourism in the activity of small farms (BG) • Agri-environment for HNV & Biodiversity (RO/BG/PL) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platforms for manure storage are missing at farm level (RO) • Superficial controls for environmental measures or not preceded by public awareness and dissemination information (prevention) (RO) • LAGs do not address natural resource measures as a priority (RO) • Highly polluting the tractors – obsolete (RO) • Local products not promoted as low footprint on environment (RO) • Land consolidation in the favour of big farms • Poor water storage and supply options for SF • Crops vulnerable due to highly dependency on weather fluctuations (too much rain, sun, etc.)

Conclusions of the session

During the discussions that emerged, the importance of **raising small farmers' voices** and public representation, especially in the relationship with policy makers and decision makers, was raised. Communities of small farmers require **access to medical services and infrastructure connectivity** and better targeted support is required to be programmed and addressed for the revival services in rural areas, delivering models through **the Smart village concept through the LEADER programme**, as a single delivery mechanism. **Preserving Pillar II subsidies within the new CAP** is essential in order to maintain investment in rural areas. Nevertheless, representatives of Poland, Croatia and Latvia warned that many LAGs and local authorities are not interested in adopting projects targeting rural communities. Last but not least, a discussion emerged about the **misuse of manure platforms funding**, revealing quality issues, water supply issues, resulting in low funds absorption and a mixture of policies which needs to be fine-tuned.

Furthermore, it was pointed that, for maintaining farm advisory systems objective and functioning in the benefit of small farmers (the ones mostly in need of), despite of the low profitability of focusing on this market niche, it is important to **support FAS for SF through public funding**.

In addition, the participants from Bulgaria pointed out that small farms are perceived as a family business, with almost the whole farm work being provided by members of the owner's family. In Bulgaria, the thematic sub-program for small farms did not work because the administrative eligibility requirements for all investment measures under the programme are similar to those of the general RD program (like the requirements for medium and large farms). Its implementation

is limited to the implementation of the start-up aid measure for small farms, which has extremely restrictive requirements, for example, for a period of 5 years the farmers cannot change or increase the economic size of the holding from the initially approved in the business plan, cannot change the crops or the specialization of the farm from the initial proposal in the business plan. This measure has become just another measure for „subsidies’ fans" and not for "start-up farmers". The most important **support measures for them are the area-based payments**, LFA compensatory payments and Natura 2000 measure.

It is important that support for small farms should aim **at preserving traditional technologies and foods, and family traditions**. Another objective should be to retain people in rural and mountainous areas. Support should not be expected to make them large and competitive in a short period of. It is good to consider integrated support schemes from both CAP pillars, but they should **be specifically tailored to the small farmers needs and should not copy the measures included in the new CAP** (especially the ones addressed through the Leader Programme).

Finally, **setting up a network of rural leaders** was raised as an interesting and useful point to be proposed when developing the new CAPs at national levels, as **a potential catalizor for the raising the resilience of small farmers communities (and not only)**.

Identification of priority policy interventions (especially “policy mixes”)

The aim of the fifth session of the workshop was to build on the identified needs and to develop further on the policy interventions for 2020-2027 programming period, cross-cutting over different EU funded programmes. During this session, the participants from the three largest delegations (Poland, Latvia and Romania) were asked to join their national groups, and, to formulate **an objective that would respond to the most pressing needs the small farmers face, based on the four prioritised themes**. The identified objectives had to be accompanied by concrete suggestions of measures, policy and relevant policy mixes from across the relevant policy domains presented in the presentation in session four. Below there are the objectives as formulated by the national teams:

Latvia

[PEOPLE & COMMUNITIES]

Objectives: *Stop depopulation in rural areas* by (1) improving the infrastructure in order to ensure a better connectivity between towns and villages and (2) by encouraging the consumption of local products.

Instruments & mechanisms identified:

- Invest in physical infrastructure, such as rural roads (Cohesion Funds) – regional authorities;
- Knowledge and Information (CAP & Regional Development) – national agricultural ministries to develop new/alternative measures for this during the next programming period (the advisory system available for small farmers at national level should be state financially supported and ideally as a peer-to-peer format).

Market measures:

- Quality schemes for food products.

Marketing measures:

- On-line marketing.



The Latvian participants working on people and communities - objectives and instruments

Poland

[PRODUCTS, MARKETS AND MARKETING]

Objectives: *Integrate small farmers better on the market by (1) simplifying the rules to small farmers scale, (2) ensuring better cooperation between generations of older and younger farmers through more education about these measures, (3) establishing a system to encourage consumer choice of small farm products, including through direct selling arrangements.*



The Polish participants working on products, market and marketing – objectives and instruments

Instruments & mechanisms identified: Production support measures: Processing facilities & funding for value addition (CAP):

- Hygiene & Quality standards for small farm production (Pillar 1 - CAP CMO – regionally developed) + Education for SF (Education + Agriculture), also for selling, processing, cooperation;
- Specialized products (M12.4, M16.4, regional development programme, LAGs – Community Led Local Development - CLLD).

Markets support measures:

- Maintaining farmer markets locations in the proximity of consumers (regional authorities).

Marketing support measures:

- Consumer education regarding healthy food and direct selling channels (via internet)
- Promotion of and awareness rising among urban consumers.

Romania

[PEOPLE & COMMUNITIES]

Objectives: *Developing vibrant rural communities by* (1) promoting measures that can help increase farmers quality of life (using the LEADER approach), (2) developing rural infrastructures, in order to improve connectivity, (3) investing in local heritage, local monuments - LEADER, REGIO and (4) encourage small farmers to become public goods suppliers – HNV schemes-HNV products (eco products & mountain products).



The Romanian participants presenting the results of the discussions on people and communities - objective and instruments

Local heritage investments (LEADER) → Other income sources, diversification (REGIO – rural businesses and start-ups);

- Modern technologies/tailor made trainings (AKIS);
- Labels – payments for public goods (Quality Scheme – Network of Local Leaders, 16.4) + enlarge eligibility criteria SF to be able to receive support from HNV measures
- Community Facilitators (renewed approach to rural networking).

Conclusions of the session

Upon reflection on the three objectives developed by workshop participants, it can be noted that **all three teams were inspired by the policy mix concept and proposed objectives that could be solved by integrating and harmonizing different mechanisms from various programmes, funds and regulations available at EU level, addressing small farmers support at both national and regional level.** This seems to be particularly available for the measures focused on community development, which were proposed by both the Polish and the Romanian delegations.

Another interesting observation is that **all three objectives proposed suggested the need for mechanisms to promote and raise awareness over small farmers among consumers,** including by labelling public goods brought by small farmers, such as contribution to landscape management through HNV as a more effective marketing measure.

Nevertheless, while participants from all the three main regions were well familiar with the type of support provided by rural development funds, there was not a clear, good understanding whether CAP measures (namely Pillar I) also provide support for promotion of local products among consumers. **Developing dedicated funds for such measures during the new programming period could be an important suggestion for participants to take forward in lobbying their national governments, accompanied by better targeted and visible promotion of such available type of support.**

Additional Notes and Narratives

As an overall remark, participants found the interaction on the day and the cross-pollination of experiences across the macro-region very useful and inspiring. Participants agreed to stay in touch with the SALSA team regarding future project findings, as well as to contribute to their regional/national Communities of Practice.

List of Participants

No.	Name	Organization	County / Country
1.	Adriana Paşcalău	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine	Cluj-Napoca
2.	Agita Hauka	Latvian Farmers Federation	Latvia
3.	Agnieszka Kościaniuk	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Poland
4.	Agnieszka Tomczyk	Małopolska Agricultural Advisory Center	Poland
5.	Alexandru Olar	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine	Cluj-Napoca
6.	Alina Alexa	Highclere Consulting	Braşov
7.	Alise Kalnina	Young Farmers Club	Latvia
8.	Anamaria Băcilă	County Agricultural Directorate	Sibiu
9.	Bogdan Alecu	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development LEADER and RNDR	Bucharest
10.	Carmen Pădurean	WWF România	Braşov
11.	Cătălin Frangulea	Metropolitan Agency	Braşov
12.	Claudia David	County Agricultural Directorate	Braşov
13.	Cornelia Alboiu	Institute of Agricultural Economy	Bucharest
14.	Daniel Călugăr	LAG Dealul Târnavelor	Mureş
15.	Daniel Chiciudean	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine	Cluj-Napoca
16.	Dragoş Alexandru	EGIS – Private Agriculture Consultancy	Bucharest
17.	Edgars Linde	Latvian Rural Advisory and Training Center	Latvia
18.	Elena Palău	Highclere Consulting	Braşov
19.	Emils Kilis	Baltic Studies Center (project partner)	Latvia
20.	Ewa Tyran	University of Agriculture in Krakow (project partner)	Poland
21.	Florentina Călugăr	LAG Dealul Târnavelor	Mureş
22.	Florin Burzo	Milk Producers Cooperative	Bistriţa
23.	George Căţean	Association of Traditional Producers	Braşov
24.	Georgeta Ujupan	Private Consultancy	Braşov
25.	Inese Mjadeleca	Latvian Ministry of Agriculture	Latvia
26.	Ioana Stanciu	Highclere Consulting	Braşov

No.	Name	Organization	County / Country
27.	Irina Toma	Highclere Consulting	Brasov
28.	Jerzy Jakubiec	Podkarpacka Agriculture Chamber	Poland
29.	Józef Kania	Malopolska Association for Agriculture Extension in Krakow	Poland
30.	Karol Zachwieja	Malopolska Agriculture Chamber	Poland
31.	Karolina Boba	Agricultural Advisory Centre In Brwinów, Poland (The State Controlled Entity)	Poland
32.	Liliana Rusu	County Council – responsible of Farmers Market	Sibiu
33.	Łukasz Nowak	SFB Owner Nowosadecki	Poland
34.	Magdalena Matejkowska	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Poland
35.	Mark Redman	Highclere Consulting	Brasov
36.	Marta Czekaj	University of Agriculture in Krakow (project partner)	Poland
37.	Maryia Yunakova	MVV Consult (project sub-contractor)	Bulgaria
38.	Mátyás Katalin	LAG Angustia	Covasna
39.	Mihai Mihu	Creștem Româia Împreună Association	Brașov
40.	Piotr Błażejowski	Podkarpackie Agricultural Advisory Center	Poland
41.	Raluca Barbu	Highclere Consulting	Brasov
42.	Sandra Šūmane	Baltic Studies Center (project partner)	Latvia
43.	Sonja Karoglan Todorović	Environmental Institute ECOLOGICA (project sub-contractor)	Croatia
44.	Szymon Zachwieja	Malopolska Agriculture Chamber	Poland
45.	Tiberiu Cazacioc	Highclere Consulting	Brasov
46.	Vilma Atkočiūnienė	Business and Rural Development Research Institute	Lithuania

Annex 7 - SALSA Southern Europe (SE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report

Overview of Participants and Particular Focus of the workshop

Describe the main workshop topic, the aims of the workshop, the types of sessions held and how the various participants (and participant composition) contributed towards the stated aims.

The Southern European workshop was hosted by the **Tuscany Region Office in Brussels** and aimed to:

- a) **bring together** a diverse range of decision-makers familiar with – and active in – rural policy-making at national, regional and local level;
- b) **reflect upon** an assessment of the needs of small farms and small food businesses undertaken in ten reference regions in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Italy and Southern France;
- c) **identify the most appropriate** multi-level (national, regional and local) policy interventions to address these needs;
- d) **compare, contrast and cross-fertilise** ideas regarding the opportunities provided by the prevailing policy frameworks in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece and France for implementing these interventions.

Participants belong to a variety of sectors from national and regional level institutions and organisation: policy makers, farmers, representatives of farmers organizations, representatives of LAGs, technical staff of the Ministries of Agriculture, Representatives of European organizations related to the farming sector, and SALSA researchers from the five Southern European countries (see table under section 6. below for more details).

The day started with an **Overview of the SALSA project (ppt)**. For this, a brief presentation on the contribution of small farms to Food and Nutrition Security, including the macro-regional findings for Southern Europe, on Small Farmer types and regional food systems was prepared and discussed with the participants.

Small farms in Southern Europe have been rapidly decreasing in numbers in the past 7 years. Losing small farms means losing rural livelihoods, which bring diversity to the rural landscape. **This decrease has happened despite of all the measures currently available for small farms.** SALSA therefore, through analysing regional food systems aims to understand what is the role of small farms also in food and nutrition security. A territorial approach was used in order to set boundaries for the analysis, as well as to contemplate and analyse the roles of the different contexts involved. Contexts have a geographical, social, economic and territorial dimensions.

The different results obtained by SALSA show interesting macro-regional trends regarding the types of food systems present, as well as the most prevalent types of farmers in the different regions. Details on these findings are provided in the ppt. prepared for the session.

During this initial overview session, participants raised a series of questions:

1. What is a small farm in Salsa? Why was Standard output used?

Establishing a definition for a small farm was a difficult task in SALSAs and was discussed amongst experts through different means: meetings and e-conference. Finally, it was decided that it was farms up to 5ha in size and/or up to 8ESUs. However, each team had flexibility to adapt this definition to their regional contexts (i.e. a small farm in Scotland, where livestock farming is common, 5ha is tiny, while in an African context, 5ha is usually considered large)

2. How did you look at the non-farm activity and the non-agricultural income?

Small farmers were asked both questions in the interviews. However, no specific question on what was the other source of income, mainly what it represented for their household and farm income.

3. Did you consider gender issues? Role of women in small farms, what is the gender dimension.

The gender dimension was mainly analysed through the regional workshops. This issue seems to be less relevant in small farms than in medium and large farms or farmer's organisations.

4. How did you consider small food business?

SALSAs looked at how small farms and small food businesses are connected. Findings seem to point towards the direction that if you invest in small food business it doesn't necessarily mean that you are supporting small farms.

5. Regarding the specific issue of small farm typologies, it was commented that "conventional strugglers' main policy instrument is the cemetery". Meaning there is little that can be done for them, they need to transform into different types to obtain decent livelihoods.

6. Other types are found, such as part-time or organic farmers are also found within the 5 types, although not within the 3 most common types in Southern Europe.

7. It was also explained that the direct payments received by small farms was not a significant variable to separate the clusters.



*Teresa Pinto-Correia
presenting the SALSAs
project to workshop
attendees*

Small Farmers' Needs – Reflection, Enrichment and Prioritisation Results

In order to be able to discuss the macro-regional needs of small farmers across the 5 SALSA countries, researchers from participant countries were asked to produce a national SWOT. This involved a process of synthesis of all data produced within the SALSA project in the various regions, as well as national secondary data from various databases and their own expert opinion. The SWOT was organized in 9 themes, which were re-organized in the macro-regional SWOT to correspond with the 8 themes in the table below (The Governance theme was re-distributed to the other 8 depending on relevance). Each of the 8 themes contained a list of specific needs from the macro-region. This means that needs from different countries were listed next to each other or merged, depending on the level of overlap and complementarity. For the participatory exercise that followed, the specific countries/contexts from which the needs emerged were anonymized.

