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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Farmers’ Organisations</th>
<th>Agri-Agency</th>
<th>Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>FNSEA, APCA, Jeunes Agriculteurs, CNMCCA</td>
<td>Afdi</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>LTO, SSVO, NCR and NAJK</td>
<td>Agriterra</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Groupe Céréaliers de France (AGPB, AGPM, ARVALIS, UNIGRAINS)</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Boerenbond, Landelijke Gilden, KVLV and KLJ</td>
<td>Trias</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>UPA Union Professionnelle Agricole (Québec)</td>
<td>UPA DI</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>LRF Federation of Swedish Farmers</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>MTK Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>CIA Confederazione Italiana Agricoltori</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>UPA Union de Pequeños Agricultores y Ganaderos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>FWA Fédération Wallonne d’Agriculture</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>CAP Confederacao dos Agricultores de Portugal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>AFA Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development</td>
<td>AsiaDHRRA</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Organisations agricoles du Sénégal membres d’Asprodeb</td>
<td>Asprodeb</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECID</td>
<td>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA</td>
<td>Asian Farmers’ Association for Sustainable Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Agence Francaise de Développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afdi</td>
<td>Agriculteurs Français et Développement International (agri-agency, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGPB</td>
<td>Association Générale des Producteurs de Blé et céréales (National union of cereal producers, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGPM</td>
<td>Association Générale de Producteurs de Maïs (National union of maize producers, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.agro-info.net">www.agro-info.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCA</td>
<td>Assemblée Permanente des Chambres d’Agriculture (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARVALIS</td>
<td>Institut du Végétal (National crop research institute, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsiaDHRRA</td>
<td>Network of 11 agencies (10 countries) for Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (agri-agency for AFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asprodeb</td>
<td>Association Sénégalaise pour la Promotion de Développement à la Base (agri-agency, Senegal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Confédération des Agriculteurs de Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Confederazione Italiana Agricoltori (Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNMCCA</td>
<td>Confédération Nationale de la Mutualité, de la Coopération et du Crédit Agricole (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPROFAM</td>
<td>Coordinadora de Productores Familiares de Mercosur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (agri-agency, Belgium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Development Cooperation Committee of IFAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGD</td>
<td>Directeur General for Development Cooperation (Belgium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGIS</td>
<td>Directeur General for International Cooperation (The Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAFF</td>
<td>East African Farmers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERT</td>
<td>Formation pour l’Epanouissement et le Renouveau de la Terre (agri-agency, France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNSEA</td>
<td>Fédération Nationale des Syndicats d’Exploitants Agricoles (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPFD</td>
<td>Fédération des Paysans du Fouta Djallon (Guinea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUPRO</td>
<td>Fédérations des Unions de Producteurs du Bénin (Benin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWA</td>
<td>Fédération Wallonne d’Agriculture (Belgium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAP</td>
<td>International Federation of Agricultural Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Jeunes Agriculteurs (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLI</td>
<td>Katholieke Landelijke Jeugd (Catholic rural youth of Flanders, Belgium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVLV</td>
<td>Rural women’s movement of Flanders (Belgium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF</td>
<td>Lantbrukarnas Riksförbund (National union of agricultural producers, Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTO</td>
<td>Land- en Tuinbouworganisatie (Federation of agriculture &amp; horticulture, the Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAEC</td>
<td>Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTK</td>
<td>Maa-ja Metsätalousuotajien Keskiyliitto (Union of agricultural producers &amp; forest owners, Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAJK</td>
<td>Nederlandse Agrarisch Jongeren Kontakt (agricultural youth organisation, the Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>National Agricultural and Horticultural Cooperative Council (The Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFAF</td>
<td>National Farmers Federation (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAFO</td>
<td>Pan African Farmers’ Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPAC</td>
<td>Plateforme sous-Régionale des Organisations Paysannes d’Afrique Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPPA</td>
<td>Reseau des Organisations Paysannes et des Producteurs Agricoles de l’Afrique de l’Ouest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACAU</td>
<td>Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Swedish Cooperative Centre (agri-agency of LRF, Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSVO</td>
<td>Centre for Rural Women’s Organisations (The Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCP</td>
<td>Union Communale des Producteurs (Benin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMAGRIO</td>
<td>Union Maghrébine des Agriculteurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICAYES</td>
<td>União Nacional das Cooperativas de Agricultura Familiar e Economia Solidária (Brasil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIGRAINS</td>
<td>Société financière spécialiste de l’agroalimentaire (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>Unión de Pequeños Agricultores y Ganaderos (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>Union des Producteurs Agricoles (Quebec, Canada)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA DI</td>
<td>Union des Producteurs Agricoles Développement international (agri-agency, Quebec, Canada)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

FARMERS FIGHTING POVERTY IN 2012

One of the best ways of increasing agricultural output, and thus raising the living standards of farmers and their families, is to improve farming practices by strengthening organisations of farmers. The point is to make that connection. Very often, services from farmers' organisations are the missing link.

Farmers across the world are keen to share expertise with and provide support to smallholders in developing countries. They are well placed to support each other because they are fully aware of the issues affecting growers throughout the world. Specifics vary, but all farmers face changing weather patterns and fluctuating markets, and they are all subject to changes in government policy and trade agreements. With this shared experience comes a strong self-help ethos.

Farmers Fighting Poverty was developed to formalise farmer-to-farmer mechanisms of support. It strengthens farmers' organisations so they can provide better and more wide-ranging services to their members. And experience shows that the economic development brought about through the activities of dynamic farmers' organisations has wider benefits too, including more democracy and a better deal for women.

Farmers Fighting Poverty operates as a fund, managed by AgriCord. Support is given to farmers' organisations rather than individual farmers. This is done with the overarching aim of improving democracy and equality at the same time as reducing poverty and increasing food security. Farmers' organisations become better governed and are able to give members the services they call for: this leads to better-run farm businesses and general improvement in living standards. As farmers' organisations improve their services, membership grows and their voice carries weight in the market place and at the negotiating table. By joining organisations, individual farmers can operate more efficiently and see clear benefits in their own households.

This programme document summarizes the approaches for strengthening farmers' organisations. The strategies, as presented in chapter 2, have been reviewed in our Advisory Committee by farmers' organisations from developing countries in different regions of the world. I sincerely thank all the leaders and staff of these organisations, including the constituent farmers' organisations of the agri-agencies, for their increasing commitment, and our backdonors (governments, development agencies, members of farmers' organisations and other private sources of funding) for their continued support.

PIET VANTHEMSCHE
PRESIDENT

IGNACE COUSSEMENT
MANAGING DIRECTOR
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DEVELOPMENT GOAL

Farmers’ organisations can foster the development of sound institutions, which are able to tackle the systemic causes of poverty. They represent the legitimate voice of farmers in shaping pro-poor rural policies, and articulate farmers’ interests to public and corporate institutions, so that their strategies, products and services are tailored to meet these demands. Given a supportive policy framework, farmers are well able, as private-sector actors, to drive a balanced social and economic development.

Farmers Fighting Poverty provides funding and advisory services to farmers’ organisations in developing countries. Its general objective is poverty reduction through strengthening of farmers’ organisations. Farmers Fighting Poverty reflects the conviction that stronger farmers’ organisations contribute to

1. more democracy (better institutions)
2. more economic growth (better services to farmers)
3. more equal income distribution (increased involvement of smallholder farmers).

FARMER-TO-FARMER COOPERATION

A the start in 2007, 111 farmers’ organisations in developing countries were involved. By 2010, agri-agencies supported 220 farmers’ organisations, for 570 projects or programmes, and in more than 60 developing countries. 45% are farmers’ organisations which deliver advocacy services, 39% economic services, and 3% both. The majority (65%) operates at sub-national or national level. Approx. 50% are African farmers’ organisations, for 60% of total expenditure.

Farmers Fighting Poverty is managed by AgriCord, a network of 9 agri-agencies, each mandated by the farmers’ and rural people’s organisations in their own countries. Farmers Fighting Poverty is currently backed up by farmers’ organisations in the EU (8 countries), in Canada, in Asia (10 countries) and in Africa (1 country).

CAPACITIES AND SERVICES

Farmers Fighting Poverty covers demands from farmers’ organisations in four areas:

- support to capacity building
  1. Organisational strengthening and inclusiveness
  2. Institutional development
- support to services
  3. Policy elaboration and advocacy
  4. Farmer-led economic development

SPECIFIC COMPETENCES OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

From the practice of working with farmers’ organisations in recent years, and from their demands for support, AgriCord has listed 17 competences, which farmers’ organisations consider as essential to be effective. These competences are the deliverables of Farmers Fighting Poverty.

A deliverable is defined as a short-term immediate outcome of a project. A deliverable makes clear what capacity or what operation the farmers’ organisation will realise through the project/contract. One deliverable, for example, states that the farmers’ organisation operates appropriate budgeting and accounting systems to provide correct, timely and transparent financial information. This can be confirmed and verified by examining financial information available in the organisation, and is expected to be sustained after the project is over.

LESSONS LEARNED

Since 2007, Farmers Fighting Poverty has been updated once, in 2010. This 2nd update takes into account the following expectations from farmers’ organisations, who were questioned on development aid practices in general, and on the work of agri-agencies in particular. Farmers’ organisations expect

- more support for operations, not only for capacity building.
- more support for economic activities and for vertical market integration initiatives.
- support for their own plans. No blueprints imposed.
- agreements on partnership with a long-term perspective.
**APPROACH**

Taking into account these lessons learned, as well as the conclusions of the 2009/2010 performance audit, the main characteristics of Farmers Fighting Poverty’s approach are:

- focused: support is provided to membership based farmers’ organisations only
- demand driven: support to projects of the farmers’ organisations themselves
- two-pronged: funding (70%) is combined with advisory services (30%)
- farmer-to-farmer: peer-to-peer work of farmers and farmers’ organisations
- flexible: project cycle can be adjusted to take into account crises and changing circumstances.
- comprehensive: from internal organisational capacity to economic operations.

**PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT**

Farmers’ organisations introduce their proposals via one of the agri-agencies, members of AgriCord. The Project Committee of AgriCord examines eligibility of proposals and applicant organisations within Farmers Fighting Poverty, and proposes funding to the Board. For project implementation, agri-agencies contract producer organisations directly. This project cycle is operational since 2003, and managed transparently (internet-based: www.agro-info.net) at identification, definition/formulation and implementation stages.