The voting procedure proceeded as follows:

Table 1: Themes and needs identified by workshop participants

Needs Themes	Voting Scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores
Products and Markets & Marketing	142	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer awareness raising campaigns about buying from local SF (17) • Develop local value chain strategies through coordination between SF, value chain actors and policy makers (17) • Promote regional niche products, food labels, brands in regional/national food systems (13)
Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS)	120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebuild strong AKIS and FAS focused on (1) Marketing (20) and (2) Improving farm management practices (14) • Agricultural ministries to publically fund and endorse agricultural education, low-cost AKIS and FAS for SF (11) • AKIS & FAS shared strategic agenda defined by public/private institutions and research structures (9)
Natural resources and climate	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultivation incentives for crop diversification/rotation, organic agriculture, IPM (15) • Develop regional crop-usage restructuring, conversion to organic and new technology insertion plans (11) • Advisory system based on well-funded scientific research and rural networks (10) • Knowledge on dealing with local varieties (and breeds) resistant to droughts (11)
Availability and Quality of Labour	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased support to small farmers to pay competitive salaries and hire labour (17) • Develop flexible procedures for hiring legal seasonal work force (15)
Better Infrastructure and Connectivity	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better services: medical care, education and roads to cities and airports (17)

Needs Themes	Voting Scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve rural internet infrastructures and household penetration by lowering rural service costs (10)
Access to affordable credit	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce administrative bureaucracy for SF to access public and CAP funding (14)
People and Communities	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the entry of young farmers in agriculture
Access to land	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land price management system to reduce speculation

What were the top themes selected?

The top themes selected AKIS, Products and Market and Marketing and Natural Resources and Climate. One new need was identified by participants and added to the 4 key themes selected “New entrants into farming”. Participants from all countries agreed that with the aging population found amongst small farmers, generational takeover and new entrants are a key need in Southern Europe.

What were the top needs selected?

Out of all the top needs identified in the table above, the most voted needs out of all were: in first place, to reduce administrative bureaucracy for SF to access public and CAP funding, and to develop local value chain strategies through coordination between SF, value chain actors and policy makers. Followed by promoting regional niche products, food labels, brands in regional/national food systems, rebuilding strong AKIS networks and FAS focused on marketing and supporting the entry of young farmers in agriculture. These seem to be common needs across all countries represented in this southern macro-regional workshop.

Session on needs of small farmers

The list of needs was presented. Voting followed (using the categories ‘general farmers’ and the three types relevant for the Mediterranean area).

The needs priorities ended with the following votes in 3 main themes: MARKETS 117, AKIS 74, CLIMATE 53. The following observations can be made regarding small farmer types and their needs:

- “Products and marketing” was an important theme for all types of farmers, but mainly for **Conventional Strugglers**.
- “Natural resources and climate” was especially important for **Business Specialised** farmers, and least for **Conventional Strugglers**.
- “AKIS” was identified as an important theme for all types, but mainly for **Conventional Entrepreneurs**.

Additionally, participants identified other needs that were not included in the voting table. Those missing needs were:

- 1) The need of creating more and more efficient producer organisations, more cooperation and working together amongst small farms. “For all types, except conventional strugglers, cooperation and farmer organisation is central. It is the only thing that they could do”. This need was included within the group: **Products and Markets & Marketing**
- 2) The need for an “ecologising” agriculture (which is not only organic) was also identified.
- 3) The need for more young farmers and new entrants into agriculture. This theme was also noted as a key need for Mediterranean areas and for all countries in this particular macro-region. It was added as new Theme to be discussed¹.

A discussion on the policy relevance of Small farms types was started by the facilitator. The general conclusion was that yes, small farm types are policy relevant, as each type has different needs, i.e. AKIS are more important for Conventional entrepreneurs than for Business specialised small farms, as they already have more information and knowledge regarding this. Policies should also focus on Young farmers and also new entrants into agriculture and help them so they become one of the most successful types of SF, and not necessarily those that are more present within the Southern European regions (i.e. Business diversified). Some participants thought that new entrants should be supported to become a large farmer and not a small one (as large farmers are better able to live of agriculture).



*Irina Toma
presenting the results
of the exercise
to workshop
attendees*

¹ The age dimension in the case of southern Europe is particularly important

Reflection on what worked well/less well in previous programming periods

The third session on the day was designed to identify good practices, policies and measures which should be kept during the next programming period, as well as ones which require improvement from across the 4 priority need themes selected:

1. Products and Markets & Marketing
2. Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS)
3. Natural resources and climate
4. New Entrants

Theme 1. Products and Markets & Marketing

Worked well	Not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for P.O Fruits and Vegetables (to be extended to all sectors in CAP reform). Mission oriented support (quality, traceability) • Cooperation measures • Contractual negotiations (implemented in milk to be extended) Farmer's bargaining power, but in Italy does not work well. Disagreement, i.e. Lactalis • Support for innovative farmers' marketing strategies (i.e. social farming). Rural development measures to support this • Short supply food chains in Italy works (e.g. Campagna Amica) • Integration between cooperatives (inter-cooperation/inter branching) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hygiene rules should be adapted and improved • Rules on environmental/labour on imported food stuffs (close the competition gap)- trade rules • Second best is labelling of imports (consumers should be aware) • Competition rules and/vs agricultural policies (grey area, unclear) • Access to "local" markets: in rural development measures; fiscal measures for farmers in remote areas • Logistics of small farms • Food labelling: traceability, transparency, PDO, PGI, need for reciprocity (we should not import lower standard) • Missed link: communication and structural development funds not targeting SF enough (ESI) • Short food chains: No consumer awareness • Tools for valorising SF contribution to biodiversity (Rural development a lot is possible but not done)

WHAT WORKED WELL

This group listed a set of policy tools that are available for farmers that are already in the market. The first tool that was mentioned was "support for producers organisations on the fruit and vegetable sector". This is said to be working well and that should be extended to other sectors, according to the ongoing CAP reform. The reason why it works as a policy tool is that it consists of a mission-oriented support (quality, traceability).

The second tool mentioned is "cooperation measures" in the second pillar.

The third instrument is "contractual negotiations", and it was explained in relation to the example in the milk sector. This is a measure made to reinforce farmers bargaining power, then the question was raised: How do you support farmers' bargaining power? The example of Lactalis was made.

There are two options: either the processing company carries out the contractual negotiations with the farmers, or the farmers join up in a cooperative and bargain themselves with the food processors. On this point there is disagreements among participants, in relation to competition rules vs. agricultural policies.

The fourth tool is “farmers support for innovative farmers marketing strategies (e.g. social farming), linked to rural development program measures as a support.

The fifth tool is short food supply chains: in Italy the Campagna Amica is a model that works very well, while this instrument works less well in other countries such as Portugal.

The sixth tool is integration between cooperatives (inter-cooperation) or network contracts with a specific purpose (e.g. export in Japan, related to a specific mission). Inter-branching was also mentioned.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Food hygiene rules should be adapted and improved to tailor small farmers need (flexibility is not enough). Rules on environmental and social aspects of farming and imported foodstuffs. The need is to close the competition gap (this has to do with trade rules). Since restrictions in this regard are difficult, the second-best option is labelling (to make consumers aware of what they buy and how what they buy is made).

There is a grey area between competition rules and agricultural policies that needs to be clarified.

Concerning access to local markets (for those farms that are out of the markets and want to enter): the rural development measures or the fiscal measures are there but should consider the rural-urban continuum (or divide) of situations. In fact, the same small farm can be much more struggling if it is located in a very remote area. The other area for improvement is the logistical organisation of small farms.

Labelling – this should be improved in terms of transparency, traceability (there was a suggestion on reciprocity).

MISSED LINKS: structural development funds that are able to target small farms in coordination with rural development and agricultural policies. And tools for valorising small farms’ contribution to biodiversity.



*Discussion on Theme 1.
Products and Markets &
Marketing*

Theme 2. Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS)

Worked well	Not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific issues are properly dealt (i.e. animal health) • There are innovations (i.e. smart farming) • Collective action identities: 1) farmer's needs; 2) who can train; 3) benchmarking/DEMO farms (not in GR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentation of actions lacking coordination • Local offices shut down or devoted to CAP bureaucracy or outdated • Not spread to small farmers through the advisory services • Conflict of interests: 1) public; 2) local/centralised / private • Education of innovation providers. Who teaches the advisors?

In this group there were representatives of Italy, Greece and Spain. We found plenty of common features both in the “working well” and in the “to improve” areas.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED:

We agreed that, in spite of having innovation agents in the regions, a fragmentation of actions occurs and generally they lack coordination. So, there are efforts carried out by private and public agents but sometimes without a common direction and even without being aware of the others' findings. Hence, duplication of efforts happens, and possible complementarities are lost.

There also arise conflicts of interest between societal demands and private innovator suppliers, who are sometimes short-term profit oriented and not necessarily in line with common interests. A discussion on how to incentivise/regulate these private providers to better align them to common goals emerged, and then in the general debate the ongoing French experience with Bayer was mentioned as one step in this direction.

Other types of unsolved conflict of interests mentioned were on the distribution of public funds for dissemination of innovations, and also regarding which is the optimal decision level on the innovation policies.

Another common negative aspect was the loss of local offices as innovation disseminators. One reason is the administrative burden to them, mostly devoted to CAP procedures and then abandoning a dissemination role that they used to have in the past. Also, some of their officials are outdated in terms of techniques and not able to provided adequate training. In Greece, these offices have shut down due to austerity measures.

WHAT WORKED WELL:

Certain aspects like animal or plant health are properly dealt in all the countries, with agile networks of agents that warn about pests and diseases, and spread knowledge on how to act against them.

As a matter of fact, innovation exists and is present, for example in the field of smart farming. However, as indicated above, it is not always spread to farmers

In some of these countries, associations of collective action have been able to create a procedure of transmitting innovation to small farmers. It helps to identify specific needs or challenges, then

the associations have the knowledge to identify the adequate “solution-providers” or where has the challenge been met, and then create conditions for technology dissemination through visits to demo-farms or specific training.



Discussion on Theme 2. AKIS

Theme 3. Natural resources and climate

Worked well	Not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The small farms are out of the CAP greening requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern countries tend to adapt rules in the most restrictive way
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIP/Operational Groups, it's good but complicated for small farmers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dedicate OG for small farmers.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk management tools in RURAL dev are not being used or not adapted to small farms.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve biodiversity and agro-biodiversity (PILLAR 2) – but need to be valorised in the market. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relation between size of the farm and biodiversity → this is something that should be stressed and promoted. → how this relates to collective action: small farm patterns contribute to biodiversity. Many farms together create biodiversity (number of products and varieties of the same products) → valorisation of products. • A lot of what we are saying is already possible → how to make a competent authority aware and succeed that they take seriously the issue of biodiversity (inertia at national level – it's not enough that the tool or the possibility is there).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agri-environmental schemes – these are not well tailored for small farms, because of eligibility rules, because there are economies of scale in the provision of environmental services (favours larger farms).

Worked well	Not worked well
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The future of the agri-env schemes -could be riskier for farmers: complex to demonstrate that they are producing env goods. • Innovative Agri env schemes through a cooperative approach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water infrastructure – lack of policy coherence (example for Alentejo).

WHAT WORKED WELL

SF can be excluded from observing certain greening requirements in order to facilitate their access to CAP payment. This is necessary as SF would have to confront higher costs to comply with those requirements.

Some Pillar II measures have also played a positive role regarding the environmental dimension of SF activities. On the one hand, some regions have design measures to support SF to preserve biodiversity and, particularly, agro-biodiversity. SF contribute to this diversity more than large farms and have a potential advantage in this regard. On the other hand, SF (by means of the coops they belong to) have participated in a number of innovation projects under Operational Groups funded by the CAP. Some of these projects are related to the environmental adaptation of agriculture. This could work better if there were SF dedicated calls for Operational Groups.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Despite the recognition of the role of SF in preserving agrobiodiversity and the existence of some measures to support it, this is not generally recognised in the RPD, so that it would deserve more attention in future measures. In addition, this service would be very much improved by means of collective modalities of SF participation. This support could be based on both public payments and actions to raise consumers' awareness.

Particular attention received the way agri-environmental schemes are applied in SF. There was a consensus that AES are not properly tailored for small farms, because of eligibility rules and because there are economies of scale in the provision of environmental services (which favours larger farms). In addition, as future AES could be more result-oriented, the necessity of new skills and knowledge, and the higher risk for farmers can even worsen SF participation in this measure. In order to tackle this, there is a need to explore and implement collective AES.

Regarding CC adaptation, agricultural water policies are and will play a crucial role. In this sense, although there have been large investments in agricultural water infrastructures and equipment (some of them also benefiting SF), these policies lack some coherence. In some regions, investments have been in few and huge projects to supply water in regions dominated by large farms. In other regions, investments have promoted the intensification of production, so that farming systems have become more dependent on a resource that will be scarcer in the future.

Finally, the risk management tools already existing in Pillar II have not been used, and they could become a crucial policy measure to address SF adaptation to CC impacts.



*Discussion on Theme 3.
Climate*

Theme 4. New Entrants

Worked well	Not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an attraction for young people in agriculture but.....how to keep them? • Fiscal initiatives • The rural development scheme for young farmers works. • High education but not in the agricultural sector, they do mistakes...not easy to begin. • They quite a lot of good skills about markets, how markets function, what are the interesting ways to access markets. • They have diversified activities (to sustain income). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we want farmers to work, services need to be brought back to those areas (basic services) and need for support for initial investment. • Need for advisory services → need for demonstration farms and exchanges between farms. • Good access to agri-environmental schemes. But the access to these practices is more expensive. • Different measures for young farmers and new entrants (CAP + national level policies) • Subsidies not based on areas but on business plans • Basic income for small farmers contributing to food security and providing eco-system services. • Cooperation • Land bank in Spain – land that is available to be accessed by farmers who want to cultivate it. • Young farmers: we need to integrate old farmers and young farmers. Every time a farmer dies, we are losing something about farming and agriculture (we should write, listen, film them, recording) → programs for retro-innovation (water saving, local varieties). • In industry/banking: people towards retirement train younger people in → it needs to be the same in agriculture. • Internship with experienced farmers in Portugal → with a small income. • Coldiretti mentions a training program example in Italy. • Participation to cooperatives: entry fee is due if you are new comer and young (and small).

WHAT WORKED WELL

During the discussion, this group listed a series of conditions that are positive for young and new farmers.

First of all, in the last years/decades we can observe a renovated interest and attraction of young people for agriculture (maybe also because of the economic crisis in the Mediterranean). At the same time, it is difficult, mainly for them who are not farmers by their family, to keep on farming, because of a lot of practical/economic difficulties.

At the same time, there are some fiscal initiative particularly devoted to young and new farmers, to start their activities.

Moreover, also the scheme for young farmer have been considered as one of the main successful measures on the rural development plan.

Most of the young/new farmers are highly educated, more of the average of the last farmers' generations. But they are not specifically educated on the agricultural sector, so at the beginning they can do more mistakes. This means also that they can better learn from their mistakes, but the begin could be difficult.

Usually, they have quite a lot of good skills about food/agricultural market: how it functions and what are the most interesting way to access it.