**RESULTS MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Progress, in terms of capacity of organisations and effectiveness of their operations, is monitored on the basis of deliverables, jointly defined by farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies. Through story harvesting, Farmers Fighting Poverty reports on the effects of its activities on institution building and farmers’ livelihood security. Since 2009, a yearly report on “Evidence of impact” is published.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FARMERS FIGHTING POVERTY**

An Advisory Committee formulates recommendations, to the General Assembly of AgriCord, on the priorities and strategies of Farmers Fighting Poverty. Members of the Advisory Committee are seven representatives of farmers’ organisations from developing countries, with two delegates from the Board of AgriCord.

**BUDGET AND FUNDING**

Farmers Fighting Poverty has been initiated with substantial financial support from the Dutch Government. Other governments have been or are involved, from several OECD countries (Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Sweden). Funding is also provided by the European Commission, and by IFAD. Agri-agencies and associated farmers’ organisations, each in their own country, raise funds and mobilise resources for Farmers Fighting Poverty, from their own membership, from other private sources. Farmers Fighting Poverty operates as a multi-donor trust fund, steered by farmers’ organisations and managed by AgriCord. AgriCord takes into account the geographical and thematic priorities, specified by each backdonor for its contribution. AgriCord is legally registered as a non-profit organisation since 2003, and has ODA-status with the OECD since 2008.

**AID EFFECTIVENESS**

As a network, AgriCord hopes to contribute to increased aid effectiveness, through (a) its direct support to the plans of farmers’ organizations, (b) the long term commitments, (c) its transparent and predictable aid flows, (d) the pooling of experience from farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies from different countries, (e) the streamlining of aid flows from different backdonors, and the increased capacities of farmers’ organizations to deal with aid flows from different origins.

---

1 Agro-Info.Net is the online database that covers all relevant aspects of the Farmers Fighting Poverty programme. Information on each project is available with a description, targets, financing, approval process and progress. This information can be accessed by all stakeholders (www.agro-info.net) and guarantees transparency of the Farmers Fighting Poverty process.
1 FARMER-TO-FARMER COOPERATION IS EFFECTIVE

1.1 DEMOCRACY, ECONOMIC GROWTH, INCOME DISTRIBUTION

IMPROVE FARM PRODUCTIVITY

Farmers Fighting Poverty addresses the productivity of smallholder family farming, and the entrepreneurial ambitions of family farmers. Improving their productivity is an effective way of reducing poverty and hunger.

Smallholder entrepreneurs can improve their productivity in a number of ways - by acquiring better cultivation techniques and improved seed varieties, reducing post-harvest losses, improving access to markets, creating employment etc. – all of which make a real difference to the lives of the poorest. But individual farmers may lack the knowledge or capital to change the way they operate. Through collective action, farmers themselves can take steps out of penury.

INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES

Therefore, farmers worldwide get increasingly organized. The World Bank Report 2008 on agriculture highlighted this “mushrooming” of farmers’ organisations, referring to a figure from the 2007 Farmers Fighting Poverty programme document: a progress of 19% in association in rural areas. By investing in farmers’ organisations in developing countries, more services can reach individual farmers, more plans and more development ideas can be voiced by their organisations.

About farmers’ organisations

Throughout this document, the term farmers’ organisation is used as shorthand for a broad range of groups and organizational modalities. Many of these structures are integrated at higher levels, in provincial, national, supra-national and even international bodies. It covers the many types of association – including cooperatives, unions and rural women’s organisations – that are formed by producers, peasant farmers, smallholders and rural dwellers.

The term also encompasses more general associations concerned with commodities, advocacy and economic services and covers too those in emergent stages.

The common thread is that their members are all involved in the land, whether in agriculture (crops and animals), in horticulture, in forestry, in fishing... and in all types of service industries related to the primary production.

Farmers Fighting Poverty addresses national, regional and local organisations. National unions often have a layered structure that brings together farmers of different crops and regions. With an ever stronger focus on economic ventures, we address more and more the farmer-led enterprises and cooperatives.

Many farmers’ organisations emerged from grassroots and were growing by membership drive, expanding via horizontal (geographical) and vertical (chain) linkages. Yet, outsiders almost always have a relation, when not a stake, and influence the process. One witnesses an increasing number of external parties that are engaged in the making and strengthening of farmers’ organizations. Many cooperatives were formed by the state. Political parties organized advocacy type of organizations in order to link rural and agrarian clientele. Religious institutions have been active in promoting rural and farmer organizations. Development agencies and NGOs appeared on the scene. Recently, private companies showed increased interest in farmer organizations for bulk supplies and marketing purposes.

As a reaction, the donor community got engaged in value chain approaches to link companies with farmers to processors, traders, financiers... In all this, it is paramount that the farmers’ organisation keeps responding to its mission and member interests, and that it provides appropriate services to its members, while taking the full benefit from outside contributions and new opportunities.

MEMBERSHIP DRIVE WITH AN ENTREPRENEURIAL FOCUS

Farmers’ organisations do not necessarily organise the poor only. Farmers Fighting Poverty supports organisations representing poor farmers, smallholders, emerging farmers and sometimes even big farmers. Through a membership drive, these organizations will increasingly include the so far unorganized farmers.

Farmers Fighting Poverty supports organisations dealing with poverty alleviation, poor regions and poor social segments, and with a clear focus on the entrepreneurs amongst them. Not all of the 1.2 billion farmers
are to remain farmers. Economic development must offer new opportunities to those who do not want to be farmers, and farmers’ organisations are keen to build these opportunities, through the development of businesses upstream and downstream, and stimulate off-farm economic activities.

A MORE EQUAL INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Farmers’ organisations often have a layered structure, with local organisations linked to a regional and/or national federation. This means that services reliably include the grassroots, and that information flows in both directions (bottom-up and top-down).

As partners of the public and corporate sectors in the development effort, farmers’ organisations often reduce the risks of farming. This is of particular importance for the poorer farmers.

Business initiatives established by farmers, in association or by virtue of their higher level organizations, are more decentralised than the initiatives by private investors or by Governments. They create industries scattered over the rural areas, with more employment per invested unit.

1.2 ORGANISED FARMERS TAKE THE INITIATIVE

THE FARMERS CONSTITUENCIES OF THE AGRI-AGENCIES

Recognising the shared nature of farming challenges across the world, and the fact that millions of smallholders in the developing world live in poverty, a number of farmers’ organisations in OECD countries have entered the arena of international cooperation. For this matter they created, so-called agri-agencies (non-governmental organisations for development cooperation linked to farmers’ organisations in their home countries), or joined AgriCord as associate members. In 2011, two new members joined the alliance:
- from the Asian region, AsiaDHRRA, the Manilla based agri-agency of AFA, Asian Farmers’ Association.
  AsiaDHRRA is a network of 11 agri-agencies and farmers’ organisations in 10 Asian countries.
- from Senegal, ASPRODEB, the Dakar based agri-agency of a large group of Senegalese farmers’ organisations.

AgriCord members are the following seven agri-agencies, each with its own network farmers’ organisations in many developing countries, and each mandated by their respective national farmers’ organisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>farmers’ organisation</th>
<th>agris-agency</th>
<th>member since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>FNSEA, APCA, Jeunes Agriculteurs, CNMCCA</td>
<td>Afdi</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>LTO, SSVO, NCR and NAK</td>
<td>Agriterra</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Groupe Céréaliers de France (AGPB, AGPM, ARVALIS, UNIGRAINS)</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Boerenbond, Landelijke Gilden, KVVL and KLJ</td>
<td>Trias</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>UPA Union Professionnelle Agricole (Québec)</td>
<td>UPA DI</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>LRF Federation of Swedish Farmers</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>FWA Fédération Wallonnie d’Agriculture</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>AFA Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development</td>
<td>AsiaDHRRA</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Organisations agricoles du Sénégal membres d’Asprodeb</td>
<td>Asprodeb</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four national farmers’ organisations are associated members of AgriCord. Some of them are in the process of establishing an agri-agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>farmers’ organisation</th>
<th>agris-agency</th>
<th>member since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>MTK Central Union of Agricultural Producers and Forest Owners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>CIA Confederazione Italiana Agricoltori</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>UPA Union de Pequeños Agricultores y Ganaderos (and ACODEA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>CAP Confederação dos Agricultores de Portugal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FARMERS FIGHTING POVERTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Since 2000, feedback from farmers’ organisations in developing countries, on cooperation issues, has been mobilised through the DCC (Development Cooperation Committee) of IFAP (International Federation of Agricultural Producers). With the start of Farmers Fighting Poverty in 2007, AgriCord also supported the “IFAP Recommendations for Eliminating Rural Poverty and Achieving Food Security”. Before IFAP’s end of operations in 2010, IFAP and AgriCord prepared a new “advisory committee” for Farmers Fighting Poverty.
This committee started in October 2011², and has formulated recommendations to the General Assembly of AgriCord about the priorities, the approaches and strategies of Farmers Fighting Poverty. Members of the committee are five representatives of regional farmers’ organisations from developing countries (West, East and Southern Africa, Asia and South America), and two representatives of the Board of AgriCord.

1.3 Enhancing sustainable change

Farmers Fighting Poverty combines capacity building (work areas 1 and 2) with concrete service delivery (work areas 3 and 4). This combination, or double focus, enhances the sustainability of the organisations. In a number of cases, the economic activity has contributed to the viability of the organisation.

Farmer-to-farmer cooperation mobilises long term commitments by farmers’ organisations in different parts of the world. It looks beyond the immediate projects and contracts, into effective and lasting improvements for farmers. Peer-to-peer exchanges between professionals, backed by their organisations, are stimulating and often lead to realistic solutions, reliable services, and sustainable results in general. By diversifying their income and increasing the proportion of autonomously generated revenues, farmers’ organisations can reduce their reliance on donor support and become more sustainable.

Agricultural or trade policies will lead to more sustainable changes when policy makers listen to the legitimate voice of farmers. Through Farmers Fighting Poverty, policy-makers are structurally linked with and alert to the voices of the poor. This leads to pro-poor policies and strategies driven by farmers and their organisations - speaking for themselves - rather than by Government or by NGO’s. Improving governance and focusing on inclusion (specific support to vulnerable groups) brings their viewpoints to the development process.

Farmers Fighting Poverty also supports and monitors a number of cross-cutting concerns, which all have their influence on the sustainability of the activities: gender, financial management, environmental concerns.

1.4 Farmers Fighting Poverty shows clear results

In terms of outreach (number of people actually participating in project activities) Farmers Fighting Poverty has involved more than 4.5 million participants in 2007-2010. A survey of 7% of all participants indicates convincing evidence of income growth. Moreover, 39% of the participants are female, i.e. almost 1.8 mln women. In 2007-2010, 60% of Farmers Fighting Poverty support went to organisations in Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmers Fighting Poverty 2007-2010: number of projects and expenditure per continent Source: Agro-Info.Net</th>
<th>projects</th>
<th>expenditure (€)</th>
<th>relative amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>65.379.016</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.211.405</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13.779.772</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe, global, others</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18.505.242</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>108.815.434</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 570 projects (2009) have been implemented by 220 farmers’ organisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of farmers’ organisations supported, per type of service provided Source: Agro-Info.Net</th>
<th>advocacy services</th>
<th>economic services</th>
<th>mixed services</th>
<th>others</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² First meeting of the Advisory Committee took place in Madrid, 13 October 2011, followed by the General Assembly of AgriCord on 14 October 2011.
If we look at 52 farmers’ organisations that were involved in three consecutive profiling exercises (see also 3.6), 29 of them became stronger for the six indicators represented in the typical spider map: columns 1 to 6 in the following table. 23 organisations remained stable. The context of fast increasing membership could explain their relative stagnation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in % over 2 years</th>
<th>1 representation</th>
<th>2 participation</th>
<th>3 accountability</th>
<th>4 strategic potential</th>
<th>5 professional capacity</th>
<th>6 gender</th>
<th>income diversity</th>
<th>degree of organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa (20 FOs)</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-13.9</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>+86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America (15 FOs)</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>+4.3</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>+49.7</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (15 FOs)</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>+5.3</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>+17.3</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>+7.6</td>
<td>+9.9</td>
<td>+17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe (2 FOs)</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
<td>+13.0</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>+9.7</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
<td>+87.6</td>
<td>+47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All regions (52 FOs)</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>+23.3</td>
<td>+37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall changes for the six leading indicators can reflect major changes in one or in a limited number of farmers’ organisations. Representation, accountability, strategic potential and gender increase. Participation and professional capacity seem to decrease. In any case, changes are lagging behind expectations. For two factual indicators (income diversity and representativity) the picture is clearly positive.

Other figures are equally encouraging: between 2007 and 2009, participating farmers’ organisations increased their membership by 12.5%.

AgriCord noticed a genuine involvement of women in all the activities of the farmers’ organisations. Until 2006, their share stagnated around 11%, nowadays (2010) 38% of all participants are women.

Being members of stronger farmers’ groups has already visibly improved women’s participation in local politics. Improvements in organised farmers’ policy positions (generated in a more participatory way, and publicised more professionally) have, albeit not systematically, resulted in pressure for better rural policies at local or national level, or in more appropriate research agendas. They have also encouraged local government to be better accountable to the public.

The results indicate a.o. that national organisations, as they reach out to their members and to the local level, can be successful. By building economic ventures from scratch, in Mali, or through micro-projects in Kenya, the local level becomes more connected to the higher layers of the organisation.

1.5 EVIDENCE OF IMPACT

In the 2007-2011 period, a total of 170 evaluations about projects and programmes, in which agri-agencies were involved, have been produced: 86 in Africa, 17 in Asia, 44 in Latin America, 8 in Eastern Europe, and 15 at overall level. From such reports, AgriCord collect stories of farmers, who witnessed the impact of the work of their organisations with the support from agri-agencies. Through such stories, a picture of the impact of Farmers Fighting Poverty appears.

The 2009 report on “Evidence of Impact” has analysed a random selection of stories, and uncovered five emerging types of impact:
- income effects from increased agricultural productivity (access to inputs)
- income effects from improved marketing
- social empowerment through the organisation of farmers
- social empowerment through farmer-to-farmer exchange and exposure
- improved professional attitude by farm management training.

---

3 For definitions, see “Farmers on the move, Annual Report 2009”, p. 10.
The 2010 report on “Evidence of Impact” illustrates that farmers’ organisations can bring technical innovations to farmers in different ways. Stories reflect impact through innovations in marketing, through savings and credit cooperative societies (SACCOs), through organic production and certification, through agroforestry, and through improved cropping techniques.

The 2011 report on “Evidence of Impact” covers more than 70 cases in over 30 countries, showing that support is not one-size-fits-all, but is tailored to the specific needs of each farmers’ organisation. Cases show how farmers’ organisations help smallholders to become entrepreneurs. Examples include crops from cashew nuts to honey, and cowpeas to onions. Women farmers refer to more balanced diets, as a result of growing different vegetables, and conservation techniques so that produce can be stored over traditional lean periods. Smallholders are getting better yields by switching to crops better suited to a fickle climate. Farmers’ organisations set up micro-finance and savings schemes, and innovate (agro-tourism, fair trade). The mechanics of introducing change rely on training, advice and mentoring through farmer-to-farmer approaches.

The 2012 “Evidence of Impact” report, with cases from more than 30 countries, suggests that farmers’ organizations have been instrumental in improving national food security. Farmers’ agro-enterprises use participatory approaches with improved group dynamism. Farmers’ organizations are becoming more accountable to their members, and use computers for faster payments to members. In Zambia, the national cotton farmers’ organization has strengthened the position of smallholders in contracts with the major cotton companies. Farmers’ organisations make it easier for farmers to step up to entrepreneurship. Farmers take on the role of trainers or innovators, price information is broadcast via radio to remote areas, and shared facilities such as warehousing reduce post-harvest losses. Improved and certified cereal seed increases yields in Burkina Faso. In Tanzania, nomadic pastoralists are improving their livestock and developing markets for meat. A dairy cooperative in Madagascar is operating to earn from 3 years of Farmers Fighting Poverty, with cases from more than 30 countries.

1.6 The Way Forward

In 2010-2011, a critical analysis has been made of how Farmers Fighting Poverty can work better. A thorough understanding of the effectiveness of support to farmers’ organisations is vital to guide future activities.

Lessons learned

Developing country farmers’ organisations have been questioned on development aid practices in general, and on the work of agri-agencies in particular. The resulting feedback and lessons learnt are taken into account. The farmers’ organisations expect

- more support for their operations, not only for their capacity building. An increasing number of farmers’ organisations have the capacities to act and to scale up services to farmers.
- more support for their economic activities and for vertical market integration initiatives. Farmers’ organisations regret that donors seem to be risk averse and avoid support for producer organisations in their role as private sector actors.
- support for their own plans. Farmers’ organisations appreciate that Farmers Fighting Poverty does not impose any blueprint for what they should do.
- support mechanisms in a long-term perspective, beyond the one project or one programme approach.

Future approach

An inventory of lessons learned from 3 years of Farmers Fighting Poverty, involving external consultants and prepared by field missions, was discussed 12 March 2010 in an open mid-term performance review meeting. Representatives of donor governments and IFAD participated. Subsequently, the conclusions were presented

---

to different representative platforms of farmers’ organisations: the IFAP DCC, and the subregional platforms SACAU, AFA, ROPPA and EAFF.

Taking into account these lessons learned, as well as the conclusions of the performance audit\(^6\), the main characteristics of Farmers Fighting Poverty’s approach are:

1. focused: support is provided to membership based farmers’ organisations only
2. demand driven: support to projects of the farmers’ organisations themselves
3. two-pronged: funding (70%) is combined with advisory services (30%)
4. farmer-to-farmer: peer-to-peer work of farmers and farmers’ organisations, including coaching and mentorship
5. flexible: timing, procedures, budgeting and reporting can be adjusted and take into account crises and changing circumstances.
6. comprehensive: support addresses specific deliverables, within the broad range of work areas of farmers’ organisations, from internal organisational capacity to economic operations.

Assumptions and risks

Risks are related to a number of internal and external factors, influencing the life of farmers’ organisations:
- the hiring of competent and trained staff, and high turnover of staff
- the working relations between elected farmers (leaders) and executive staff
- the overloaded agenda of the leaders of farmers’ organisations and their capacity to follow up an increasing number of important and “key” policy issues
- the need to defend farmers’ interest at many different levels: ministries, major development programmes, private sector initiatives, and a need for priority setting
- the difficulties for producer organisations to increase and diversify sources of income.

A second assumption is that back-donors will remain interested in funding Farmers Fighting Poverty, which till now also has been the case. Yet, we still observe a major gap between available funding and the needs of farmers’ organisations. Funding was real and increasing in 2007, 2008 and 2009, but very low in 2010, despite important international pledges of support to agriculture and to farmers’ organisations. Since then, the support to Farmers Fighting Poverty is again and further increasing.

Risks are also related to the commitment of supporting farmers’ organisations, their willingness to remain involved in longer term partnerships with their colleagues in (other) developing countries, and to respond to their concerns and priorities. Indications are positive. The agri-agencies mobilise an increasing number of OECD producer organisations, and 2 agri-agencies from developing countries joined as members in 2011.

\(^6\) Farmers Fighting Poverty Mid Term Performance Audit, Brussels, 12 March 2010.
2 STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT THE CAPACITIES AND SERVICES OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

Farmers’ organisations are highly effective agents of poverty reduction, via advocacy and economic services, but only if they are well organised internally, representative and inclusive, well embedded within the institutional and societal fabric of the country or region, and particularly attentive to the position of smallholder farmers in a competitive environment, as well as to women and to young farmers.

Different types of farmers’ organisations tend to specialise in distinct services for their members. Broadly speaking: (i) policy influencing and elaboration (covering a wide array of areas such as health, education, food security, rural development, trade ...), and (ii) technical, financial and economic services for improved incomes of members. All these services are complementary and essential for poverty reduction in rural areas.

These services are provided by a vast range of farmers’ organisations: local or village-based organisations, cooperatives and trade unions at different levels, “product” grouping organisations, farmer-led commercial structures, etc. At local level, with decentralisation policies, organisations are increasingly investing in local communities or local management committees and contribute to the consistency of activities that affect rural areas. In the economic sense, farmers’ organisations can play an important role in the supply or marketing of products. Their capacities to negotiate within sectors, within the interprofessional organisations, grow significantly. Lastly, at national and supranational level, organisations have been set up to improve farmers’ participation in the drafting of policies with the main aim of defending the interests of their members.