Finally, the usually have diversified activities and so a good way to sustain their income.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

One of the most important difficulties that young/new farmers can have is the lack of basic services on the most rural/marginal areas. If we want to advantage the implantation of new farmers, we need to preserve or to brought back basic service to those areas (school, medical services, etc...). Young/new farmers also need some fiscal/economic support for their initial investment, and this is particularly true for new farmers not coming from family farming.

There is a strong need for advisory services, such as demonstration farms and exchange of materials and information among farms. Cooperation between farmers should be improved. Coldiretti mentions a training program example in Italy. In fact, as said before, new/young farmers can be highly educated but not always on agriculture. They have usually a strong environmental sensibility, so they could access to agri-environmental scheme, but they need also in this case some advisory for accessing these time-consuming and difficult practices.

The measures should be differentiated between young farmers and new farmers, both at the national and European level, because they have different needs. One possible measure to be considered is that subsidies should not be based on farm surfaces, but on business plan.

There is a need for a basic income for small farmers contributing to food security and providing eco-system services.

The land accessibility should be improved, if we want new farmers. One example can be the land bank in Spain.

We need to integrate old farmers and young farmers. Every time a farmer dies, we are losing something about farming and agriculture (we should write, listen, film them, recording), like programs for retro-innovation (water saving, local varieties). In industry and banking some activities already exist: people towards retirement train younger people in, it needs to be the same in agriculture. An example is the internship with experienced farmers in Portugal, but with a small income.



*Discussion on Theme 4.
New Entrants*

Identification of priority policy interventions (especially “policy mixes”)

Workshop participants were divided into country teams to discuss the main take home messages key actions that could and should be implemented in each of their countries.

Italy

Participants in this group brainstormed the following key messages and reflections to take home:

- **IMPORTANCE OF TERRITORIAL FOOD SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE TO UNDERSTAND SMALL FARMS.** Participants highlighted the importance of the territorial context to understand farm conditions and accessibility/viability (e.g. lack of social services in rural areas) to the rest of the region. Large farms may support small farms by mediating, therefore the interaction is important (i.e. as it happens in Bolgheri wine area) to steer processes. Importance of supply chain contracts as tools to foster these interactions.
- **DEFINITION OF SMALL FARMS THAT IS FAIRER TO THEM.** Participants made a reflection about the definition of “small”. Small is different in relation to other similar concepts, e.g. the definition of genuine farmer. Therefore, policies should target different definitions of small (i.e. genuine farmer may be referred to large and small, active farmer can be referred to large and small). Prevalence of the agricultural activity (access to land, innovation) remains a valid concept for policy purposes for some of the participants.
- **DEVELOP AKIS.** Develop/activate AKIS at all levels once and for all!

- **ACTIVATING POLICIES TO SUPPORT CONSUMERS AWARENESS.** Introduce policies that target consumers (i.e. from Portugal). CAP tools are already available but should be improved or better targeted and implemented.
- **USE POLICIES TO RECOGNISE THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION.** Territorial presidium and biodiversity were recurring areas where small farms play a key role. The sustainability pathway is inevitable (no return to intensive without considering impacts (all levels) for all farms. Ecosystem service payments are an interesting way forward but also recognition of social/cultural value of farming was emphasised as important.

Portugal

Currently, Portugal is not aligned with the CAP recommendations regarding budget distribution across the pillars. In Portugal 50% of the budget currently goes to pillar 1 and 50% to pillar 2. Therefore, the recommended reduction for the future CAP of 7% in pillar 1 and 15% in pillar 2 in the Portuguese case seems unfair. Pillar 2 is very important for rural development and small farms in particular.

There was a suggestion to create positive discrimination initiatives for small farms, not necessarily financial, they could be related to technological support, mobility etc.

Another suggestion was to create a basic income for SF based on results and service provision, i.e. ecosystem services, social capital, food production etc. This basic income should be cumulative. The higher the number of services that SF provides, the higher the basic income. This would therefore vary greatly across small farm types and would require of the creation of carefully chosen indicators, which is not considered an easy task, but not an impossible one either.

Additionally, in order to maintain older farmer's knowledge on agricultural practices and promoting generational takeover, there could be projects whereby older more experienced farmers get payed to train and support younger farmers and new entrants. New entrants usually have big motivations but lack the knowledge, and sometimes after trying and failing they get discouraged and leave.

Agriculture needs to be revalorised by society. Activities that aim at this should be also be promoted.

It was also pointed out that in Portugal and especially among small scale agriculture, there is a lack of technological knowledge and thus innovation. There should be incentives for technological innovation and developments. There are many solutions being used in other countries that farmers in Portugal do not know about and could be very useful. This could be operationalised through operational groups for knowledge and innovation.

Eligibility is also a key constraint in Portugal. More time is needed for real innovation and development. This ends up inhibiting access to many people with innovative ideas.

However, not only technological innovations should be supported, social innovation too. Mainly regarding food and agricultural issues. These types of innovations can have effective change to change food systems and transform them towards sustainability.

Spain

The support to cooperation and innovation (or in other words, innovative models of cooperation) are the key ingredients for an enabling policy environment for SF in Spain. Some cooperation and innovation measures proposed were:

- At different levels: agreements between cooperatives or SF associations for specific activities; creation of 2nd level cooperatives (cooperative of cooperatives), etc.
- Using innovative models: such as the common land management initiatives initiated by some cooperatives, or the promotion of innovative products through the creation of commercialising networks or platforms–
- Resort to collective infrastructure and social innovation, such as incubators for new products from SF.
- Supporting the development of short food supply chains (both physically and commercially), including direct sales, is crucial for the future of SF. This support can come at European level from the Pillar II of the CAP, and at other levels, as for example from local Administrations.
- Exchange of experiences and good practices at national level between different Spanish regions.
- The European Innovation Partnership for Agricultural Productivity and Sustainability (EIP-AGRI) is considered as a positive experience at European level.

SF's access to markets needs to be improved through organising production and promoting small producer's collective action. In this sense, SF's organisation can be in the form of cooperatives, but there are also other forms, such as producers' associations or societies which, if they are really owned by SFs and well managed, they can serve similar purposes. This is crucial to reinforce SF's position and bargaining power in the food chain, in particular in some export-oriented farming systems.

Moreover, arrival of new entrant farmers, not only as part of the generational renewal but also newcomers, must be supported in order to secure the viability of SF agriculture and their organisations (cooperatives and others). There is a debate around whether the support should be only for full-time new farmers or it should also support part-time new farmers.

Greece

In some cases, small farmers are not eligible for direct payments granting, owing to the large share of their off-farm income to total household income. Therefore, there should be some additional criteria for the definition of small active farmers.

Another major issue which was pointed out, concerns the small size of the majority of producers' groups (PGs), which implies difficulties in accessing new export markets and meeting the quantity and quality requirements of foreign importers. Therefore, intensive efforts should be made for the establishment of associations of PGs, so as to reach a minimum viable size.

In addition, one of the most important outlets for SFs, are open-air markets, which are widespread throughout the country. However, in comparison to middlemen/merchants, farmers' participation in these markets is limited. Therefore, the institutional framework concerning open-air markets

should be finalized (which is still pending) and more beneficial treatment of farmers in these markets, especially the small ones, should be provided.

Moreover, four policy initiatives could enable SFs' involvement in alternative food chains, which expand during the last years: (i) establishment of an efficient advisory system, (ii) securing efficient sources of borrowing for SFs, (iii) encouragement of co-operation among SFs, and (iv) SFs' inclusion in public procurement procedures.

Finally, farm incomes, including subsidies, are an important stabilizing factor in protecting total income of farm households. Within the crisis farm incomes act as a safety cushion compared to incomes from off-farm sources, which have been significantly reduced. However, the recently reformed tax system for farm incomes is expected to be particularly burdensome for both active people and retirees who earn a supplementary income from farming. Both these categories are the majority of small farmers, whose future is thus jeopardized. Therefore, a more favourable tax regime for SFs should be applied.

Greek Team



Spanish Team



Portuguese Team



Italian Team



Discussions about the take home messages per country group

Overview of the current CAP and post 2020

Messages to be delivered at the European level. Who do we need to talk to? What should we communicate? Comments/discussion from participants follows

- Controversial definition of the active/genuine farmer. And also of ‘small’ farmers.
- The project must make some suggestions about whether we still need small farmers. The CAP will see the budget reduced. Do we need small farmers, even if they are less productive and operate with higher costs? What should we do with this at policy level?
- Someone points that it is not a matter of small or large, it is a matter of being active or not.
- How about the income from other agricultural activities? If genuine farmer is linked to agricultural income – how can you support farmers that have other incomes? Proportion of income from agriculture.
- Concern: stimulating commercial orientation. Why do we need small farmers? There is a theme on pushing farmers toward to competitiveness and markets. However commercial orientation should not be the main driver. What does it mean? Not just market integration but economic integration of the farm in terms of redistribution and reciprocity.
- Contribution of farms **in food systems – small farmers want to be recognised about the added value of the food coming from small farms.**
- Recognition of small farmers → if it goes through certification then it will be more costs on farmers. Eco-system services are not remunerated. In terms of the potential for the region: they are now producing for the external markets therefore this benefit is lost.
- In this regard the promotion of short food supply chain is the key. But for wine? Or for olive oil? They are integrated in the market. Fruit and vegetable production. Suggestions: types and products could be matched.
- Messages are many and should be divided by “clients”: national or regional authorities, commission and European level (central), civil society. To take small farmers seriously in thinking the different programs.
- Consumer awareness building program in eastern Europe. But where in the CAP? In the national policies?
- Risk of exclusion of small farms, if we keep direct payments per ha. Eligibility criteria at member state level. Point: payments targeting the first hectares. Historical trends in payments.

List of Participants

	Name	Affiliation
Spain		
1	Egon Cervera	Valencian Federation of Agri-food Cooperatives
2	Joaquín Arnau Reverter	Head of service of the Regional Ministry of agriculture
3	Rubén Granado Díaz	Andalucian Public Agency of Agriculture (AGAPA)
4	Tomás García Ázcárate	CSIC Spain
France		
5	Marta Debolini	INRA Avignon
6	Samuel Feret	CIHEAM-IAMM in Montpellier
Italy		
7	Francesco Vanni	Research Centre for Agricultural Policies and Bioeconomy
8	Paola Scarpellini	Italian Agency for the Countryside and Ethical and Responsible Agriculture
9	Alessandra Gemmiti	Tuscany Region
10	Isabel Basto	Coop Portogallo
11	Katerina Vrublova	Copa Cogeca
Greece		
12	Charikleia Spinthiropoulou	Wine producer, 'Argatia' winery owner
13	Anastasios Gkougkoulis	'GalaHellas' Dairy Goat & Sheep Cooperative
14	Ioannis Karastergios	Agronomist-Consultant
15	Dimitrios Adamopoulos	Olive oil producer, owner of the company "I. Adamopoulos & Co." [standardization and marketing of olive oil]
16	Apostolos Polymeros	Director, Ministry of Rural Development & Food-Directorate General of Rural Development
Portugal		
17	Sandra Candeias	DRADR - General Direction of Agriculture and Rural Development
18	José Coutinho	Regional Direction fo Agriculture
19	Marta Cortegano Valente	Local development agency
20	Sónia Calção	Office for Planning, Policies and general administration
21	Vitor Lamberto	National Confederation fo Agriculture

	Name	Affiliation
Other participants (Brussels)		
22	Flavio Conti	ENRD
23	Luca Gaddoni	Coldiretti Brux/Campagna amica
24	Ricard Ramon	DG Agri
25	Robin Guillon	Representative of the PACA region in Brussels
SALSA team		
26	Annalisa Saccardo	Coldiretti (Italy)
27	Rita Gentili	Coldiretti (Italy)
28	Pavlos Karanikolas	AUA (Greece)
29	Theodore Tsiligiridis	AUA (Greece)
30	Teresa Pinto Correia	UÉvora (Portugal)
31	Maria Rivera Méndez	UÉvora (Portugal)
32	Irina Toma	Highclere Consulting (Romania)
33	Francesca Galli	Uni Pisa (Italy)
34	Dionisio Ortiz Miranda	UPV (Spain)
35	Laura Arnalte	UPV (Spain)
36	Victor Martínez Gómez	UPV (Spain)

Annex 8 - SALSA Northern Europe (NE) – Macro-regional Workshop Report

Overview of Participants and Particular Focus of the Workshop

At a time when malnutrition alongside food insecurity constitutes profound challenges to an increasingly resource constrained world, SALSA (<http://www.salsa.uevora.pt/en/>) aims to provide a better understanding of the contribution of small farms (SFs) to Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) by using interdisciplinary approaches, food system mapping and foresight analysis. This report is part of a set comprising Northern, Eastern and Southern workshop reports covering SALSA activities throughout Europe and available on the SALSA website.

The purpose of this northern macro-regional workshop was to bring together a diverse range of decision-makers familiar with, and active in, rural policy-making at national, regional and local level from Scotland (8 participants), Norway (3 participants) and France (3 participants) to discuss the needs of SFs and interventions to address or alleviate those needs. In addition, 9 members of the 3 regional SALSA teams also attend, with the Scottish representatives predominantly acting as facilitators alongside Mark Redman from Highclere Consulting, leading this work package. The full list of participants can be found in appendix 1.

In order to ensure all participants had a reasonable understanding of the SALSA project Lee-Ann Sutherland (SALSA) gave a brief presentation explaining the contribution of small farms to ‘sustainable food & nutrition security’ and reflecting on the assessment of the needs of small farms and small food businesses over the 30 regions covered by SALSA.

Prior to the workshop the SALSA project teams prepared a SWOT analysis based on knowledge and data gained from interviews, focus groups and workshops, as well as national secondary data from various databases and their own expert opinion, to identify SFs needs in each of the four reference regions². Participants from each country were asked to consider the SWOT analysis



from their region, add any needs they felt were missing and then, using 3 sticky dots which they could place as they saw fit, to vote on those needs that they felt were most important or relevant to their region. Following the voting the participants then suggested and discussed interventions that may alleviate or mitigate the most voted on needs.

² Norway, reference region Hedmark, France, reference region Vaucluse, Scotland, two reference regions, West Coast- Lochaber, Skye and Lochalsh, Arran and Cumbrae and Argyll and Bute and Central Scotland - Perth and Kinross and Stirlingshire.

The Needs of Small Farmers.

Scotland

Scottish participants were given red dots to vote for needs they felt most important to the central reference area and blue dots for the west coast. These two regions of Scotland are quite different. The west coast is predominantly a historically crofting area characterised by common working communities or ‘townships’ typically consisting of small individually owned plots of marginal land and a share of poor quality hill ground used for grazing. Crofts enjoy certain rights under the Crofter Scotland Act not given to other small farms in Scotland. Small farms or smallholdings in the central region generally consist of units on good quality land that have become available following the division of larger farms.