Therefore, Farmers Fighting Poverty supports farmers’ organisations in four areas, and can cover all concrete demands of farmers’ organisations in each work area. We make a distinction between capacity building (work area 1 and 2) at one side, and services (work area 3 and 4). Indeed, as explained above (par. 1.5), farmers’ organisations have been questioned on the practices of agri-agencies, and indicated that they expect more support for their operations, for the services they provide, not only for their capacity building. An increasing number of farmers’ organisations have the capacities to act, scale up and sustain their services to members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>support to capacity building</th>
<th>support to services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organisational strengthening and inclusiveness</td>
<td>3. Policy elaboration and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional development</td>
<td>4. Farmer-led economic development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly defined strategies in each work area allow for joint learning and capitalisation of expertise, and make monitoring (of activities and results) focused and transparent. In particular, deliverables (competences) are defined within each work area. Learning is therefore cross-cutting for all four work areas, whose managers will strive for systematic documentation and analysis of experiences and results.

Monitoring, and capitalisation in particular, involves farmers’ organisations from developing countries: the advisory committee (see also par. 3.2) is composed of representatives of AFA (South-East Asia), EAFF, ROPPA, SACAU, UMAGRI (Africa), and UNICAFES (Brasil). They formulate recommendations, including strategy changes, to the General Assembly of AgriCord.

Obviously, in the daily practice there is interaction between the four work areas. Furthermore, agri-agencies also have different focuses and approaches, depending on the needs of farmers’ organisations and the relationships they developed with them.
Therefore, through the AgriCord network, coordination of activities under each work area optimises the different expertises of the agri-agencies. The current –indicative- situation can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>work area focus</th>
<th>work area 1</th>
<th>work area 2</th>
<th>work area 3</th>
<th>work area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afdi – France</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriterra – Netherlands</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fert – France</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trias – Belgium</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA DI – Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC – Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTK – Finland</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA – Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsiaDHRRA – Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asprodeb – Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both monitoring and capitalisation allow Farmers Fighting Poverty to respond to new realities, to take into account lessons learnt, and, subsequently, to adapt its intervention strategy. This will enhance the effectiveness of activities undertaken by farmers’ organisations and supported by agri-agencies.

For each work area, this chapter presents the strategies to support farmers’ organisations, as follows:
- the context (setting the scene)
- major challenges for farmers’ organisations
- the corresponding strategies
- the “competences” of farmers’ organisations, the “deliverables” of Farmers Fighting Poverty.

### 2.1 Strategies for Organizational Strengthening and Inclusiveness\(^7\) (Work Area 1)

**Setting the Scene**

The situation of a farmer, in terms of food security, livelihood security and their small agri-businesses cannot be changed or improved by the individual farmer. Farmers organize themselves into forms of collective action to deal with these challenges together. They form membership based farmer organizations (FO’s). And these FO’s face challenges inherent to collective action and organizational growth.

FO’s today are booming, voicing the interests of farmers, and providing services to their members. The role of farmers’ organizations in development is nowadays largely acknowledged, but a gap still remains between the role they are expected to play, and the capacities they have. To a large extent, formal and professionalized farmers’ organisations still largely depend on external donor support, and are financially more accountable to donors than to their own members which can undermine their legitimacy vis-à-vis governments.

To consolidate the ambition of being the legitimate representatives of farmers, FO’s are well aware that it is important to keep a strong and broad membership base. It will give them the necessary political and economic leverage to defend the interests of the farmers. To be effective agents of change they need active members who are informed, motivated and keen to participate in their organization’s governance.

Sound financial management, and proper monitoring of external support is an inevitable prerequisite for strong relations with donors and partners in general. Farmers’ organisations are often in between the urge to focus on professional management and internal procedures at one side, and the need to be present and constantly involved with farmers at the grassroots level. Farmers’ organisations increasingly work with adequate, well educated and properly trained staff at different levels, despite fierce competition from private

---

\(^{7}\) In this context, “organisational development” covers aspects of internal organisation related to membership, management and administration. “Inclusiveness” covers the ambition of a farmers’ organisation to include vulnerable groups and different categories of farmers (man, women, youth, smallholders, emerging...).
sector and from NGOs. The secured access to (or ownership of) appropriate organizational infrastructure, both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’, obviously stabilises an organisation, and supports its recognition.

**CHALLENGES**

The first challenge for FO’s is to commit and engage its members, board, management and staff:
- involvement of members in decision making, information flows towards and from members, participatory internal procedures.
- to identify and to keep high quality and motivated personnel
- management of membership base and dynamics, links to groups at grassroots level;  

The second challenge for FO’s is to provide in economic and representation services to the members
- assess, monitor and act upon the needs of the members
- to implement proper operational and financial management principles

The third challenge for FO’s is to network and attract resources
- consolidate the overall outreach
- collect membership fees
- achieve and consolidate external legitimacy

The fourth challenge is to adapt and to innovate
- to anticipate on a changing context
- making choices on the vision, mission, and mandates of the organisation, and for monitoring the effects of the choices that have been made

The fifth challenge is to balance coherence and diversity within the organization
- inclusiveness (vulnerable groups might need specific supportive measures, such as literacy programmes or tailored services and products, to bring them into the organisation);
- to build an effective, balanced working relation between elected leaders and the staff of the organisation
- to build a sustainable farmers’ organisation, considering social, ecological and economical dimensions of sustainability

**STRATEGIES**

Work area 1 covers the efforts of farmers’ organisations to enhance their internal organizational capacities, their membership base and the skills of their human resources. More specifically it supports their efforts to improve the way they consult their members and disseminate information, to define their strategy and priorities, to widen their membership and to improve accountability. It also promotes actions to address the needs of women, young farmers, and specific vulnerable groups. And it strengthens other key competences such as financial management, management of human resources, monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore it pays particular attention to developing systems and procedures for organizing demand-driven, tailor-made and accountable service provision to members.

These activities are underpinned by various types of organizational capacity assessments, implemented by the farmers’ organisations, and facilitated by agri-agencies. The assessments and other methods for identifying and implementing support activities by agri-agencies will take in account the different types of organizations and their life cycle. Support ranges from advice and training to coaching and mentoring as part of the peer-to-peer approach of agri-agencies.

Particular attention goes to

(a) division of roles and responsibilities between elected leaders and management, background of policies related to agriculture, rural development, trade, chain development, etc.,

(b) the capacity of an organisation for participatory generation of policy proposals (PGPP), with periodic collective consultations that make the collected knowledge more valid and representative;

(c) procedures, internal organisation (functions/tasks, accountancy), and structural setting (separate departments, subsidiaries, coops...) and human resource development related to economic activities, service delivery to members, and financial autonomy;

(d) the capacity of an organization to get feedback from their members on the services provided and to adapt and improve service provision.
THE COMPETENCES OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

The ambitions of farmers’ organisations in this area, as reflected by their demands for support and registered by agri-agencies, have been formulated in six (6) “deliverables”. Farmers Fighting Poverty supports farmers’ organisations for competences related to internal organisation, with particular emphasis on financial management (nrs. 2 and 3), and for competences related to membership and participation (nrs. 1, 4, 5 and 6).

1. The farmer organization plans, implements and monitors policies and operations (services) within a strategy agreed by its membership in a participatory manner.

2. The farmer organization has adequate and sustainable resources (infrastructure, finance, human resources and others) and manages them appropriately.

3. The farmer organization operates appropriate financial management systems to provide correct, timely and transparent financial information that guarantees accountability towards its members and donors. The farmer organisation management utilizes the financial reports for planning, control and decision-making.

4. The farmer organization is democratically governed and functions with the full participation of its informed members.

5. The farmer organization has an active and representative membership, mandated by and structurally aligned with well functioning local basic groups with increased membership base.

6. The farmer organization empowers youth, women and vulnerable groups to participate and to exploit their economic and social potential.

2.2 STRATEGIES FOR INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT (WORK AREA 2)

SETTING THE SCENE

Over the last decade, we have seen a growing understanding among several public and private key players in developing countries of the essential role played by farmers’ organizations. We have also seen renewed interest at national, regional and international level in the agriculture sector following the surge in food prices in 2007-2008 and the opening up and emergence of international, sub-regional and national markets.

In this context, the new attention focused on farmers’ organisations and agriculture in general requires different institutional arrangements in commodity chains, in the agricultural sector, and in society in general. Farmers’ organisations alone cannot achieve everything for their members. They have to establish relationships with other key players in the agricultural sector and beyond. It is in their interests to build and consolidate strong, often structural, alliances with other players. They have to take a clear stance when dealing with their governments, the private sector and other civil society organisations.

But the current processes of reinforcing agricultural farmers’ organisations, especially in front of the numerous challenge’s, still remain very limited and is precarious, with the organisations even facing setbacks from time to time. In reality, these organisations are still too weak to be able to fully play their role.

THE CHALLENGES

With regard to services for producers, the organisations must deal with other key players, suppliers and traders, upstream and downstream in the food chain, with extreme structural weaknesses, particularly in terms of bargaining power. The challenge lies in ensuring a far better participation of farmers’ organisations in the agri-food chain.

In their efforts to support family farming in its own dynamics, the multiplication of centers of political power and their increasing distance from producers, their organisations must make even more efforts to keep up with current political developments, and to be visibly present in all relevant circles of influence within society.

---

8 In this context, “institutional development” covers the formal “structures or mechanisms of social order and cooperation, governing the behaviour of (farmers’) organisations within a community (social and economic environment)”. 
The challenges are therefore:
- to prioritize external targets to save scarce human resources an identify “niches” where decisions are made (in politics and economics), and organising mandated participation and professional monitoring;
- to position farmers’ organisations as negotiators of agricultural and rural policies, from local to international level.
- to be present in larger farmer networks, in alliances with civil society organisations, and in alliances with other public and private service providers, knowing and monitoring of effects of the choices that have been made and providing feedback to their members (downwards accountability).
- to create formal discussion settings (tables de concertation) within commodity chains.

**Strategies**

It is necessary to reinforce the capacity of an farmers’ organisation
- to strengthen their analytical capacity to analyze the external environment and be able to break down decision-making circuits and decide on how to participate and take positions;
- to identify and forge relevant alliances with the various key players of the civil society and with the public and private sector;
- to function as an alliance member while having the capacity to fully participate in agenda setting and being effectively accountable to their own members.
- to reinforce the process of restitution and capitalisation (the external environment distances the leaders and technical staff of the internal environment).

The link with research institutes and innovation centres is of particular importance. Access to new technologies, new practices, new market opportunities, will be greatly facilitated via increased involvement of farmers’ organisations in the priority setting and field implementation – with farmers – of research.

In order to adopt a clear position on the “political” front, it is essential for the authorities that govern the organisation (from the grassroots level to the president) to have a well-founded perception of the various challenges. At the same time, farmers’ organisations (from the North and South) can make full use of their alliances, grow stronger and take into account each other’s interests.

With regard to instruments for improving farmers’ market power such as introducing joint purchasing (or selling), management supply, contract farming, storage and warrantage schemes, etc., efforts need to be made to raise awareness of the positive experiences of using these instruments and efforts are also needed to reinforce the ability of to implement them directly or to support their members in doing so.

Build multi-stakeholder alliances, with civil society organisations and research, etc. Consolidate the collective position of farmers with local, regional, national authorities as well as in international debates and negotiations. Make sure that essential topics are properly covered: land issues, the status of family farms, agricultural and trade policies, WTO and EPA negotiations.

This calls for efforts in building upon existing experience across boundaries, with professionals in other (OECD and developing) countries. Training of leaders and staff of farmers’ organisations, through regular international exchanges, and enhanced accountability towards the grassroots of farmers’ organizations are key issues.

**The competences of farmers’ organisations**

This work area, and competences mentioned below, relate to the capacities of organisations for two aspects: to occupy strategic positions in agro-food chains and in society, and to formalise such positions.

7. The farmer organisation has positioned itself strategically in the external environment in its own country and abroad, and is networking with other organisations. It has built visibility for increased credibility and influence.

8. The farmer organisation has established formal institutional arrangements with relevant private, public and donor institutions with the aim of improving service delivery to its members.
2.3 Strategies for Policy Elaboration and Advocacy (Work Area 3)

Setting the Scene

After twenty years that have been shaped by the withdrawal of the State from the agricultural sector in order to respond to financial and budgetary adjustments, the majority of governments in the South have become aware of the need to boost agricultural development. Against a backdrop of price volatility that have in some cases led to food riots, potential conflicts regarding land appropriation, an increase in non-food agricultural production, climate change and so on, they intend to invest in more offensive agricultural policies. These policies have changed considerably in three different ways. They are clearly more proactive, are part of regional policies and take into account the relevant socio-professional stakeholders.

In reality, farmers’ organisations are playing an increasingly decisive role in the defining of agricultural policies and in directing them towards supporting the development of family farming. The response, however, to the challenges faced by rural areas cannot lie solely with farmers and State intervention is required in order to create conditions that are more favourable for producer-led initiatives.

The Challenges

Even if farming organisations have been able to influence the broad strokes of agricultural and trade policy and the public choices that underpin them, there are still some major challenges that need to be addressed.

- Farmers need to analyse the political environment, their position in negotiations, and their potential bargaining power. The policy environment is very complex, as the policies developed in most countries are divided up into sectorial policies that are not necessarily coherent.
- For any negotiation, collective positions, within larger alliances or policy elaboration networks or not, need to be properly defined and mandated, for all relevant levels (local to international), and for all relevant topics (land issues, family farming, trade...), and the related policy elaboration activities coordinated.
- Beyond the involvement in policy development, there is a need for farmers’ organisations to be part of the implementation processes of policies at all (local to international) levels.

Strategies

The strategy can be broken down into three guidelines which may be adjustable depending on the dynamics of the farmers’ organisation, its relation with authorities and institutions at national and sub-regional level.

1. Reinforcing the making of political proposals

   Generally speaking, for the values they defend ("What is our vision of agricultural development in 10 to 15 years' time?") and particularly for the agricultural policies they have to face, farmers’ organisations carry out activities which can be supported and improved: (i) Monitoring information related to rural development policies and their direct implications for farming families; (ii) Exchanges of views with the members that allow information to be circulated at the same time as gathering expectations and capitalising on experience; (iii) Participating in the drafting proposals.

2. Reinforcing the political weight of farmers’ organisations

   This involves improving the links between the organisations and their networks to increase the legitimacy of their proposals and their capacity to influence public decisions and building multi-stakeholder alliances with civil society organisations, research, etc. It is important for farmers’ organizations to be visible on the national and international stage, through regular and well-targeted communication: “occupying public space” contributes towards greater recognition of farmers’ organisations.

3. Improving the extent to which proposals of farmers’ organisations are taken into account

   Maintain a sufficient level of engagement for the proposals negotiated by farmers’ organizations to be integrated into policies and strategy documents and for policy guidelines to be actually translated into implementation instruments, whether they are sector-based programmes or acts of legislation. This follow-up is necessary to make sure of their positive effect on the development of small farmers.
Four different approaches are followed by farmers’ organisations, for effective lobbying and advocacy.

a. Drafting positions shared by the farmer-members
Support can be aimed at developing a strategy for internal communications and information management (dedicated teams and equipment) as well as conflict management between the different levels and member groups of the organization, organising workshops in the regions and at national level to reflect on their vision of rural development. Mobilise key individuals with a background in policy analysis to improve proposals, and link it more closely to the various challenges of negotiating.

b. Make use of alliances, from national to international level
Farmers’ organisations in different parts of the world are confronted with very similar difficulties, in maintaining decent levels of income for farmers. The agricultural organisations that are involved in AgriCord are mobilising elected leaders and staff, to share their experiences of development, make headway with their demands and promote closer relations and alliances between farmers’ organisations from the North and South in order to forge a common vision and position on international issues.

c. Communicate
Develop external communications strategies is important, directed towards government and local authorities, parliamentarians, etc. Diversify the range of media used (websites, internal newsletters, national newspapers, radio and television broadcasts, press conferences, demonstrations, etc.), develop and maintain appropriate networks of professional and political relations, document and communicate policy elaboration processes for facilitating follow-up.

d. Promote transparency
Farmers’ organisations can obtain greater transparency in official policy-making procedures, by putting in place formal institutional frameworks for consulting and negotiating, and by clarifying the role and positions of different players in the negotiations.

THE COMPETENCES OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

In line with the approaches presented above, Farmers Fighting Poverty monitors the following deliverables for activities of farmers’ organisations.

---

9. The farmer organization has analysed and decided on its strategic positions regarding policy issues in a participatory way.

10. The farmer organization has developed an exchange process and joint positions with national, regional and international organizations of family farmers and other actors on issues related to agriculture and food security.

11. The farmer organization communicates on its policy positions.

12. The farmer organization’s policy positions have been integrated in national strategy documents.
2.4 STRATEGIES FOR FARMER-LED ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES (WORK AREA 4)

SETTING THE SCENE

In a globalized environment and with emerging regional markets, competitiveness is not only a vital strategy; it is the condition for survival of farmers and their organizations. There are many micro-entrepreneurs and small-scale farmers with businesses that are quite often not profitable and do not generate employment. These farmers continuously face the challenges of enhancing production, accessing markets and responding to market requirements. At the same time, agricultural policies increasingly aim to move from subsistence agriculture to a more market-oriented agriculture. In that respect, there is a renewed attention for cooperatives and the cooperative movement and other farmer-led businesses.

Smallholders have formed a large array of farmers’ organisations in order to enhance their competitiveness. These organisations support their members on two fronts: market access and service delivery (e.g. input supply, extension, etc.).

Producers are increasingly organised in either so-called farmer-led businesses or in cooperatives, or as farmer-groups. There are also more and more opportunities for and experiences of farmers’ organizations in engaging in significant partnerships with the public and private sector, and hence improve service delivery to their members. All these initiatives have in common that farmers and their organizations must operate in a business-like way, or work with the private sector to establish a link with markets.

All these innovative organizational and institutional arrangements require an enabling environment and appropriate policies to make them work for smallholder farmers.

CHALLENGES

To compete in a globalised world, farmers face several challenges. Small scale farmers and micro-entrepreneurs operate in an environment with a lot of local and sub-national competition in the market amongst each other and also with traders entering products from other areas or neighbouring countries. Due to political and geographical context transport and transactions costs make it difficult for farmers to compete in the market. In many countries there is a lack of market supporting institutions, which means that law and regulations are not supportive to commercial entrepreneurship of small scale farmers. Quite often there is a lot of ‘red tape’ (bureaucracy, discriminating taxes, etc) when entering a market.

All these elements cause serious challenges for farmers organisations. The first challenge is to develop viable profitable forms of farmer-led enterprises (cooperatives, business wings, farmers as shareholders etc.), and/or links with the private sector that allow smallholder farmers to take their share in the value chain while minimizing their risks as entrepreneurs. These enterprises have to be both sound and sustainable and their businesses based on a bankable business plan. Investments have to be found and innovations to be supported by the organisation.

Initiatives have to be both financially and economically sustainable and lead to growth in revenue, increase in number of members or shareholders and in the number of jobs, and an increase in income of the farmers.

The second challenge for farmers’ organisations is to provide services to their members that allow them and their private and collective businesses to maintain their competitiveness. They need to keep in mind that a farmers’ organization can not “do it all” and needs to carefully identify the services to provide. Services provided generally focus on access to resources and inputs, improvement in processing and handling and marketing.

A third challenge is the inclusion of resource poor farmers and groups (women, young farmers) in farmer-led enterprises and targeted service provision to enhance their entrepreneurial capacities and integration in emerging value chains.

STRATEGIES

Farmers’ organisations provide services to members. They also improve links with existing service providers, and access to markets and innovations.
Under this work area, agri-agencies support farmers’ organisations to envision, develop and undertake economic initiatives of various types, in view of their impact on farmers’ incomes.

(1) Support to the establishment of farmer-led enterprises that allow farmers to either take position in the value chain through adding value to their primary production or develop strategic partnerships with other economic operators within the chain. This means support to cooperatives or other businesses to distribute seeds, to facilitate access to inputs, to collect, process and sell products, and to establish relations with other actors in the chain. The agri-agency’s role is to mobilise expertise on entrepreneurship and on farmer-led business development, and on specific issues such as value chain governance, market intelligence and risk management. Focus on business development implies evolving from project (grant) funding to peer-to-peer advisory support and knowledge transfer. Agri-agencies’ support focuses on organisations (cooperatives or other types of of farmer-controlled companies) with a clear business plan, and will promote funding through investments or loans. Support can include the making of a bankable business plan, with links to financial and other service providers, and investors.

(2) Promotion of grassroots’ entrepreneurship to strengthen entrepreneurial attitudes and skills of smallholder farmers.

Agri-agencies’ support the promotion of entrepreneurship among members of farmers’ organisations for small scale, grassroots business initiatives. Smallholders are invited and incited to formulate improvements (simple business plans) and innovations to their farming activities, be it in crops, husbandry or off-farm activities. Emerging ideas of farmer groups are linked with existing service providers, such as banks, input suppliers, processors, and commercialisation agents.

(3) This includes initiatives of national or sub-national organisations, for their support to farmers groups or cooperatives, focusing on production (quality development) and marketing (expand into new and developing markets) and possibilities of investments.