The full list of SF needs and votes can be found in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Needs of Scottish small farmers taken from SWOT analysis and votes from Scottish participants at the workshop of those considered to be most important

	 West Coast  Central	Needs
Connectivity & Infrastructure	 	Internet (especially high speed internet) Service connectivity/provision and public services Infrastructure around processing and production (e.g. abattoirs)
Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) for Small Farmers		Accessible innovation for small farms – courses, training and support Affordable and flexible (Fits around other work) Inclusion into farm advisory service programmes and governance schemes
Rural Demographic Trends	  	Support for viable rural communities Need to encouraging succession and new entrants into farming Need to support younger new entrants – affordable housing Need continued access to labour for the food and drink/hospitality sector (post Brexit) and other services necessary to support rural communities
Agricultural Labour Availability & Quality		Need continued availability of unpaid family labour and that from WOOFers and voluntary labour.
Access to Land	  	Land reform to enable access to affordable land – Scotland has highly concentrated land ownership. Extending crofting thought to be valuable opportunity

	 West Coast  Central	Needs
Climate and Natural Capital		Improved guidance and information on specific risks and mitigation National Strategies to deal with loss of high value farmland, wildfires etc.
Access to affordable credit		
Market Integration of SF, and their Value Added to Food Systems	 	Small farms need access to supermarkets and/or alternatives to supermarkets. Supermarket reform Support for food brands and small farm/local provenance, alternative food networks.
Governance Factors	 	More small - farm relevant subsidy system (e.g. front-loaded towards first few hectares) Longer-term support for initiatives and start-ups. Subsidy system needs to value natural goods/ecosystem services as well as agricultural production.

The three most voted on needs were:

- *Access to land* - Land reform to enable access to affordable land  
- *Market Integration of SF, and their Value Added to Food Systems* - Support for food brands and small farm/local provenance, alternative food networks  
- *Governance Factors* - Longer-term support for initiatives and start-ups  

Scottish participants considered access to land to precede all else and the development of better national strategies and initiatives to support new entrants and encourage succession as the most important SF needs across both regions.

Discussions around access to land and maintaining rural populations included thoughts on new entrants who need affordable small plots and incentives for both newcomers and out-goers, the latter who can make way for younger and/or more productive new entrants. The crofting system in particular is thought to have issues in that unworked crofts aren't very effectively re-allocated.

Participants expressed the view that the general aspiration to provide incentives should be addressed at the national level with a better strategy for small-holdings, an extension of rural housing schemes, subsidies that front-load the first few hectares and lower income barriers in existing farm schemes in order to encourage smaller enterprises.

Discussions also included issues around marketing, so appropriate incentives (e.g. alternative food networks), and local processing (slaughterhouses and creameries) were believed to be important. Participants described SFs struggling to make a return or even break-even with small batches of

produce in terms of finding somewhere reasonably local that will sell it or process it. They thought that a move towards more output-based payment systems is needed to encourage production and other environmental benefits rather than area-based schemes that are felt to have encouraged consolidation to the detriment of small farming. They also felt that policy should give more recognition to the greater challenges faced in the Less Favoured Areas (LFA) farming context and equally to increase support for socio-economically deprived localities e.g. the Scottish island of Bute where small farming is important to communities.

The full list of incentives proposed are listed below, together with the suggested level of implementation (L-local, R-regional, N- national):

- Supporting local systems for co-operative marketing, financial and training (L)
- Easier access to info for local food sales (L+N)
- Promote cultural value of local food (Education) (L+N)
- Local marketing schemes (L)
- More assistance for LFA and socio-economically deprived areas e.g. islands (geographically deprived) (L+N)
- Develop crofting model for other regions- for brand, recognition, protecting land & communities (N)
- Regional abattoir capacity (R)
- Develop croft housing scheme (R)
- Make land cheaper (agricultural land planning) (N)
- New -entrants scheme for crofters and farmers and out-goer incentive (N)
- Activity transfer (N)
- Subsidy- income barrier too high for small farm schemes (N)
- Area-based scheme to have some front loading -start at 1 Ha -could be national, non-EU level (N)
- National small land holding scheme (N)
- Move towards outputs (not only food- sympathetic to scale) e.g. carbon capture (N)
- Disincentivise un-environmental practice (N)


Norway

The Norwegian participants most voted on needs were;

- Investments in connectivity and infrastructure (better roads / reducing travel time) and avoiding centralizing public services (*Connectivity & Infrastructure*) 
- Capital to invest in innovative technologies (*Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) for Small Farmers*) 
- Increased investments in climate-smart technology (*Climate and Natural Capital*) 

The above needs attracted the most support in the ranking exercise for Norwegian participants and during discussions improved infrastructure was identified as a major requirement. Access to roads and transport during winter & summer can be problematic due to geography and weather. A need for better internet access in rural areas to support online advertising and sales was identified, and a belief that villages require shops and services to survive and support SFs. The full list of needs can be found in **Table 2** below.

Table 2: Needs of Norwegian small farmers taken from SWOT analysis and votes from Norwegian participants at the workshop of those considered to be most important.

	Number of votes	
Connectivity & Infrastructure		Need significant investments in roads + local hospitals
Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) for Small Farmers		Capital to invest in innovative technologies
Rural Demographic Trends	Removed by participants	More (liberal) guest worker programs (foreign labor) to help needs for seasonal workers on farms.
Agricultural Labour Availability & Quality		
Access to Land		
Climate and Natural Capital		<p>Knowledge on how to adapt to warmer, wetter and dryer weather. Insurance schemes in case of crop failure.</p> <p>Increased investments in climate-smart technology</p> <p>Increased focus on education in climate-smart practices both in schools and from extension services</p>
Access to affordable credit		Economic advice on part of extension services
Market Integration of SF, and their Value Added to Food Systems		More distributors that are willing to/have a business model where they buy small quantities from producers
Governance Factors		



During the discussion around climate change, which was of great concern, participants identified the current debate in Norway regarding agriculture being blamed for high carbon outputs and there was concern that Norwegian farmers would be subject to stricter regulations and could be unfairly punished through national policy when neighbouring countries may be doing less to mitigate climate change impacts. They would like to see a common understanding with all European countries, EU members or not, to work on policy together.

Climate events impact strongly on SFs and they argued that SFs were uniquely equipped to deal with threats more effectively than larger industrialised units. The negative results of extreme weather events are a real threat and immediate action is needed to meet these challenges. Participants wanted a policy focus on education for all to understand climate change, how SFs function and how their ability to adjust rapidly can enable resilience and elicit an environmental focus. Thus, all citizens whether farming or not can understand how to tackle climate change.

Participants were keen to investigate new markets and innovative ways to sell their produce and reach a bigger market share than they do currently. Some wanted to find ways to co-operate with other farmers and producers which requires local, regional and national support and access to more funding to enable small producers to be viable and sustainable. The geography of Norway means that many SFs feel isolated, in particular during the winter months, when many road and rail connections are closed. Collaborating with neighbouring farmers as well as increasing ways in which local community businesses could become involved through marketing or processing were also identified by the group as needs to keep SFs viable.

One SF need which had come from the SWOT analysis which identified “a more (liberal) guest worker program for seasonal workers” was challenged by the Norwegian participants. They argued that the policy in place for seasonal labour was already too liberal and proposed a policy that targeted local labour forces that had agricultural experience. There was a suggestion that such an organisation or agency could match a trained reliable and available workforce to farms at certain times during the year, engage in the community and wider society, understand farming and therefore increase support for the agricultural sector. Such organisations, colloquially known as ‘machinery rings’ e.g. Ringlink <http://www.ringlinkscotland.co.uk/about-us> already exist in Scotland and are believed to highly successful.

The full list of incentives proposed are listed below, together with the suggested level of implementation (L-local, R-regional, N- national):

- Sustainability investment grants (not pro-growth-> don't need to expand but improve) (R)
- Climate -local support (L)
- Educational programs (L)
- Flexible food safety guidelines for SFs (L)
- Co-ordination of selling produce and transporting produce outside immediate local area. Ex REKO (fair consumption) (L)
- Geography is an issue
- Internet connectivity (N)
- New business model- not run as a business
- Climate [is / should be?] on national policy
- [Who?] In negotiations with state at the moment regarding educational policy (N)
- Climate- common interpretation of climate change needs- with farmers (agriculture)
- Common understanding of what is required by every country / person
- Climate policy- not to disadvantage Norwegian farmers by doing more [refers to the Norwegian tendency to want to be the best so may be disadvantaged by doing too much]
- Common rules to apply to all

France

Before beginning the exercise, the French team explained that they are contractors, engaged only in the satellite photography involved in WP3 and were therefore hesitant to provide a message for the region. They proposed feeding back from the workshop to other representatives in the region and working with them to more clearly identify needs and perhaps attempt a foresight analysis exercise. However, they were willing to take part to the best of their ability and provided some useful insight.

The French participants most voted on needs were;

- Easing of access to land for *collaborative* innovative diversified SF models (*Rural Demographic Trends*) 
and
- A need for local, small scale, collaborative up and downstream systems (*Governance Factors*) 

The full list of needs can be found in **Table 3** below.

Table 3: Needs of French small farmers taken from SWOT analysis and votes from French participants at the workshop of those considered to be most important.

	Number of votes	
Connectivity & Infrastructure		Better connection to services such as health in deep rural areas
Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) for Small Farmers		Recognise and support the social benefits provided by the SF Cover their specific innovation needs
Rural Demographic Trends		Ease access to land for innovative diversified SF models, particularly for NE: Change the priorities in the regional scheme for farming structures Support young farmers at the regional level
Agricultural Labour Availability & Quality		Change the statistic system to include the monitoring of part-time farming Include the working time estimation in order to avoid overwork situations Better recognise spouses informal work plays to the farm
Access to Land		Break the concurrence with larger farms in the context of pressure on farmland
Climate and Natural Capital		More educational programs needed, more research and information about how to adapt to changing weather patterns
Access to affordable credit		Prioritise the SF and NE in the access to credit (for investments) Need to inform the decision makers (services, banks) about the viability of SF and of alternative models, too many stereotypes still in the decision makings. Need to change the priority schemes in the regional decision-making system when evaluating the applications of SF to credits Alleviate the gender issue, in a context where SF are mainly concerning women, who face more difficulties than men to accede credits
Market Integration of SF, and their Value Added to Food Systems		Better organisation of local marketing alternative systems A better organisation of public procurements Better identification of the environmental and social qualities of the local products provided by SF
Governance Factors		Better organising local food chains based on direct marketing or short chains,

		Number of votes	
			Ease access to land for SF, which means changing the priorities defined at the regional level in the „structures regional schemes”

In France, working at the regional level is very important for small farmers. There is a requirement to adhere to national policy, but participants felt that there was a lot more potential to work at a regional and local level, thus moving decision making in food production from a national to a regional level would help small farms. Priorities differ across regions, so national policy is not a ‘one size fits all’ and in fact small part time farms see no formal support. The 2nd pillar of CAP provides a very small window to support part-time farming, but it is not seen as a positive benefit as in order to maintain a viable business, additional income from off-farm employment is necessary. If CAP were to support more part-time farming, it would be seen more positively, could increase sustainability and provide additional environmental benefits.

Land is strictly managed by national level farm regulations that control farm sales and the way land is distributed is not viewed as benefiting SFs. Overwork and long hours were cited as a major problem for small farmers who feel there is little support from the local community and who struggle to maintain production and processing with limited resources and support.

A recognition of the social, health and environmental benefits that come from SFs as well as an appreciation for local produce needs to be prioritised. Encouraging communities to invest socially as well as economically in SFs could therefore be a way to keep SFs more viable and valued and reduce the long hours currently worked by small farmers.

Collaboration was identified as a significant need for SFs, especially for protecting the branding and provenance of produce. The French team noted that the provenance of produce from SFs was sometimes lost and rebranded under another company’s name which is understandably an issue for small producers.



The team were keen to highlight an ongoing project in Rennes called Terres de Sources³ which supports and encourages good practices of local farmers who are committed to

³ <http://www.eaudubassinrennais-collectivite.fr/protection-des-ressources/91-terres-de-sources/332-la-marque-de-territoire-terres-de-sources.html>

the protection of the local environment and drinking water. Farmers respecting the strict specifications of the project are engaged in an agreement with the local council to supply produce for public school catering contracts. The project has grown over the years and hopes to extend its reach to involve local consumers by offering them Terres de Source products.

Regional identity and politics are important across France, and as such, the French team did not feel comfortable assigning specific interventions for the whole country. As a result, interventions at local, regional or national level were not identified.

Identification of Priority Policy Interventions

This workshop was run over two days so at the beginning of day two, following the introduction of new participants, each group gave feedback from their discussions on day one and a plenary discussion was encouraged.

During the plenary, participants discussed the availability of technology to large farmers who had the resources to capitalise on the latest inventions to increase production. However, that avenue is not open to SFs and it was suggested that cooperation and social innovation could be the answer to increasing production and ensuring an adequate supply of produce to the local food system. There are some active successful cooperatives, but they often fail due to lack of support and the time, money and energy it takes to build and maintain a customer base. In fact, one person commented that “production is the easy part, marketing is the real challenge.”

Access to land, or rather the lack of it was also discussed and felt to be a uniting issue for all regions and a major barrier to production. A shortage of abattoirs was believed to be a major problem in Scotland where more infrastructure is needed to support livestock production and one participant pointed out that a study is currently underway looking at the feasibility of mobile abattoirs.

Tourism was cited as a positive attribute in regard to local food businesses particularly in areas of Norway and Scotland that enjoy a busy throughput over the season.

There seemed to be a general agreement that the adaptability of SFs should be more widely recognised, especially with regard to extreme weather events, as SFs have proved to be resilient and have the capacity to cope with rapid change.

The participants were then encouraged to mix and work in 3 multinational groups to share the policy interventions they discussed the day before. Each group worked independently, then, guided by the facilitator, they played “intervention bingo,” identifying corresponding interventions between groups and those unique to each group. Eight 8 themes came to the fore.

Incentives and interventions

Visibility of produce and origin

Participants felt that produce from SFs entering the local food chain should be more visible. For example, lambs from the west coast of Scotland may be important to validating the contribution of SFs to food and nutrition security nationally

Community development

The role of small-scale farms in the retention of community facilities (schools, shops, recreational facilities) and the importance of that community to support SFs through purchasing produce and supporting various markets should be better recognised. It was suggested that there is a requirement to share resources in order to provide them



as a package i.e. playing a role in local economic development. In addition, it was thought that SFs have a role in decreasing depopulation and providing opportunities for new entrants and rural resilience.

Farming less favoured areas (LFAs)

SFs are ideally suited to maximising the productive output of less favoured areas. In areas where land is poor, livestock production or horticulture on a small scale adds to the local economy and can increase rural resilience. Participants felt that greater financial consideration should be given to supporting production in LFAs.

Climate change

SFs can play an important role in climate change mitigation by encouraging local food consumption, the diversification of production, educating consumers and better organising local food chains.

While SFs (and all) farmers must accept that they have some negative impacts on climate change, nevertheless governments should look at climate change mitigation and accept that small scale food producers working environmentally soundly and selling locally make an important contribution to these mitigation measures. Positive mitigation of climate change should be recognised in support systems, particularly in relation to eco-systems and environmentally friendly farming. Participants thought that there should be more consultation with SFs and small food



businesses (SFBs) in National Adaptation frameworks

Subsidies

There was a belief that a more equitable distribution of agricultural support payments (e.g. in post-2020 CAP) between large and small farms in recognition of the public goods provided by small farms should be adopted, particularly if research shows they provide a significant contribution to sustainable FNS.