THE COMPETENCES OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

The ambitions of farmers’ organisations in this area, as reflected by their demands for support and registered by agri-agencies, have been formulated in five (5) “deliverables”. Farmers Fighting Poverty supports farmers’ organisations that facilitate in the establishment of farmer led enterprises or cooperatives (nr. 17), access to resources and inputs (nrs 13 and 14), that support in improving quality and quantity (nrs. 15 and 16).

13. The farmers’ organisations facilitates fair access to resources (such as land, rural credit and risk management products) for individual members, for local farmer groups or for sub-national or national-level farmer organisations.

14. The farmers’ organisations facilitates or provides sustainable and timely access to adequate, cost-efficient inputs and new techniques for agricultural production and for other rural income-generating activities. This includes knowledge dissemination (extension) and strengthening the management capacities of members and local farmer groups.

15. The farmers’ organisations facilitates or provides integrated services for individual farmers or local farmer groups to achieve a sustainable increase in processing, decreased post-harvest losses and improved product quality.

16. The farmers’ organisations leads collective action to improve product marketing (better conditions including price, timely marketing, more value added and shorter chain) to increase the market power of family farmers and to achieve higher incomes.

17. The farmers’ organisations has promoted transparent farmer-led rural enterprises with good potential for sustainability (agricultural inputs, marketing, processing and trading).
3 DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF FARMER-TO-FARMER COOPERATION

3.1 OWNERSHIP BY FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

Support is only provided to legitimate and representative farmers’ organisations, on the basis of project and business proposals as developed by the organisations themselves. They may use different sources of advice (from consultants, from NGOs...), but the farmers’ organisations controls the project activities and budgets.

The content of projects, eligible within Farmers Fighting Poverty, indeed reflects and addresses the priorities of the farmers’ organisations, as appropriate for their particular context. The supporting agri-agency is backing up the process, and mobilises support from its own farmers’ constituency. The project cycle is farmer-led.

Support is tailored not only to the specific demands of a farmers’ organisation but also to its existing capacity. It is possible to support new or starting organisations, to improve their capacities, and later focus more on their advocacy role and their economic activities. Support is customised and, for economic activities and investments, business plans and feasibility studies are required.

3.2 GOVERNANCE BY FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

AgriCord is governed by a General Assembly of 22 delegates, of which 13 are elected leaders of farmers’ organisations and 9 are executive directors of the agri-agencies. The executive Board of AgriCord is chaired by the president of AgriCord, an elected farmer leader. AgriCord is mandated and led by representative organisations of farmers in the EU (8 countries), in Canada, in Asia (10 countries) and in Africa (1 country).

The AgriCord General Assembly is responsible of the steering of Farmers Fighting Poverty. The General Assembly takes advice from the Advisory Committee, composed of farmer representatives from developing countries in different regions of the world (AFA, EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA, SACAU, UMAGRI, UNICAFES). The Advisory Committee formulates recommendations on the objectives, the priorities, the approaches and strategies of Farmers Fighting Poverty. It meets jointly with the General Assembly, every year.

3.3 PEER-TO-PEER POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Farmers ‘speak the same language’. Advisors who are themselves part of the farmers’ world provide advice based on an appreciation of the realities of that world, and of the absorption capacity of farmers’ organisations and their members. Our experience is that farmer-to-farmer exchanges can generate inspiring new ideas, and can change the attitudes of individual farmers.

The added value mobilised by agri-agencies
Source: Royal Tropical Institute, Improving Development Practices: The Producers’ Perspective, 2009, page 22 (edited)

Farmer leaders see another feature that is unique to agri-agencies and their way of operating: agri-agencies are rooted in the agricultural sector and they know through experience what farmer and producer organisations are about and the challenges they face. Agri-agencies consider agriculture to be more than just a practice; it is also a profession. They do not use blueprint approaches, but take a pragmatic approach. As one farmer leader said, ‘They allow us to make errors and learn from it.’ Agri-agencies also invest in long-term relationships, which may have their ups and downs, and this ensures continuity of projects and programmes.

Farmers’ organisations can call upon advisory services at any time. Experts come from farmers’ organisations, including agri-agency staff. Often, these exchanges are part of longstanding partnerships between the

---

farmers’ organisations involved. Farmers Fighting Poverty promotes linkages between OECD farmers’ organizations and their colleagues in developing countries, as well as cooperation between organisations from developing countries. Agri-agencies also involve “external” consultants (from outside farmers’ organisations), and builds alliances with organisations that complement its expertise. Advice can be sought for any of the work areas and cross-cutting areas. Advisory services are provided either directly in missions, in the form of desk work, or by continued presence in the field.

### Participants in advisory missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Agro-Info.Net</th>
<th>2007-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgriPool farmer experts</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agri-agency officers</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultants</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events (participation developing countries)</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others (students etc.)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farmer-to-farmer contacts are particularly effective in organisational and institutional development processes: the “organisational” challenges are often similar, and the discussion on specific conditions (political, social, economic...) generates ideas and appropriate solutions. Solving problems with the help of peers is a motivating and stimulating process.

Agri-agencies are not the same as NGOs


“Farmer leaders often compare support from agri-agencies to support provided through NGOs. Agri-agency support is specific because of its farmer-to-farmer approach. And agri-agencies support the actual development of farmers’ organisations, whereas agricultural sector policies and programmes often stop short of this. Farmer-to-farmer support is considered particularly useful in its South-South form (i.e. similar contexts and challenges, partnerships with linked-minded organisations etc.). As for organisational strengthening, support to establish reliable financial accountability systems is considered essential, as it allows financial support to be mobilized from other sources.”

### 3.4 Long-term commitments

Institutions develop gradually, so predictable aid flows enable them to take optimal decisions and development paths. Agri-agencies, as part of the farmers’ organisations themselves, are well aware of these development paths. The existing “natural” networking between the representative organisations of farmers is a favourable environment for long-term commitments.

Agri-agencies promote long-term relationships between farmers’ organisations. Such long-term commitments contribute to a solid partnership, better coordinated aid, coherence between interventions and the opportunity to learn and flexibly adapt over a period of years.

### Development practices: the farmers’ perspective


Several farmers’ organisations have long-standing relationships with agri-agencies, and farmer leaders state that support from agri-agencies goes beyond mere funding. It is distinguished by its emphasis on ownership (strategic plans and projects are formulated by the organisations themselves), quality and mutuality; and links between farmers’ organisations in both the North and the South provide learning opportunities. Furthermore, several farmers’ organisations appreciate that agri-agencies increasingly coordinate support among themselves and with other donors and development partners.

*Farmers Fighting Poverty* also promotes permanent and structural cooperation of farmers’ organisations with institutions and organisations needed for a country’s development. Where feasible, activities such as market chain development, credit intermediation, input supply... are linked to existing institutions, thus contributing to their sustainability.
3.5 **REPRESENTATIVE FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS WITH SOLID ROOTS**

Farmers’ organisations have the ambition to genuinely represent farmers and their interests. This calls for coherence between activities at all levels, from the roots - the individual farmers - to the national level and beyond. Economic initiatives are usually taken at grassroots level. More impacting business initiatives can surge from provincial or higher levels of the organizations, or by the association of farmers form a region or even the country. Advocacy is done by higher-level federations.

**National relevance of lobbying**


Farmer leaders feel that agri-agencies emphasise organisational capacity strengthening at national level, particularly for lobbying and advocacy. In fact, national policies (e.g. in Zambia) and innovative concepts and approaches - also introduced by agri-agencies (e.g. with CIFA in India) - are more and more based on value chain and agri-business development approaches. Furthermore, many national producer organisations have commodity-based farmers’ organisations among their grassroots members. This would require, according to the interviewees, a reorientation of capacity strengthening of their organisations to enhance grassroots economic development.

The national standing of a farmers’ organisation is important, as this is where political leverage can be brought to bear; national organisations also form the basis for regional and international links. National organisations can be mandated by lower levels to coordinate external support, often provided by several different donors. A legitimate national or intermediate farmers’ organisation will be strongly connected both to local groups and to wider federations.

**Support to farmers’ organisations at different levels (2007-2010)**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>project intervention level</th>
<th>organisation level of operations</th>
<th>farmers’ organisations per level of organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grassroots</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supra-national</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, sub-regional or international networks or platforms of farmers’ organisations are generally not eligible for direct funding. Support is preferably given to individual farmers’ organisations, even for joint activities. Exceptions can be made on the basis of a temporary role for a network supporting individual farmers’ organisations, and when a clear mandate is given to the network by constituent organisations.

3.6 **MAPPING AND PROFILING WITH FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS**

**Mapping**

A proper understanding of the dynamics of farmers’ organisations in a country is useful for all actors in development cooperation. Agri-agencies have supported, in a number of countries, the strengthening of national platforms to become the reference organisations for their own government as well as for external partners. A mapping of farmers’ organisations is useful where basic information is lacking.

Mapping provides background information on the representativity of the different farmers’ organisations, on their position and role in the local and wider policy environment, and on the relevance of their initiatives. This information is later regularly updated to enable farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies to make informed strategic choices.

End of 2011, 39 mappings were completed or planned: 20 in Africa, 13 in Asia, 3 in Latin America, 3 in Eastern Europe. Recent mappings covered Bangladesh, Cameroon, China (Yunnan), Eritrea, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan,
Madagascar, Nigeria, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, Tanzania, Burkina Faso, Albania, Macedonia and Mali.

This information is also completed with other information, relevant for the activities of farmers’ organisations: agricultural and trade in the country, third party evaluation reports, internal assessments, legislation, etc. AgriCord has started a country-by-country database. The information is available to the farmers’ organisations themselves, or with their approval.

PROFILING

For the leadership and staff of a farmers’ organisation, the assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the organisation is an important management tool. The profile is the basis on which a farmers’ organisation can build its further organisational development. Profiling evaluates strengths and weaknesses on the basis of a number of indicators, covering eight areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>extent and relevance of external relations and alliances with other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>degree of involvement of farmers in policy and decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>leaders report to farmers – farmers control the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic potential</td>
<td>capacity to pursue long-term goals in service provision and strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional capacity</td>
<td>expertise and implementation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>women membership, participation and involvement in external relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income diversification</td>
<td>ability to generate own income compared to external resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativity</td>
<td>membership base within the potential and relevant farmers’ constituency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first six are presented in the form of a polygon or spider map. A well-balanced organisation will produce a regular hexagon. Successive profiles can be superimposed on a baseline profile, and changes can easily be seen in terms of the polygon’s changing shape. Data are collected both directly by agri-agencies and with participation from the organisations. Besides showing the evolving strengths and weaknesses for individual organisations, more general lessons on the strengthening of organisations can be concluded (cfr. 1.4). In the past 4 years, more than 150 profilings were realised. In 2010, 56 organisations were profiled on their situation in 2009: 22 in Africa, 17 in Asia, 15 in Latin America, and 2 in Eastern Europe.