Cooperation

Participants believed that cooperation is key across all dimensions including education, social organisation and housing. There was a suggestion that agricultural organisations like SAOS⁴ should be enabled to create effective cooperative arrangements to link SFs and SFBs together, and that community of interest groups should be able to access community support funding in the same way that geographic communities can. It was felt that there must be a way to create a less siloed way of working in food systems by enabling cross sectional communication and improving support for cooperation in marketing and distribution of produce. In addition, the adaptation of existing legal structures could assist cooperative developments and facilitate access to land, markets and financial support.

Access to land

The lack of access to land was deemed to be one of the biggest barriers to SF production across all 3 regions. In Scotland the Land Reform in Scotland policy⁵ is designed to improve Scotland's system of land ownership so that land may "contribute to a fair and just society while balancing public and private interests" and support more people productively using land which is a step in the right direction but is not well implemented at present. In other regions it was believed that opportunities and support for individuals to rent small areas of farmland for small scale production should be implemented.

Skills and education

SFs and SFBs are believed to be important for creating innovative and direct marketing methods and can play a role in creating training opportunities both on farm and within the supply chain. By creating education and training opportunities, existing skills gaps could be reduced.

For small farms to succeed the underlying supports needs to exist, not just as subsidies but as marketing initiatives, advice, training and innovation support.

Conclusions and Reflection

Despite being geographically distant it would seem that the requirements and needs of the small farmers represented by the participants attending this macro regional workshop are very similar.

Access to and availability of land, particularly smaller holdings, is an issue across all regions. SFs believe they have a closer relationship with the environment and farm more sympathetically than large land managers and should therefore be valued by society and financially rewarded to enable production and maintain stewardship of small less fertile or smaller areas of land. There is an argument that says that if a large farm was divided into smaller units that area could collectively be more productive than that one single large farm, which may be particularly true in LFAs.

It was suggested that there is a requirement across all regions for increased investment in local infrastructure both physical and technological. Many rural areas still struggle with poor internet

⁴ SAOS -Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society Ltd <http://www.saos.coop/>

⁵ <https://www.gov.scot/policies/land-reform/>

services while urban areas enjoy “super-fast” broadband, and many producers have to travel long distances, often on poor quality roads, to abattoirs or markets which raises welfare concerns and is economically unviable.

Funding for SFs is largely unavailable, or the amounts offered aren’t worth the transaction costs as subsidies are not designed for or effective at a small scale. It was suggested that a scheme similar to the “national small landholding scheme” effective in the UK post war, is required to encourage and enable SFs. In addition, farmers feel that they need to work more co-operatively but that requires guidance from agricultural advisors or organisations and time, energy and financial investment which many people do not have.

The aggregated policy interventions suggested by participants, if supported by policy makers, could increase the support to SFs and SFBs, protect rural communities, mitigate climate change through encouraging the production and consumption of local food and build resilience into rural populations.

Acknowledgements

The researchers would like to thank the participants who so generously gave their time and experience to contribute to this research.

The views and recommendations expressed in this report are drawn from the participants in the workshop and are not necessarily representative of wider small farmers or crofters or other professional opinion. Furthermore, this report does not represent European policy.

For further information contact: Carol.Kyle@hutton.ac.uk

List of participants

ROMANIA:	
Mark Redman (WP lead and facilitator)	Highclere Consulting
FRANCE:	
Catherine Darrot	SALSA
Doriane Guennoc	SALSA
Lucie Rigal	Small farmer and representative of farmers organisation
Pascal Aubree	Coordinator of regional farmers organisation dedicated to sustainable farming
Pascal Renault	Regional council
NORWAY:	
Anne Margrethe Brigham	SALSA
Ellen Marie Tangen	Small farmer & small farm business owner
Hans Bondal	Small farmer and small farm business owner and leader of the regional sheep and goat association
Hilde Bjorkhaug	SALSA
Kjersti Hoff	Small farmer and leader of the National Small holder Union
SCOTLAND:	
Alistair Henry	Scottish Government - senior policy officer for policy, advice and activity on small landholdings
Alistair Prior	Scottish Government team leader - Rural Communities Policy and for the Scottish Rural Network
Finlay Matheson	Crofter and ex-director of Crofting Federation

John Martin	Scottish Government, senior policy officer at Agricultural, Rural & Economy Division
John Murray	Food and Drink Scotland, business development manager (Highlands & Islands)
John Toal	Head of Policy at the Crofting Commission
Lee-Ann Sutherland	SALSA
Patrick Krause	CEO Scottish Crofting Federation
Rosemary Champion	Smallholder and chair of Smallholding Scotland
Carol Kyle	SALSA (facilitating)
Christina Noble	SALSA (facilitating)
Dominic Duckett	SALSA (facilitating)
Vanessa Burns	SALSA (facilitating)

Annex 9 – SALSA African (AFR) - Macro-regional Workshop Report

Nairobi, 30th October 2019

Overview of Participants and Particular Focus of the workshop

The African macro-regional workshop was hosted by the SALSA partner **ACTS (African Centre for Technology Studies) in Nairobi** as an Agricultural and Food Security Policy Dialogue Workshop, part of their “Sustainability Dialogues” workshop series. The goals of the event were to:

- a) Bring together a diverse range of decision-makers (geographically, multi-level governance)
- b) Identify and prioritise the needs of small farms through a participatory process
- c) Agree the most appropriate policy options & tools for small farmer needs
- d) Share experiences across Africa and Europe and lessons learned.
- e) Build on the Africa Sustainability Dialogues, SDG 2 and 17, in relation to the agricultural sector

Participants belong to a variety of sectors from local, national and regional level institutions and international organisations: policy makers, youth, academia, private sector (e.g. KEPSA-Kenya), civil society, Parliamentary working group, representatives of farmers organizations, representatives of LAGs, technical staff of the Ministries of Agriculture at national and county (sub-national) governments, representatives of the African think tanks, Regional Economic Bloc (e.g AU-NEPAD) and members of the African Union working groups on Green Framework and Maritime (Blue Economy), and SALSA researchers from the five African countries (see table under section 6. below for more details).

Expectations from the Workshop participants

- Use the upcoming African policy briefs to lobby at our governance level to achieve sustainability in our Agricultural sector.
- Inform AU/national, regional lobbies, ministries and organization.
- Spread our research to the relevance: national, regional, and locally.
- Connect with SALSA partners through SALSA’s social media platforms.
- Implement agricultural policies and put them into practice to enhance high productivity.

The day started with a presentation of an **Overview of the SALSA project (ppt)**. For this, a brief presentation on the contribution of small farms to Food and Nutrition Security, including the macro-regional findings for Africa, on Small Farmer types and regional food systems was prepared done and discussed with the participants.

Dr Joanes Atela from ACTS opened up the day by saying that the role of the workshop was to start a dialogue and to help move beyond discussions to actions to help develop a vision, share ideas that are inclusive and support the development agenda of Africa. He specified that the focus of the day would be on small farms, which assure more than 70% of the agricultural activities on the continent, assuring food, employment and assuring rural livelihoods.

SALSA African Macro-regional Workshop - Group Photo of participants



Dr Atela noted that in Kenya agricultural policies have changed over time, and that it is important to encourage participants from Kenya to assess what has worked well/less well to be able to identify a vision and lessons into the future. He guided the delegates that this workshop is focusing on agriculture and ideas that will help achieve sustainability in African agricultural sectors. The SALSA project presents different cases to open up dialogue, to share experiences from different countries and to integrate in sustainability issues.

Charles Tonui from ACTS further added that the discussions on of the day would also be relevant for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) agenda, in particular SDG 2, but that there are links between small farms and many other SDGs and that different partners could be working to support small farms from different sectors (transport, infrastructure). He encouraged participants to think about how to leverage synergies between different sectors and expressed his hope that the current event, as well as ACTS' overall sustainability dialogues would serve as a platform for think tanks in Kenya.

Irina Toma, from Highclere Consulting in Romania, explained that her organization is responsible for the policy recommendations of the SALSA project. She mentioned that Eastern Europe, just like Africa, has many small farms, with small plots, who are struggling to become integrated to markets. As small farms have their own challenges, but also specific opportunities, she invited the workshop attendees to pay attention to the SALSA research findings that would be presented, as well as take part of the participatory process through which the workshop aims to identify the priority needs at different levels of policy on which African governments need to focus on. Based on the findings from different countries and regions, the common things from farmers in Eastern Europe and African SALSA macro-regions, particularly because of the fact that a high proportion of their produce is consumed in the household.

Dr. Joanes Atela giving an overview of the workshop (Photo taken by ICOSY-ACTS media team)



Irina Toma making her presentation (Photo taken by ICOSY-ACTS media team)



The **presentation of some of SALSA’s findings** that followed revealed that, while Europe’s Southern and Eastern macro-regions have lost almost 1.4 million small farms in only 6 years, statistics regarding the growth of population in Africa’s rural areas shows an increasing trend, with SSA’s population expected to increase 2.5 fold by 2050. Keeping in mind this overall challenge of feeding a growing global population by 2050 in different contexts, with different trends, she

presented the workshop's aims. **Irina Toma presented to participants the SALSA project's approach to studying the contribution of small farms to Food and Nutrition Security (FNS)**, including the project's definition of small farms⁶, the food system's approach taken to understand small farmers' contribution to the access, availability, stability and utilization dimensions of FNS and SALSA's main typologies (for small farms and food systems).

Richard Yeboah, from University of Development Studies (UDS) in Tamale, Ghana, then presented SALSA's main findings from the projects' African regions. This included findings on the main small farmer types (Conventional Strugglers and Part-time farmers), as well as the main food systems types (Regional food systems, with only two Ghanaian food systems having a more export or balanced food orientation) identified in SALSA's African regions. The findings also showed that the two small farmer types identified use a large part of their produce for self-consumption, leaving only a smaller percentage for sales to proximity consumers (incl. regional markets) or wholesalers. Unlike other types of small farms identified through SALSA, processors, small retailers and cooperatives were rarely among the sales points they accessed. Figures show that the importance of self-provisioning (or consumption of produce within the household) was the highest in Africa, while direct sales to consumers were a non-existent lower trend, compared to the projects' other three European macro-regions. In spite of this, according to SALSA's estimates, 80% of the African small farmer based food systems studied had the potential to replace supply 80-100% of the growing food demand by 2050 – an encouraging news regarding the potential of small farms to contribute to FNS.

During the **Question and Answer session** that followed participants raised a series of questions:

1. Your findings showed that small farms in Africa are often not organised in cooperatives and are not able to access processors. Why is it that the small holder farmers are not able to market their produce within their cooperatives? These are the important links to stimulate production. What can be done to encourage cooperatives? What can we learn from the European experience?

Cooperatives are not strong in all European RRs and do not include all farm types. They are more important in Southern Europe for specialised farmers growing cash crops for exports (oranges, olives), and less important in Eastern Europe but also some African countries such as Tunisia, where farms are more diversified and some farmers are sceptical of cooperatives because of forced cooperation during the communist era or other negative previous experiences. There are schemes in Europe under the CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) to provide basic support for cooperative establishment.

There are many reasons why farmers do not want to join cooperatives in Africa. In many small farms in Africa, farmers experience low production, have a preference for flexibility, to sell produce at the farm gate or local market as and when cash is required, rather than bulking up and delaying sale. There many regions in Africa that lack cooperatives as well as technical support from the cooperative managers. This is in part due to the lack of enforceable cooperative legislations, policies and regulations in regions with established farmer cooperatives. There is limited access to affordable credit within the farmer

⁶ The SALSA project defined small farms as those either <5ha of land, or under 8 [Economic Standard Units](#).

cooperatives. There are also challenges with the governance and management of cooperatives, which require trust, good management systems and soft skills.

2. *In Kenya, most small farms are less than 5 acres (not 5 ha). How did this affect the results of the study?*

We did not use the 5 ha limit systematically for the African reference regions, but adapted the selection criteria for farms to the local context. So in Kenya and Malawi, farms included were smaller than 5 ha.

3. *In Kenya, most farmers are “conventional strugglers” and there is a need to support young farmers to take over these farms and support them in commercialisation. But that does not come out clearly from your findings.*

The findings presented were the combined result from the 5 African reference regions, so not just for Kenya. Also, the specific locations where the research was done, and the sample size, were small – hence the results are not statistically significant at a regional level.

4. *In terms of regional markets, how do Africa and Europe compare, and where is Africa lacking in terms of international marketing?*

SALSA focused on food crop value chains, not cash crops. If cash crops (cocoa, tea, coffee, oil palm) had been included, the results would be quite different and would show high market integration and higher levels of cooperatives.

Small Farmers’ Needs – Reflection, Enrichment and Prioritisation of Results

In order to be able to discuss the macro-regional needs of small farmers across the 5 SALSA countries, researchers from participant countries were asked to produce a national SWOT analysis report. This involved a process of synthesis of all data produced within the SALSA project in the various regions, as well as national secondary data from various databases and their own expert opinion. This analysis was done only for the Ghana, Kenya and Cape Verde RRs, not for Malawi and Tunisia, where activities were sub-contracted to focus only on WP3 activities. The SWOT was organized in 9 themes, which were re-organized in the macro-regional SWOT to correspond with the 8 themes in the table 1 below (the Governance theme was re-distributed to the other 8 depending on relevance). Each of the 8 themes contained a list of specific needs from the macro-region. This means that needs from different countries were listed next to each other or merged, depending on the level of overlap and complementarity. For the participatory exercise that followed, the specific countries/contexts from which the needs emerged were anonymised.

Irina presented how the list of needs was developed and invited participants to point out any additional needs that were missing. This resulted in seven additional needs being identified:

1) **Addressing the commercialisation of agricultural lands (due to urban expansion and other drivers)**, resulting in conversion of agricultural land into land for settlement and infrastructure. This was considered important for all types of farmers and was included within the theme **Access to land**.

2) The need to **Enhance public private partnerships** for Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS) was also identified and added to the **AKIS** category.

3) The need for a **Reduction in tree felling for fuelwood** was added to the category **Natural resources and climate change**, as small farms, in particular in dryer parts of Africa, are affected by loss of tree cover (with reducing trees providing fodder, shade and contribute to soil fertility and preservation from erosion).

4) Four specific needs were added to the category **Products, markets and marketing: Dissemination of market information, Price control systems, (multi-stakeholder) platforms for value chain actors, and Processing and storage for value addition to small farm produce**. However, only the latter received a relatively high number of votes.

Voting followed (using the categories ‘general farmers’ and the two types most relevant for the African macro-region: **Part-time Self-provisioners** and **Conventional Strugglers**).

The detailed results are shown in Annex C of this workshop report and summarised in the Table below.