A profiling report typically has the following content:

- country indicators
- programmes and services
- membership and member characteristics
- systems and procedures
- needs of the organisation
- organisation indicators and description (goals, strategy)
- structure and leadership
- resources
- networks and linkages

Through mapping and profiling activities, farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies establish and maintain clear communication channels: it has been observed that the growth processes of a farmers’ organisation are improved by constructive and open dialogue, with the supporting agri-agency.

3.7 FARMER-TO-FARMER COOPERATION HELPS TO HARMONISE AID

Farmers Fighting Poverty contributes to increased aid effectiveness, through (a) its direct support to the plans of the local farmers’ organizations, (b) the long term commitments, (c) its transparent and predictable aid flows, (d) the pooling of experience from farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies from different countries, (e) the streamlining of aid flows from different backdonors, and the increased capacities of farmers’ organizations to deal with aid flows from different origins.

Effective coordination and harmonisation between donors and farmers’ organisations allows donors to improve the quality of aid. Farmers’ organisations regularly ask agri-agencies to facilitate their relations with donors, to make funding contracts more effective, efficient and appropriate. Agri-agencies also facilitate the

---

10 Annex 9b of the “Farmers on the move – Farmers Fighting Poverty 2009 Activity Report” gives the explanation of the leading indicators of profiling. For each indicator, information for 6 to 15 lagging indicators is registered.
access of farmers’ organisations to existing networks and donor groups with whom agri-agencies have structural links.

As well as this direct support to improve aid flows, agri-agencies contribute indirectly in various ways. Indirect support includes enabling farmers’ organisations to design a professional strategic plan in which donors can invest, or carrying out profiling and country mapping exercises, so they can better visualize farmers’ organisation dynamics in the country under consideration. A farmers’ organisation might later share the results with donors to help coordinate aid flows. Another example of indirect effect on aid flow is when farmers’ organisations are helped to increase their influence in emerging commodity-chains in developing countries, which are often supported by other donors.

Farmers’ organisations working with many different development partners

“The majority of the national farmers’ organisations have developed relationships with a wide array of development partners, leading to financial and technical support through projects, each of them often with their specific requirements. Agri-agencies are among the first partners who engage in support projects. More recently agri-agencies have improved the coordination of their project support, which is seen as a step forward in harmonising support activities. In that respect agri-agencies are considered by farmers’ organisations to be front-runners. Experience suggests that strategic plans for organisational development facilitate the design of support projects and their alignment with an organisation’s policies and procedures. The support from agri-agencies for developing strategic plans is therefore much appreciated by farmers’ organisations.

Finally, the effort made by the agri-agencies and farmers’ organisations, from an increasing number of countries, to participate in AgriCord and to join efforts for Farmers Fighting Poverty, contributes to more efficient development aid. This collaboration is structured and formally recognised: AgriCord is legally registered as a non profit organisation since 2003, has members in Europe (Belgium, Finland, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Sweden), in Canada, and –since 2011- also in Asia and in Africa. AgriCord has ODA-status with the OECD11.

Learning processes between agri-agencies are core business within AgriCord, at different levels (Board, Project Committee, work area management, M&E team...). Inputs, recommendations and comments from farmers’ organisations are taken into account by agri-agencies as an ongoing exercise, with the aim of harmonising their procedures and approaches, and improving the overall effectiveness of their support.

---

11 OECD list of international organisations, whose received core contributions may be reported as official development assistance (ODA), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/36/16/31724727.pdf, AgriCord is nr. 21047.
4 FARMERS’ INCOME, DELIVERABLES AND CROSS-CUTTING CONCERNS

4.1 FARMERS’ INCOME AND LIVELIHOOD

Farmers Fighting Poverty addresses the productivity of smallholder family farming, and the entrepreneurial ambitions of family farmers. Improving productivity of farmers is an effective way of reducing poverty and hunger. Each activity is structured around a specific work area and a deliverable (see below) but also includes some particular focus on farmers’ income and food security. More than a cross cutting concerns, farmers’ income and food security are considered as constant final objectives for each activity and project.

AgriCord and agri-agencies keep track on information related to yields, production, sales, income, etc. as related to project activities. These information ensure to track on availability of food and changes in living conditions, and thus to remain focused upon the overall objective of the programme to improve the income and livelihood situation at the farmers’ household level in order to reduce poverty and hunger. Impact at farmer and household level is also monitored.

4.2 “DELIVERABLES” FOR PERFORMANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT

From the practice of working with farmers’ organisations in recent years, and from their demands for support, Farmers Fighting Poverty has crystallised the essential characteristics of an effective farmers’ organisation into “deliverables”, for each of the four work areas of Farmers Fighting Poverty.

A deliverable is defined as “a short-term immediate outcome of a project”. A deliverable makes clear what capacity or what operation the farmers’ organisation will realize through the project/contract. Deliverable 3, for example, states that the farmers’ organisation operates appropriate budgeting and accounting systems to provide correct, timely and transparent financial information. This can be confirmed and verified by examining financial information provided by the organisation, and is expected to be sustained after the project is over.

Deliverables reflect the core business of Farmers Fighting Poverty. In each contract, one or more deliverables, from the same set, are defined. This makes clear what is expected of the farmers’ organisation and the agri-agency.

The overall logframe of Farmers Fighting Poverty (annex 1) is presented in three parts. Annex 1a gives the development aim and programme purpose, as linked to the 4 work areas and their 17 deliverables. Annex 1b specifies the deliverables, including the cross-cutting concerns.

In the sequence of the OECD-DAC results chain12, a deliverable is the short-term immediate outcome of a project: in this case, a change that is directly attributable to a contract under the Farmers Fighting Poverty strategic framework.

12 A results chain is the causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives – beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback. In some agencies, reach is part of the results chain. (OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management 2002)
TWO-PRONGED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

The deliverables, as defined in Farmers Fighting Poverty (see 4.2), focus on the competences of farmers’ organisations. When a strong farmers’ organisation provides effective services (input supply, extension, marketing...) to members, farmers can achieve better results in terms of yields and farm production. The contract deliverables therefore have two-pronged outcomes:

- the organisation delivers better services and becomes stronger (as expressed in the profiling results)
- farmers increase their income.

At the ultimate long term impact level, the two outcomes will reinforce each other

- stronger organisations, with increased turnover and efficient business activities will become sustainable and influential in their sector
- better yields, increased farm production and incomes will contribute to food security, reduced poverty in rural areas and more democratic distribution of incomes at a broader scale.

By making a distinction between these two aspects of outcome, we demonstrate the added value of working through farmers’ organizations. Farmers Fighting Poverty therefore includes monitoring of the competences of farmers’ organisations (as project deliverables), as well as the farmers’ income and food security (as cross-cutting concern).

4.3 THE FOUR WORK AREAS AND THEIR DELIVERABLES

Farmers Fighting Poverty is comprehensive: it covers the whole range of capacity-building needs and operations of farmers’ organisations. These are clustered into four work areas, as explained in chapter 2, each of which covers a set of specific deliverables:13

Deliverables for work area I Organisational strength and inclusiveness
1. Farmers’ organisations’ policies and strategies prepared with members’ participation
2. Well-managed human resources and adequate facilities
3. Good financial management and transparent information
4. Democratic governance and active and informed members
5. Well-functioning local farmer groups
6. Empowerment of youth, woman and specific vulnerable groups

Deliverables for work area II Institutional development
7. Influential partnership positions with relevant stakeholders
8. Formal institutional cooperation with public and private decision-making bodies

Deliverables for work area III Policy elaboration and advocacy
9. Strategic positions on policy decided in participatory way
10. Positions with other organizations of family farmers on food security
11. Communicates on policy positions
12. Policy positions in national strategy documents

Deliverables for work area IV Farmer-led economic development
13. Fair access to land, water, credit and other resources for members
14. Improved services to increase members’ agricultural production
15. Improved processing services for members’ production
16. Improved product marketing
17. Development of farmer-led rural enterprises services.

Every project contributes to one or several of the deliverables. For each deliverable, measurable targets are defined and monitored. Annex 1c gives the measurable targets (outputs) for each deliverable.

13 Deliverables are summarised in this paragraph. For full details, see annex 1b.
Example of a deliverable (in work area 2) and related output(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Area 2: Institutional development</th>
<th>deliverable</th>
<th>output</th>
<th>verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7: The FO has positioned itself strategically in the external environment in its own country and abroad, and is networking with other organisations. It has built visibility for increased credibility and influence.</td>
<td>- FO is an official member of local/national policy organizations and participates in meetings</td>
<td>- Accredited participation in local/national meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FO participates in international policy meetings</td>
<td>- Accredited participation in international meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FO has internet access and web site</td>
<td>- Internet access/web site operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It allows us to learn and capitalize, together with the farmers’ organisations, the experiences in each work area. Work areas and deliverables also are a management and organisational tool to improve quality and efficiency.

4.4 CROSS-CUTTING CONCERNS AND THEMES

A number of concerns and themes deserve follow-up in every individual activity. For this, information is gathered, on the basis of questionnaires, at the beginning and at the end of every project period. The procedure for monitoring information (from questionnaires) on cross-cutting concerns and themes is identical with the monitoring of the deliverables (and targets).

Farmers’ income and food security

Farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies, in every project, to keep track of information related to yields, production, sales, incomes... related to project activities, as indicators of availability of food and changes in living conditions. This is directly related and focused upon the overall objective of the programme: its contribution to the income and livelihood situation at the farmers’ household level.

Gender equality

Women producers and their organisations account for a significant proportion of FOs’ membership, and the FOs aim at increasing women farmers’ participation in organisational activities. Special attention has been given to the inclusion of women in every project during the 1st phase of FFP between 2007 and 2009. The 2009 report on Farmers Fighting Poverty, based upon monitoring of gender, shows that 38% of participants are women. This effort is sustained, and broadened to include aspects such as participation of women in senior management and direction. The farmer organisation applies appropriate practices to foster the social, economical and political empowerment of women in its policies and operations.

Environmental sustainability

There is a joint commitment of farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies for systematic inclusion of environmental concerns. The farmer organisation has to apply appropriate practices in environmental sustainability and contribute significantly to sustainable farming practices, better natural resource management and/or efficient energy use through its policies and operations.