Themes and needs identified by workshop participants

Needs Themes	Voting Scores	Top measures voted on by participants and scores (including those with more than 10)
Access to Funding and Affordable Credit	67	Better credit schemes for small farming and agriculture (25) Stimulating uptake of insurance for crop failures (15) Empower the Agricultural Development Bank to get back to Agricultural financing (15)
Natural Resources & Climate Change	64	Extension services for educating SF about climate change (21) Developing (micro-)irrigation infrastructure (15)
People and communities	61	Increase appeal of agriculture for youth through technology and land access (29) Rural job creation through business /industry (21) Reversing youth migration trends to urban/tourist/EU centres (11)
Availability & Quality of Farm Labour	56	Investment incentives to encourage youth to agriculture (23) Life-long practical learning for farmers (21) Training on application of phytopharmaceutical products, accounting issues, and management of inputs (12)
Products, Markets & Marketing	53	Processing and storage for value addition to small farm produce (14)
Better Infrastructure and Connectivity	52	Proper needs assessment of rural areas by country governments (19) Better rural roads and connectivity to main market cities/islands (18) Faster and more stable internet network (12)
Agricultural Knowledge & Innovation Systems (AKIS)	50	Better resource allocation for extension officers (12)
Access to land	39	Encourage consolidation of land (16)

What were the top themes selected?

The top five themes selected for further discussion were (1) **Access to Funding and Affordable Credit**, (2) **Natural Resources and Climate Change**, (3) **People and communities, merged with Availability & Quality of Farm Labour into the Youth engagement in Agriculture** (4) **Products, Markets & Marketing**, and (5) **Better Infrastructure and Connectivity**. Participants from all countries agreed that making farming attractive and feasible for the young generation was a key need for Africa, as well as supporting small farms in commercialisation and value addition of their produce.

What were the top needs selected?

The most voted needs out of all were: (1) **increase appeal of agriculture for youth through technology and land access**. This was followed by (2) **Better credit schemes for small farming and agriculture**, (3) **Investment incentives to encourage youth to agriculture**, and (4) **Extension services for educate SF about climate change**. Because (1) and (3) were similar, it was agreed to merge these two under the heading “Youths”, and to add two additional themes in the discussion: **Better Infrastructure and Connectivity** and **Products, Markets & Marketing**.

The following observations can be made regarding small farmer types and their needs:

- “Youths” (under the themes “People and Communities” and “Availability & Quality of Farm Labour”) was an important theme for all types of farmers, but mainly for **Part-time self-provisioners**.
- “Credit” was important for all small farm types.
- “Natural resources and climate” was especially important for **Conventional Strugglers**, but also for Part-time self-provisioners.

However, there was no time to discuss the differences between farm types in terms of priority needs.

Reflection on what worked well/less well in previous programming periods

The third session on the day was designed to identify good practices, policies and measures which should be kept during the next programming period, as well as ones which require improvement from across the 5 priority need themes selected:

1. Youth engagement in agriculture (combining People & Communities, and Availability & Quality of Farm Labour)
2. Access to Funding and Affordable Credit
3. Better Infrastructure & Connectivity
4. Natural Resources & Climate
5. Products, Markets & Marketing

Participants were divided into 5 groups with approximately 5-8 participants each, based on participants’ interests and preferences. Because of the large proportion of Kenyan participants (~85% of 55 workshop participants), the Kenyan perspective is over-represented in the workshop outputs.

Theme 1. Youth engagement in agriculture

The group/team at the table was composed exclusively of Kenyan representatives, and therefore their review of practices that worked well/less well are a reflection of their specific experiences.

What has worked well	What has not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land availability is good in the Rift Valley of Kenya – so youths can access land for farming • There are specific funds supporting rural youths for enterprise development (e.g. UWEZO fund, Kenya; Planting for Food and Jobs in Ghana) • There is some access to agribusiness opportunities through youth-based organisations • TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training) internships are available for youths in Kenya (Agricultural Colleges and Farm Institutes in Ghana) • Incubation centres and agricultural shows can help youths to develop businesses and innovations • Apprenticeships are helping the youth to start training in agriculture at an early stage • Supporting policies include the Youth Development Policy in Kenya and the Agribusiness policy (Youth in Agriculture programme in Ghana) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a poor match between youth education and the needs of the sector small farms and agribusinesses. Focus is on theory, not practice. • Agriculture is not always promoted as an enterprise, and this can put off youths • Credit governance makes it difficult to access credit, and the land tenure system does not allow using land as a collateral • Not enough work is done to address policy gaps related to youth issues • Youth participation in policy design and implementation is weak – they have limited opportunity to contribute ideas to policy design • The use of technology in farming is not sufficiently promoted to make farming attractive to youth • There is inadequate support to and use of youth innovations • Agricultural research is poorly linked to the needs of farmers, in particular youths. Access to research is poor. • There are no tax incentives / tax exemptions for young farmers

WHAT WORKED WELL

In Kenya, there are a number of innovative initiatives and policies supporting youths (training, apprenticeships, funding, etc.), many of which aim to make farming more attractive to youths and preparing them through appropriate training and experiences (e.g. via incubation centres). The Kenyan National Youth Development Policy (2018) aims to empower the Youth to productively contribute to sustainable development, including “transforming agriculture and agri-business to make it attractive to the youth”.

In Ghana the National Youth Council is responsible for promoting youth issues and has been working well so far, but not able to meet all the youth population. There are also youth programmes in agriculture, but mainly run by NGOs.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Improvement is required in particular in relation to policy development, technology transfer and innovation. Youths rarely have the opportunity to be involved in the design of agricultural policies that affect them – resulting in policies that do not respond to their needs.

Youth tend to be attracted to technical and social innovation in agriculture, but there is not enough support for youth innovation and entrepreneurship. Agricultural research does not normally address the needs and interests of young farmers explicitly.

Theme 2. Access to Credit

This group around this table included the most diverse range of African participants, from Ghana, Tunisia, Cape Verde and Kenya, and therefore their review of practices that worked well/less well are a reflection of their specific experiences.

What has worked well	What has not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative flexible policies allowing emergence of credit facilities in Kenya and Ghana • Private sector credit facilities – microcredit schemes, especially in Kenya. Some NGOs in Ghana provide credit with high recovery rates • ICT/mobile-enabled credit facilities in Kenya • Linkages between vegetable farming industry and small farms in Tunisia • Direct government /public support for small farms in Ghana, including subsidy inputs in Ghana and Malawi (Planting for Food and Jobs programme) and Tunisia • Public credit systems – Agricultural Development Bank (ADB) – Ghana, the Banque Nationale Agricole (BNA), which provides access to specific credits (for seasonal crops and investment etc.) in Tunisia, AFC Kenya/Agricultural Development Cooperative • Non-state pro-poor micro-credit programs in Cape Verde • Introduction of Value Chain Financing in Ghana by mainly Projects, NGOs and Microfinance institutions (e.g. SINAPI ABA Savings and Loans, Presby Agricultural Services). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of social barriers to credit access Kenya • Public/Government finance to small farms (previous models in Ghana did not work well because of low recovery) • Mobile credit is increasing personal debt due to high interest rates and unregulated digital services (see here for further information) • Public-private partnerships (all countries) • Alternative off-farm credit (off-farm employment) • Monopolizing input supplies (Tunisia) • Enhance informal land-tenure systems to enable access to credits (Tunisia, Cape Verde, Kenya) • ADB credit to farmers should be re-instated

WHAT WORKED WELL

Participants mentioned a wide range of positive credit practices from across the continent, ranging from private to public ones. Especially note-worthy were the private micro-credit facilities in Cape Verde as well as ICT/mobile enabled credit facilities overall. Other types of financing for small farms such as input subsidies, value chain financing in Ghana and Tunisia were also noted for their

positive effects. Public credit schemes via the Agricultural Development Bank (Ghana) and the National Agricultural Bank (Tunisia) or the Agricultural Development Corporation (Kenya).

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Kenyan participants mentioned that social barriers to credit access (such as age barriers) should be removed, while for Tunisian, Kenyan and Cape Verdian contexts the land tenure system should be improved in order to enable access to credit. Participants noted in general the public/government finance to small farms, public-private partnerships and alternative one-off credit in all countries being problematic. ADB credit scheme to farmers should be re-instated. Improve on credit recovery from public sector. At the same time, there is an [increasing literature](#) on the negative environmental impacts of farm input subsidy programmes, which encourage high external input farming practices rather than support agro-ecological, sustainable intensification.

Theme 3. Infrastructure and connectivity

This group was composed largely of Kenyan representatives and one Ghanaian representative, and therefore their review of practices that worked well/less well are a reflection of their specific experiences.

What has worked well	What has not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use taxes from cash crops (coffee, cocoa and tea) to improve road network and quality • Reduce the cost of construction / road maintenance • “Last mile” and ‘Rural Electrification’ electricity connection has worked well in most rural areas in Kenya and Ghana respectively. • Cost of electricity connection has gone down in Kenya (1,500 Kenyan Shilling) • Good mobile phone coverage in Kenya by several companies, even in rural areas • There are local FM radio and TV stations broadcasting in local languages • Mobile phone usage has expanded with agricultural messages sent to farmers through SMS and voice in local languages (ESOKO, mfarm) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads serving rural farmers are of poor quality (limited funding for improving feeder roads by the county governments in Kenya) • In areas with no electricity: provide support to solar companies to provide solar energy to rural community farmers (The Kenya Off-Grid Solar Access Project (KOSAP) a flagship project of the Ministry of Energy, financed by the World Bank, might bring change in remote villages when implemented) • Irrigation: Irrigation infrastructure should be improved for small scale and large-scale farmers

WHAT WORKED WELL

This group was again dominated by Kenyans, and so the table above reflects mostly experiences from Kenya and Ghana – which, in comparison to other African countries, have relatively well-developed infrastructure and good levels of internet connectivity as in other African countries. In particular, power supply is fairly regular here, including in rural areas. This provides a more enabling environment for small farms and other food system actors.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

The improvements relate to road quality and irrigation infrastructure. The latter are often government-run and poorly maintained, because of challenges at the procurement stage. Smaller irrigation schemes in addition to the large ones would also be important.

Theme 4. Natural Resources and climate change

This group/team around the current table was composed of Kenyan representatives, and therefore their review of practices that worked well/less well are a reflection of their specific experiences.

What has worked well	What has not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Devolved / decentralised climate finance – country governments are working close with farmers to contextualise actions instead of implementing blanket recommendations (Kenyan counties) ● More awareness of climate change issues via CIDPs (County integrated development plans) that integrate climate change in Kenya ● The Kenyan constitution now recognises allocation of land to women. This has helped women to access land and manage it sustainably (because they have tenure security) ● County sensitisation on the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP) – implemented since 2015. This is meant to sensitise farmers on low carbon technologies / encourage them to adopt circular economy principles – e.g. use manure for biogas. Is working on some model farms. ● Many non-state actors / NGOs have engaged farmers to be more resilient (e.g. via introduction of organic / agro-ecological practices also in Ghana) ● Training on conservation agriculture and climate smart agriculture (Kenya, Southern Africa, Ghana) ● FTCs (Farmer training centres) and ATDC (Agric technology development centres) have worked in training farmers in sustainable NRM (Kenya) ● Agroforestry has been promoted a lot in dry areas and has benefited small farms also in Ghana. ● Some counties are also engaged in processing / value addition (e.g. mango) (county govt, and some private investors). ● The Ghana National on Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Ghana National Climate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agriculture extension services (Kenya) in most counties not working – there are not enough resources for operations and to train staff. In particular, individual farmers not linked to a project or coop are not able to access extension staff. ● Efforts to organise small farmers into groups and cooperatives has not been so successful because of high costs associated with operations. So difficult to implement any NRG management via groups ● Many interventions depend on project / donor funding, so are not sustainable and not able to achieve impact at scale ● Lack of understanding (amongst professionals and decision makers) of the small farm economy – how to maximise production without damaging the natural resource base. Interventions are not based on adequate knowledge of the small farm economy. ● Coverage of FTCs and other interventions have not really been benefiting farmers at scale ● Adoption levels of climate smart agricultural technologies is quite low. Low numbers of trained personnel on climate smart agriculture ● There has been some training of farmers on climate smart agriculture, but adoption rates are low (perhaps practices are not adapted to small farm needs). There is a climate smart agriculture implementation framework. ● A lot of the measures are not sustainable beyond the financing period. ● Prioritisation of climate change issues at the county level is not always happening ● 4K clubs have died off (school programme) ● Policies must be implemented

What has worked well	What has not worked well
Change Policy and Ghana National Climate Change Policy Framework are in place <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Afforestation and Re-afforestation projects implemented (more trees are planted) 	

WHAT WORKED WELL

Most of the group members were from Kenya and were able to point out a number of successful programmes and interventions that supported sustainable natural resource management and climate change adaptation. In particular, the [devolved climate finance system](#) has been successful in supporting locally appropriate adaptation strategies.

Important legal changes supporting sustainable NRM (in Ghana) include changes to the constitution of Kenya, which now allows women to own and inherit land – which, in the long term, is likely to support sustainable management practices by providing secure rights over land, encouraging investments.

Other successful examples include the introduction of climate smart agriculture, conservation agriculture and agroforestry in Ghana. Most of these interventions were as part of donor-funded or non-state actor supported projects and programmes with limited coverage and time scale.

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Three main areas of improvement relate to shortage of resources for NRM and climate change, dependence on donor funding, and lack of evidence-based programme design.

Most programmes addressing NRM and climate change are funded by sources from outside Kenya, in particular international development agencies, bilateral donors and INGOs. Whilst these programmes have often established successful pilots, they have generally struggled to take success to scale by covering larger geographic areas / more farms (scaling out) and to achieve sustainability by becoming self-supporting (scaling up). Many successful programmes have closed down, such as the [4K clubs](#) that worked in primary schools to raise awareness about environmental and agricultural issues. The current education curriculum called Competence Based Curriculum (CBC) had incorporated practical sessions for pupils and students. CBC implementation commenced in 2019 in Kenyan issues (but some of these are currently being revived).

A lack of a detailed understanding of the economics of small farms and their specific needs in different contexts is contributing to poor programme and policy design, which does not address farmers' priority needs. Some programmes introducing sustainable natural resource management practices are not sufficiently considering small farms labour and other resource constraints, when introducing e.g. conservation agriculture. The NCCP should also be implemented.

Theme 5. Products, and Markets & Marketing

The current group/team was composed of Kenyan and Malawian representatives, and therefore their review of practices that worked well/less well are a reflection of their specific experiences.

What has worked well	What has not worked well
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good level of household consumption for several crops (staples) due to increasing (rural) population and therefore increasing demand for food • Improved market information overall (but with varying degrees of success in different African regions, meaning a more positive effect in Balaka, Malawi due to minimum price setting and media promotion, but less positive outcomes or Kenya's Ugunja, where just the regular market price is offered by middlemen) • Sharing of market prices through mobile phones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers in many regions are still facing productivity issues and high self-consumption needs preventing them to be a constant contributor to regional and international markets; productivity issues could potentially be caused by lack of understanding of markets and motivation to improve production • Lack of knowledge and financial capacity to make the necessary investments to meet quality standards, branding and marketing requirements and conduct basic processing • Better research and documentation about the amount of market aggregators in each region who can create market linkages for small farmers • Mismanagement of cooperatives by small farmers themselves due to lack of skill in cooperative management and elder leaders taking over cooperatives to the disadvantage of younger, more ambitious farmers • Input counterfeits on the seeds and input markets need better government regulation • Need for more structured markets in order to understand demand better or have options for contract farming • Low reputation of small farmer produce for urban consumers requires more positive advertisement programmes • High price fluctuations should be reduced.

WHAT WORKED WELL

The group started off by reviewing general positive trends in their countries and regions with regards to smallholder farmer market integration. They firstly reported the good level of household consumption achieved by many small farmers and the fact that they benefit from more liberalized markets with a broad choice. The impression of the group was that there is a high demand for produce from small farmers (for food, but especially for cash crops such as tea, coffee, cocoa). Furthermore, participants mentioned the improved market information disseminated by the media (about minimum or market prices, depending on national context).

WHAT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

Regarding the policies and mechanisms that require improvement, some participants from Malawi mentioned that, in spite of the positive effects of liberalization, there would be more structured

markets that would allow for some contract farming, more predictability about demand and the clear markets they are producing for. This, together a more thorough research regarding who the regional aggregators are and the roles they play in each district. Nevertheless, the discussion around the table went on about how many farmers need to improve productivity to be able to sell to regional markets. While some thought it was a question of motivation from the side of farmers, others were of the opinion that the farmers' lack of ability to invest in quality inputs prevents them improving productivity beyond simple household self-sufficiency and to be able to observe market standards. Some Kenyan attendees mentioned that many inputs that small farmers buy are counterfeits, so developing better regulations on this should be on the governments' agenda.

Last but not least, the lack of working cooperatives in certain regions are crops was highlighted (but this is highly context dependent within and among African countries). The reasons invoked for this were the fact that older farmers have in many cases taken over the leadership of the cooperative and more incentives should be offered for the transition for youthful leaders, who could better manage it. More investigation should be made as to why many cooperatives were not able to continue after donor money ended. Last but not least, although market demand for small farmer produce increased, more positive advertising could be done to improve the perception of consumers regarding their produce. Here the example of the sweet potato crop, which is difficult to market due to a wide-spread perception that it is a poor' man's food.

Concluding reflections on what worked well/less well in previous programmes



*Mr Nathans Browne, JP,
Director, International Policy
Research Centre (Photo taken by
ICOSY-ACTS media team)*

Mr Nathans Browne, JP, Director, International Policy Research Centre and member of AU Maritime working group shared his key policy pointers on What we should focus on in Kenya from all these priorities?

According to Mr Browne, at national level there is a need to train more members of the Kenyan parliament and the senate on how agriculture is key for Kenya. The policies and legislation they develop should focus on enhancing productivity for the areas they represent. Furthermore, AU

member states should consider how the concept of the blue economy could (discussed in the AU Maritime working group he is part of) could work to the benefit of small farms, in particular through the revival and adaptation of technologies to their needs. Last but not least, Mr Browne mentioned that it is the responsibility of policy professionals to follow-up on proposed policies and to verify the level to which they have been implemented. This is why it is important to improve the capacity of policy makers to assure proper governance in their policy areas.

Overview of the macro-regional policy context

Rebecca Arunga, NEPAD/APRM Programme Officer for the Kenyan Secretariat opened the afternoon session with a presentation on the CAADP Continental Results Framework. The introduction explained that NEPAD is a programme of the African Union (AU), adopted in 2001 by African leaders. Its primary objectives are poverty eradication, promotion of sustainable growth and development, and the empowerment of women through building genuine partnerships at country, regional and global levels. The Kenyan secretariat, established in June 2016, is responsible for the overall coordination and implementation of NEPAD activities in Kenya and eastern Africa region.

In June 2014, African Heads of State and Government adopted the Malabo Declaration on “Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods” (see table in Annex 3). The Malabo declaration builds on the successes and lessons learnt from 10 years of implementing the Maputo declaration (2003-2013) and sets commitments to be achieved by 2025 in in the African agricultural sectors. The Maputo and Malabo declarations are related to African Agricultural Ministries commitments under CAADP and support some of its specific aspects.



*Rebecca Arunga (NEPAD) -
Photo taken by ICOSY-ACTS
Media team*

The 2018 progress review on the CAADP process revealed that 47 members submitted progress reports (see Figure below). Following the review process it was identified that 20 AU member states are “on track”, while 27 member states are “not on track”.



CAADP 2018 progress report submission by AU member countries

In particular, the 2018 progress reports showed mixed results from countries participating in the SALSA project, namely positive outcomes for Kenya, Cape Verde and Malawi (who are “on track”), but also need for improvement from Ghana and Tunisia (who are “not on track”). The mixed progress report results also have implications for various enabling factors for small farms, who are the most prominent type of small farms in SALSA countries, but unrecognized as a distinct target group of CAADP. CAADP pays attention to the following enabling factors:

- **Investment finance** - more specifically the 10% budget allocation for agriculture
- **Research and extension services** - with a focus on development and scaling up of technologies and innovation, integrated capacity strengthening, knowledge management and gender mainstreaming. The main policy issues that need to be addressed here include anchoring agricultural research and extension services into national multi-sectoral integrated food security frameworks and strengthening policy and institutional frameworks, so as to enhance formal and informal linkages between researchers, extension workers and farmers.
- **Mechanization** – in order to increase productivity, generate rural employment especially among smallholder agriculture. Its success depends on organizational innovations such as reliable services and cooperation arrangements for and with farmers
- **Digital Technologies** – developing ICT connectivity and increasing their affordability in rural areas can help smallholder farmers. Stronger collaboration must be secured with the private sector – including African digital start-ups – and donors, with particular attention paid to enhancing the effectiveness of agricultural digital innovations

- **Post-harvest losses** – reducing post-harvest losses would have a direct contribution to the FNS dimensions of food availability and utilization, by both increasing the quantity of produce and improving income generation
- **Agricultural Value Chains industrialization** – The CAADP agenda emphasizes investing in technology and innovation, competitiveness, regional integration and promoting integrated value chains. Furthermore, AU member states are advised to select five commodities or services and to specialize in those, so as to ensure competitive advantage and to maximize returns.
- **Vocational skills and training in agriculture** – youth entrepreneurship and youth empowerment through capacity building is a solution to the youth bulge and ensuring food security. Targeted capacity building should strengthen leadership abilities, personal development and competencies such as self-confidence, innovation and creativity, the ability to take initiative, willingness to take calculated risks and to collaborate in the agriculture space
- **Women empowerment** – national governments should embed gender perspectives within development programmes and policies, in addition to committing the investments necessary to implement those policies. Women and young people must be included in decision-making about agricultural priorities and investments, and both policy and practice must provide the space for their contribution
- **Regional trade and market access** – Some of the areas in which NAIP could focus include elements to boost intra-African trade such as trade policy, supportive trade facilitation, increasing productive capacities, building better trade related infrastructure, increasing access to trade financing, availing trade information and enhancing market integration

During the **Question and Answer session** that followed participants raised a series of questions:

1. *Does CAADP make a differentiation by farm size either in policies or during the bi-annual reporting phase?*

No, neither CAADP nor evaluation indicators refer to the scale of the farms.

2. *What are some of the factors which led to higher performance scores in some of the SALS A countries?*

Vladimir from the University of Cape Verde answered part of this question by mentioning that the community of Portuguese-speaking countries has a food and nutrition security COUNCIL led by Brazil, which has driven the implementation of many programs and legislative and institutional changes in these countries. Considering Brazil's successes in eliminating starvation within 10 years because of school feeding and other important programs, it is a good practice case study for many of the other countries in the group.

3. *What mechanisms are put in place to assure that member countries align their policies with the declaration, and in particular the commitment to spend 10% of the national budget on agriculture?*

Rebecca from NEPAD Kenya replied that this is done via the mutual accountability mechanism of CAADP, in particular its biannual reporting which started in 2018. AU and NEPAD visit and advise member countries on national agricultural investment plans.

4. *How is the responsibility of implementing the CAADP commitments shared with the regional levels of administration, especially in decentralized countries such as Kenya? Do local governments know about the 10% commitment? Does the central government have to allocate 10% to agriculture, or can each count do it at their level? Does the Ghanaian case provide some examples?*

Mr Dr. Kwaku, the Northern Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer of the Department of Agriculture in from the local administration to Tamale, Ghana responded that, in Ghana, the government has not achieved 10%, only now about 6%, but opened various fora for discussion in order to empower the district assemblies in Ghana to ‘own’ agriculture, in terms of budget allocation and programme implementation. District assemblies are meant to allocate funds for storage facilities / warehouses, processing infrastructure etc. So in principle they don’t have to wait for the national government – district assemblies are empowered to invest in at least some of the necessary enabling conditions for small farms.

Richard Yeboah, from UDS Ghana, mentioned that, in considering country spending on the agricultural sector, one should also take into account the salary costs of government staff, as current reports might be deceiving in terms of the actual investment in farmers themselves.

The Malawian governmental representative mentioned that Malawi has managed to achieve the 10% consistently, even reaching 12 or 13% at times. Although there are other shortcomings, the investment target was achieved. The Malawian government just developed a second national agricultural investment plan that is “Malabo compliant”. This new plan pays more attention to the division of activities and responsibilities between the national and district levels. However investments in agricultural will not necessarily give quick results as programs for improved extension services, for example, take time to show results. Therefore, most governmental actors, but also farmers, often tend to prefer investments in roads, bridges or other immediate and visible assets.

The representative of a county government in Kenya mentioned that none of the country’s counties has achieved the 10%. She also mentioned that donor funding for agriculture is often also counted towards the 10% allocation. District agricultural departments have a (budget) ceiling, so the amount of funds from government and donor funds together should be used. Counties do things such as constructing grain stores, and encouraging women and youths in agri-business, subsidized tractor purchases and supporting food and nutrition security (value chains that support the nutrition element as well). Such programs are often run with development partners, as national governments can’t do this on their own.

Identification of proposed interventions by workshop participants

Workshop participants continued working in the same groups to formulate and propose several interventions and main take home messages that could be considered in relation to each theme. Due to the comment of one participant that African agricultural issues often don’t have to do with policy formulation, but to policy implementation, it was decided that each table would develop

proposed interventions at both levels, highlighting also which authorities should have the final responsibility for making the desired changes.

Due to the budgetary limitations of the workshop, only a small number of participants from outside Kenya (one from Tunisia, two from Ghana, two from Malawi and one from Cape Verde) were present and the Kenyan perspective became over-represented in these suggestions. For this reason, the facilitators decided not to split participants into different country groups, but to ask them to develop recommendations based on the policy themes they had previously worked on. In addition, not all participants had an equally deep understanding of current policies related to the key themes, and their state of implementation. Therefore, the outputs of this workshop require a deeper analysis of specific national and sub-national contexts to suggest recommendations in the future.

Group Discussions - Photo taken by ICOSY-ACTS Media Team



Theme 1. Youth engagement in agriculture

Two main proposals emerged from this (mainly Kenyan) group:

- (1) **Policy formulation proposal:** Operationalise the Kenyan [Agricultural Research Fund](#) and link research to the needs of small farms, whilst also improving the communication and dissemination of research findings. This could include the provision of real-time data on small farms to agricultural departments, researchers, farmer organisation and development agencies to ensure that research is based on an accurate and up-to-date understanding of farm structure and farm needs. This is primarily the role of the government through the [Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization](#) (KALRO), whose motto is “Demand driven research for food security and income generation”.
- (2) **Proposal:** Support the **implementation**, review and development of relevant youth policies that will create an enabling environment for youth entrepreneurship, to include:
 - The agricultural sector transformation and growth strategy ([ASTGS](#));

- the [Kenya youth agribusiness strategy](#), and
- The [AU agenda 2063](#).

Theme 2. Funding and affordable credit

Two main suggestions emerged from this mixed group (Tunisian, Kenyan, Ghanaian and Cape Verdian):

- (1) **Policy proposal:** Legal recognition of small farmers in access to subsidies (clear definition of what is a small farm) and targeting of these farmers better in all policy documents⁷. Creating this change would fall under the responsibility with national governments
- (2) **Policy formulation proposal:** Some participants were of the opinion that there should be a policy to limit land subdivision to a certain level or develop other policy arrangements for assuring secure land tenure and further sub-division of land, in order to force farmers to find other, more consolidating arrangements
- (3) **Policy implementation proposal:** Have a good partnership between public and private organizations. Responsibility for this action falls with national and sub-national government, but also with EU/ Africa dialogue.

Theme 3. Better Infrastructure & Connectivity

Again this was a majority Kenyan group, as reflected by the proposed interventions to support small farms:

- **Policy formulation proposal:** Provide time lines for the implementation of policies, led by the national government
- **Policy formulation proposal:** Irrigation policy and quality monitoring to improve all year round production, led by the national government
- **Policy implementation proposal:** To address the poor state of rural roads, prioritise roads in areas where cash crops are being grown by using the taxes on cash crops. The group felt that taxes from cash crops should go back to the areas where the production is done (e.g. for sugarcane).

Theme 4. Natural Resources & Climate

For the Natural Resources and climate group, the discussions identified several proposals:

- (1) **Policy implementation proposals:** Many of the challenges related to sustainable natural resource management and climate change adaptation relate to a shortage of resources and capacities. These could partly be addressed by a full implementation of the Maputo and Malabo commitments (investing 10% of public spending in the agricultural sector), but group members considered even that level of resourcing to be insufficient to address the huge challenges posed by climate change. They proposed to re-focus efforts on traditional and local knowledge and

⁷ One Kenyan participant noted that in her national context such a definition of small farms already exists (more than 12 acres), so this is a context-specific recommendation – not necessarily valid for all African countries

resources, and support farmers in upscaling their efforts and to learn from each other via farmer-to-farmer extension, with support from researchers and other experts. This could also help address the inadequacy and lack of adaptation of NRM and resilience-building strategies to small farm needs. For example, in Kenya, pastoralist communities are hit hard by climate change and loss of livestock, but proposed interventions often disregard pastoralists' preferences and lifestyles.

- (2) **Policy implementation proposal:** Again in Kenya, the devolution of powers to county levels offers many opportunities. Extension services that this level can learn from and with local communities and integrate traditional knowledge into programmes and strategies. However, this will require capacity development of extension staff and local leaders. There are already ongoing programmes that develop farmer capacity via training of trainers. Such programmes could be strengthened and scaled out. Regarding the actors responsible for implementing this change, county government departments have been identified as relevant, as they could also support small farms via study visits, which can help them learn from each other and improve their practices. National level extension staff should work together with local extension staff to provide advice and support.
- (3) **Policy formulation proposal:** In most African countries, the focus of agricultural development policies and programmes has been on increasing agricultural productivity economic development, without necessarily taking local contexts and preferences of small farms into account. Small farms would require a different approach to modernisation and commercialisation of agriculture – one that is less dependent on external inputs and that emphasises sustainability. The above outlined strategy could support in particular smaller and part-time farmers with limited resources. Value addition to agricultural produce could indirectly benefit NRM by increasing farmers' incentives for and returns to sustainable farming.
- (4) **Policy implementation proposal:** Kenya has a target to cover [10% of its land with trees](#), and such policies can support carbon sequestration and improve the livelihoods of farmers by providing multiple benefits (fruit, fodder, fuel). But such targets need to be adapted to the context of the agro-ecological zone (with drylands benefiting from protection of natural trees, whereas more humid areas are more suitable for planting of fruit trees).
- (5) **Policy formulation proposal:** Many NRM and CC policies and programmes need to be updated, because they are not appropriate for the current context any more. Some previous programme such as 4K could be revived (this seems to be happening already in some areas), as they helped raise awareness about environmental issues from an early age.

Participants concluded that there are many experiences in Africa with sustainable natural resources management and climate change adaptation, but that these are not always screened for their suitability and inclusion of small farms.

Theme 5. Products, Markets & Marketing

Members of this mixed Kenyan and Malawian group formulated the following proposals:

- **Policy Implementation proposal:** (Country) governments cooperative departments should ensure they enforce the law on specific cash crop cooperatives, in particular requirements about youth and gender representation;
- **Policy Implementation/Practice proposal:** Cooperative governance structures and/or NGOs should undertake training in marketing and assure post-project monitoring, as many collapse after the end of capacity-building projects;
- **Policy implementation proposal:** Enforcements of laws on counterfeit farming inputs.

Concluding Panel

Panel Session: Panelists from Kenya (from left Mr Isaac Mbeche, Head of Technology Transfer Unity, ICIPE; Mr Wycliffe Obiero, Ugunja, Siaya County), Ghana (Dr Kweku De Yentri), Malawi (Mr Anderson Chikomola) and Kenya (Ms Jessica Molubi, KALRO) - Moderated by Ms Norah Ndege, Research Fellow, ACTS, Photo taken by ICOSY-ACTS Media Team



In closing of the SALSA African macro-regional workshop, but also Agricultural and Food Security Policy Dialogue Workshop, part of their “Sustainability Dialogues” workshop series, ACTS made a reference to moving beyond discussion towards a high-level vision and goals through prioritising what to do and focus on. Challenges remain at the level of some objectives, such as between climate change and intensification, so as an ending reflection, the ACTS representative invited several key policy makers to make some ending comments about the potential synergies between the policy objectives discussed.

Mr Isaac Mbeche, Head of Technology Transfer Unity, ICIPE, Kenya mentioned that his take on the discussed issues is that we need to focus on how we can transform small holder farmers; how they can start using modern technologies and how they can mechanise (for example the use of tractors will help to reduce labour and time). These transformations will require knowledge from

farmers on farm inputs, their produce and how they can link to the markets. Lastly, he mentioned the need for more united smallholder farmer governance, for them to be able to lobby for themselves as a group.

Dr Kweku De Yentri from Ghana mentioned that the systems should be put in place to enhance production using the value chain approach. Several actors should be involved including service providers, the clients, the consumers. He believes that such transparency and collaboration could enhance productivity because farmers will be more motivated to work and improve their production through such arrangements. He mentioned this model has worked for some communities in Ghana and should be upscaled.

Mr Wycliffe Obiero, Ugunja, Siaya County, Kenya, mentioned it is important for policies to identify the numbers of small holder farmers in each district and support them with fertilizers and seeds. In terms of gender equality, women all over the continent should be allowed to possess or inherit the land, since they are the ones who are working on those farms. Also, the needs of the youth need to be taken care of – for example, more youth-friendly extensional services should be developed.

Mr Anderson Chikomola from Malawi mentioned that since the research is driven by technology, the researchers need to work together with farmers towards tangible results in order to address farmers' problems and challenges.

Ms Jessica Molubi, KALRO, Kenya mentioned that policy stakeholders should work together in order to come up with a sustainable solution that will address small holder farmers problems.

As closure, Irina Toma announced participants about the opportunities for follow-up of the SALSA African workshop:

- Using upcoming African policy briefs for lobby at any governance level
- Inform AU/REC/ national/ regional lobbies – representative organizations, ministries, local authorities, GAL, national rural networks
- Spread our research (see our website) – Relevance: National, regional, local level
- Connect with our SALSA researchers – Community of Practice Events
- Sign up to our SALSA newsletter

AFR Workshop Annex A – Malabo Declaration Commitments

The Malabo Declaration consists of seven core commitments:

Commitment 1: Re-committing on CAADP Process

Commitment 2: Enhancing Investment Finance in Agriculture

- Uphold 10% public spending target on agriculture
- Operationalize the African Investment Bank

Commitment 3: Ending Hunger by 2025

- At least double productivity (focusing on inputs, irrigation, mechanization)
- Reduce PHL at least by half
- Nutrition: reduce percentage of underweight children to 5% and stunting to 10%

Commitment 4: Halving Poverty through Agriculture by 2025 through inclusive Agricultural Growth and Transformation

- Sustain Annual sector growth in Agricultural GDP at least 6%
- Establish and/or sustain inclusive public/private partnerships for at least five (5) priority agricultural commodity value chains with strong linkage to smallholder agriculture
- Create job opportunities for at least 30% of the youth in agricultural value chains
- Preferential entry and participation by women and youth in gainful and attractive agri-business

Commitment 5: Boosting Intra-African Trade in Agriculture Commodities

- Triple inter-Africa trade in agricultural commodities and services
- Fast track continental free trade area and transition to a continental Common External tariff scheme

Commitment 6: Enhancing Resilience to climate variability

- Ensure that by 2025 at least 30% of farm/pastoral households are resilient to shocks
- Enhance investments for resilience building initiatives, including social security for rural workers and other valuable social groups, as well as for vulnerable ecosystems
- Mainstream resilience and risk management in policies, strategies and investment plans

Commitment 7: Enhancing Mutual Accountability for Actions and Results

- Through the CAADP results framework, conduct a biennial agricultural review process conducted through a scorecard-based mutual accountability mechanism
- In a Kenyan context, the secretariat coordinates the following thematic areas:
- Natural Resources Governance and Food Security (CAADP)
- Regional Integration, Infrastructure and Trade (PICI, PIDA, SE4ALL)
- Human Capital Development (ATVET, Skills Initiative for Africa, Strengthening Capacities of African Governments (UN Development Account), ISD4, NEPAD E- schools, Country Results Framework).
- Industrialisation, Science, Technology and Innovation (AESAI)

AFR Workshop Annex B - List of participants and affiliations

No.	Name	Institution	Email	Phone No.	Signature
1.	PURITY KIMATO	KI PPARA	pkimato@kipara.or.ke	0725019133	
2.	REBECCA ARUNGA	NEPAD KENTA	rebecca.arunga@nepadkenya.org	0722605677	
3.	Chic Shimba	Kenya Markets Trust	cshimba@kenyamarkeats.org	0720879039	
4.	Agatha Letikirich	S.S.S	agathaletikirich55@gmail	0712598236	
5.	Grace Tione	LUANAR	gtione@yahoo.com	0992236633	
6.	Francescah Mungji	KOFAR K. LTD	kofaltd@gmail.com	0727690370	
7.	Nancy Onudi	Media	nancy.onudi2017@gmail	0710153858	
8.	Anderson Chikomda	Ministry of Agriculture-ITW	andchikomda@yahoo.com	0581729862	
9.	Tessie NOLUBI	KALRO	tossicandubi@gmail.com	0721368417	
10.	WICLIFFE OBIERO	KNIP	obiend2040@gmail.com	0719111803	
11.	ISAAC MBECHE	ICIPE	imbeche@icipe.org	0799615194	
12.	Imelda Achiony	Parliamentary Caucus on Sustainable Development Goals & Business	imeldaa4@gmail.com	0710750436	
13.	JABESH OCHENDO	AGRO-CHEMICALS ASSOCIATION OF KENYA	okumujabes@gmail.com	0728 042590	

No.	Name	Institution	Email	Phone No.	Signature
14	MICHAEL SARHA	NATIONAL MUSEUMS OF KENYA	sirhex.sarha225@gmail.com	+254710938959	
15	Tom Randa	University of Nairobi	tomrandau@gmail.com	075078777	
16	Salome Okoth	ACTS	S.okoth@acts-net.org	071062986	
17	Vickia Chigo	ACTS	V.chigo@acts-net.org	072011921	
18	Duncan Maina	ACTS	d.maina@acts-net.org	072243432	
19	ROGERS MATERO	SHUNEROSE KENYA LTD	roggersmayem@gmail.com	0724510102	
20	NATHANS BROWNE, JP	AU-RECS WORKING GROUP / IPR	nbrowne@iprec.org	0722705418	
21	MARTIN MARAMI	UON	martin.marama@uon.ac.ke	0720145100	
22	EUSTACE KIRAU	KOAN	ekirau@koan.co.ke	0709027728	
23	JESCA MAKENA	MUALF-CCU	makena.jesco@gmail.com	0716621430	
24	Henry Kimani	MEDIA	henrykimani@gmail.com	0720720398	
25	DENIS MUTUGI	MEDIA	mutugidennis@gmail.com	07205007831	
26	MARIE SELWIN	"	marie.selwin@gmail.com	0700661772	
27	Paul Baswati	"	paulbaswati@gmail.com	0723-724543	
28	GEOFFREY OMONDI JUMA	MOI UNIVERSITY	geoffreyomondi2012@yahoo.com	0720788581	
29	DAVID BUSURU	KEPFA	abusumehps@uon.ac.ke	0723164041	
30	KEV PAUL MWSYUNBA	M OF ARI	kev.paul86@gmail.com	072074669	
31	JESSICA MWAISI	KEPFA	stere.mwaishi@gmail.com	071467881	
32	Charles Tunui	ACTS	ctunui@acts-net.org	0723932844	
33	Lizabell Odhiambo	County Government of Siaya	l.odhiambo39@yahoo.com	0718190500	

No.	Name	Institution	Email	Phone No.	Signature
14	MICHAEL SARHA	NATIONAL MUSEUMS OF KENYA	sirhex.sarha225@gmail.com	+254710938959	
15	Tom Randa	University of Nairobi	tomrandau@gmail.com	0715078779	
16	Salome Okoth	ACTS	S.okoth@acts-net.org	071112966	
17	Victoria Cheungo	ACTS	V.cheungo@acts-net.org	072211921	
18	Duncan Maina	ACTS	d.maina@acts-net.org	072243432	
19	ROGERS MAYEMO	SHONEROSE KENTA LTD	roggersmayemo@gmail.com	0724510102	
20	NATHANS BROWNE JP	IPREC AU RECS WORKING GROUP	nbrowne@iprec.org	0722705418	
21	MARTIN MAAMU	UON	martin.maamu@uon.ac.ke	0720145100	
22	EUSTACE KIACHU	KOAN	e.kiachu@koan.co.ke	0709027728	
23	JESCA MAKEKA	MEDIA - CCU	makeka.jesca@gmail.com	0716621420	
24	Henry Guma	MEDIA	henryguma@gmail.com	0720740348	
25	DENIS MUTUGI	MEDIA	mutugidennis7@gmail.com	0725007831	
26	MINDETE SELWIN	"	mindetese@uon.ac.ke	0700661772	
27	Paul Basimati	"	basimati.paul@gmail.com	0723-724543	
28	GEOFFREY OMONDI JUMA	MOI UNIVERSITY	geoffreyomondi2012@yahoo.com	0720788581	
29	DAVID BUSURU	KEPPA	busurudavid@gmail.com	0723164041	
30	KEY PAUL MWSUNBA	MOFARM	key.paul86@gmail.com	0720744669	
31	STEFAN MWADE	KEPPA	stefan.mwade@gmail.com	0714467885	
32	Charles Tunui	ACTS	C.tunui@acts-net.org	0723932844	
33	Elizabeth Odhiambo	County Government of Siaya	e.odhiambo@siaya.go.ke	0718190500	

AFR Workshop Annex C – Detailed needs and voting scores

Note: needs in red were added during the workshop

Theme	Small farm needs		General	Type 1 (part-time self-provisioners)	Type 2 (conventional strugglers)	Total
People & Communities	1	Reversing youth migration trends to urban/tourist/EU centres	0	9	2	11
	2	Increase appeal of agriculture for youth through technology and land access	12	13	4	29
	3	Rural job creation through business /industry	11	6	4	21
		<i>Sub-total</i>	23	28	10	61
Better Infrastructure & Connectivity	4	Proper needs assessment of rural areas by country governments	10	5	4	19
	5	Faster and more stable internet network	2	8	2	12
	6	Lower price to rural internet infrastructure	0	2	1	3
	7	Better rural roads and connectivity to main market cities/islands	9	4	5	18
	8	Improve electricity connectivity and affordability				
		<i>Sub-total</i>	21	19	12	52
Access to Land	9	Encourage consolidation of land	2	4	10	16
	10	Improve cadastre to secure land rights	1	3	3	7
	11	Develop land price control system	4	1	4	9
		Address the commercialisation of agricultural land (due to urban expansion etc.)	4	1	2	7
		<i>Sub-total</i>	11	9	19	39
Access to Funding and	12	Better credit schemes for small farming and agriculture	10	7	8	25
	13	Stimulating uptake of insurance for crop failures	2	4	9	15

Theme	Small farm needs		General	Type 1 (part-time self-provisioners)	Type 2 (conventional strugglers)	Total
Affordable Credit	14	Empower the Agricultural Development Bank to get back to Agricultural financing	7	5	3	15
		Stronger farmer organisations / cooperative / farmer-based organisations	6	2	4	12
		<i>Sub-total</i>	25	18	24	67
Agricultural Knowledge & Innovation Systems (AKIS)	15	Better resource allocation for extension officers	7	2	3	12
	16	Permanent access to technical assistance for SF	3	1	3	7
	17	Extension services for innovation, improved output, quality standards, int. markets	3	3	1	7
	18	Better trained extension officers (more links with research centres)	4	0	1	5
	19	Awareness and conditions for association/cooperatives & subsidies	0	2	4	6
	20	Better monitoring mechanisms of SF	0	4	2	6
		Enhance public private partnerships	2	2	3	7
		<i>Sub-total</i>	19	14	17	50
Availability & Quality of Farm Labour	21	Life-long practical learning for farmers.	8	4	9	21
	22	Training on application of phytopharmaceutical products, accounting, input mgt	4	4	4	12
	23	Investment incentives to encourage youth to agriculture	6	12	5	23
		<i>Sub-total</i>	18	20	18	56
Natural Resources & Climate	24	Educate country governments about climate change risks and opportunities	2	3	6	11
	25	Extension services for educate SF about climate change	6	6	9	21
	26	Implement flood prevention measures (incl. farm relocation)	0	1	1	2

Theme	Small farm needs		General	Type 1 (part-time self-provisioners)	Type 2 (conventional strugglers)	Total
	27	Forbidding small farms to farm along waterways	0	1	1	2
	28	Afforestation to improve rainfall	2	2	1	5
	29	Developing (micro-)irrigation infrastructures	6	4	5	15
		Reduction in tree felling for fuelwood	3	2	3	8
		<i>Sub-total</i>	19	19	26	64
Products, Markets & Marketing	30	Certified production for small farms	2	1	3	6
	31	Obtaining regular production quantities	2	1	0	3
	32	Promoting local/national production	3	2	0	5
	33	SF quality products integration in supermarket chains	1	0	2	3
	34	Increase uptake of cooperative forms	0	1	5	6
		Dissemination of market information	2	0	0	2
		price control system	4	2	1	7
		Platform for value chain actors (multi-stakeholder)	1	5	1	7
		Processing and storage for value addition to small farm produce	4	5	5	14
		<i>Sub-total</i>	19	17	17	53