Financial management

Sound financial management proved to be the cornerstone of accountability towards internal and external stakeholders, combined with strict funding procedures but also allowing for flexibility in funding modalities. The cross cutting issue on financial management aims at that farmer organisation operates appropriate financial management systems to provide correct, timely and transparent financial information that guarantees accountability towards its members and donors.

Farmer-to-farmer cooperation

AgriCord and the agri-agencies, for the sake of improving their services, and focusing on their specific added value, pay special attention to the effectiveness of farmer-to-farmer cooperation in projects. This cross
cutting issue aims at increasing active farmer-to-farmer cooperation in advisory services for business development and members’ economic activities and lobbying. Specific partnerships between farmer organisations from OECD and developing countries have increased awareness in rural populations of the OECD countries.

**Sharing of knowledge and innovation**

Promoting innovation, training, farmer-led agricultural research programmes build the capacity of farmers’ organisations’ members and enable them to increase production. Keeping track of this issue in all projects helps to ensure an effective dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge.

**Planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME)**

Monitoring and evaluation are based upon Agro-Info.Net, to keep track of outputs and outcome, at project level in the first place. Agro-Info.Net has proven to be a reliable and transparent PME tool. AgriCord and its member agri-agencies can thus provide correct, timely and transparent information that guarantees accountability towards partners (including “beneficiaries”) and donors.

AgriCord and the agri-agencies, for the sake of improving their own services, and focusing on their specific added value, will pay special attention to the effectiveness of farmer-to-farmer cooperation in projects, to the role of farmers’ organisations in effective dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge, and to innovation.

Monitoring and evaluation are based upon Agro-Info.Net, to keep track of outputs and outcome, at project level in the first place. Agro-Info.Net has proven to be a reliable and transparent PM&E tool. Improvements are needed, for instance to apply an audit track on the registered information for tracing the displayed information back to the original sources and confirm its accuracy and trueness.
5 **Monitoring and Evaluation**

*Farmers Fighting Poverty* focuses on outputs and outcomes in terms of strength of farmers’ organisations. But most activities typically have two-pronged outputs and outcomes, on the one hand they improve the performance of the farmers’ organization, and on the other hand they improve the incomes and livelihood security of the member farmers’ households. Both aspects are taken into account.

Monitoring and evaluation takes place at the following levels:

1. the project (output and outcome of project activities)
2. the farmers’ organisation (overall strengthening)
3. the farmer households (impact on food and livelihood security)
4. the agri-agencies (quality of the contribution of agri-agencies to 1, 2 and 3).

5.1 **Output and Outcome of Project Activities**

Standard project monitoring covers information of the project inputs, activities and their outputs as defined in the logical framework. Quantities and expenditures are recorded in interim and annual reports. Reporting is jointly done by the farmers’ organisation with the supporting agri-agency, using Agro-Info.Net. This means that specific project reporting is required. However, the intention remains to move away from specific project reporting (bureaucratic and time consuming), and to take the annual report of the farmers’ organisations (standardized, audited) as the basis for project monitoring.

When a project is being prepared and considered for support, a link is established between the proposed activities and one or several relevant deliverables (cfr. 4.2 and annex 1c). These relevant contract deliverables measure the main expected changes (immediate outcomes) of improving organizational performance. The implementing farmer organization and the supporting agri-agency will report on the contract deliverables both at the beginning of the project (baseline) and annually as well as at the end of the project, so that attribution of the project achievement at the end can be fairly established.

Registration is internet-based (www.agro-info.net).
The participating farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies also report on cross-cutting concerns, and, in particular, on impact in terms of (food and) livelihood security at the level of farmers’ households. AgriCord uses specific formats of story harvesting on impact, and produces a yearly report on “Evidence of Impact.”

Data on cross-cutting concerns are compiled, from all relevant projects. This will provide information about how Farmers Fighting Poverty works, and the extent to which it can make a positive difference on each of these concerns. For each work area, deliverables from different projects are aggregated annually, to provide evidence of increased farmers’ organisation capacities and relevant farmers’ organisation operations.

At the outcome level of the project, deliverables are monitored in two steps by the farmers’ organisation with the supporting agri-agency:

1. the report quantifies results for a set of quantitative indicators (project targets);
2. the report includes a qualitative judgment and description – written by the farmers’ organisation with the supporting agri-agency - on how these outputs contribute to the relevant deliverable(s).

To what extent the project has improved the farmers’ situation (outcomes in terms of income, food security...) is monitored by story harvesting (see 5.3).

5.2 Monitoring the strength of farmers’ organisations

A strong farmers’ organisation has relevant capacities in eight organisational fields, as presented in 3.6 before. And we refer to 1.4 for some key available results from profiling.

In recent years, the Farmers Fighting Poverty programme has collected a wealth of information about a number of farmers’ organisations that the agri-agencies work with, generally presented as profiling. Farmers’ organisations have shown interest for profiling since the years 2003-2004. Some 60 farmers’ organisations worldwide are profiled once a year. Examining the results allows the agri-agencies to compare organisations and see which are growing stronger. The results also shape the internal strengthening processes of farmers’ organisations, and contribute to their overall credibility. Indirectly, profiling results also reflect the success or failure of the support provided.

A manual gives the methodology and instructions for the profiling of a farmers’ organisation. The manual covers the different capacities to be analysed, the way data are collected, and the significance of the different leading indicators. The manual also provides guidelines to collect basic information on the country, and to determine some key financial indicators for the organisation.

One of the first initiatives was taken in 2002 by Asiadhra and Agriterra, in order to make a description of organisations in Asia. On this basis, and with involvement of other organisations, also from Africa and Latin America, a tool was developed by Agriterra. Its quantitative form was not unlike the Octagon of SCC, the Swedish Cooperative Center, enabling the generation of radar diagrams or spider maps in order to make visible, at a glance, the (changes in) strength of rural membership organisations.

The spider map approach is based upon the idea that a comprehensive picture of the organisation’s capacity and development profile can be obtained through systematic assessment of a number of key features of the organisation.

17 Sida and SCC started to develop the Octagon assessment tool in 1999, launching it in 2001. The focus was on NGOs, not on farmers’ organisations. The Octagon is based on a different group of indicators.
But also, the approach allows for identification of measures and ways to improve the organisation’s capacity to perform effectively. If the same analysis is made systematically on several occasions over several years, it becomes possible to assess changes in the organisation.

**Critical aspects of a well-functioning farmers’ organisation (leading indicators)**

Among farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies, there is a wide consensus on the basic qualities or capacities that are important for any farmers’ organisation (of any type, for a local women producers’ group to a national platform over a commodity-specific or input-specific coop).

On the basis of discussions between farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies, and taking into account the Internal Organisation Model (IOM) but enriching this with the specific nature of membership organisations, the following eight qualities have been defined as being basic, and are called leading indicators: the critical aspects by which to assess the strength of a rural membership organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>typical question</th>
<th>leading indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the FO involve its members?</td>
<td>1  Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the FO report back to its members?</td>
<td>2  Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the involve women?</td>
<td>3  Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the provide useful services?</td>
<td>4  Strategic potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the FO relate to other actors?</td>
<td>5  Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the FO a professional organisation?</td>
<td>6  Professional capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the FO obtain income from other sources than donors?</td>
<td>7  Income diversification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the a representative organisation for farmers?</td>
<td>8  Representativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed description of the definitions and contents of each indicator are available in the current manual. The indicators 1-6 are calculated by a mix of facts and opinions, and the indicators 7-8 are based solely on facts and figures. The first six indicators are commonly represented in the spider map (see above), the other two in more simple line graphs:

![Graph: Imbaraga (Rwanda): Diversification des Revenu](image)

**Qualitative profiling**

At the same time, a format for a more qualitative description of organisations was developed and employed. In total, 30 such descriptive documents have been produced in the period 2007-2010.

**Relevance and practical aspects**

The strong points of the profiling are, from the organisations’ point of view, an increased visibility of the organisation (particularly when also a descriptive document is made) and the potential for analysis, jointly with the agri-agency. Also, from the organisations’ point of view, it provides valuable information to the leadership and management for internal guidance and policies.

For the agri-agencies and for their backdonors, profiling is not only an instrument to help them and the organisations to define the way forward, but also an accountability tool: we say that we endeavour to strengthen farmers’ organisations, hence we had to specify that conception of strength and develop a method to measure it from time to time. This made it possible to consistently report on the changes in the farmers’ organisations over a longer period (2007-2010).

---

18 Producer organisation profiling: manual to the quantitative analysis, v. 2.2. January 2010 (Agrterra)
5.3 Monitoring impact at farmer and household level

Story harvesting provides information on the impact at the individual farmer and household level. The experiences of individual farmers are collected in a systematic format and the validity of the information for general membership is confirmed.

Through story harvesting, Farmers Fighting Poverty reports on the effects of its activities on institution building and farmers’ livelihood security. Some of these effects are direct, such as vertical integration of farmers in the market; some are less tangible, such as strengthened horizontal rural safety nets, or better downward accountability of governments, and clearer information channels at grassroots level.

AgriCord produces an annual report “Evidence of Impact”, based on stories harvested from roughly one-sixth of the farmers’ organisations supported. The reports 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 are available (cfr. 1.5) and include a presentation for farmers’ organisation, the most important lessons learnt, and emerging themes.

Such evidence is based upon external evaluations in approx. 1/3 of the cases, while the remaining cases reflect an internal self-evaluation by the farmers’ organisation or the agri-agency. Many of the stories are harvested by leaders, members or managers of farmers’ organisations. While the validity of the cases for the general membership deserves to be (externally) confirmed, they can give a good picture of the effects on household level and especially on the way changes came about. Farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies are aware that impact cannot always be scientifically attributed to a specific activity or project. Therefore, the process of evaluation includes an in-depth dialogue between agri-agencies and the farmers’ organisations. Impact evaluations on the livelihood of farmers are shared within the different thematic work areas of AgriCord.

From 2012 on, farmers’ organisations and agri-agencies keep track, in each project, of information related to yields, production, sales, incomes... related to project activities, as indicators of availability of food and changes in living conditions (cfr. 4.4).

5.4 Monitoring the quality of cooperation

AgriCord monitors the quality of support delivered to farmers’ organisations. The aim is to assess the added value of the support as delivered through Farmers Fighting Poverty.

Quality refers to:
- the transparency of the management of Farmers Fighting Poverty, for all stakeholders. They have access to all relevant information via Agro-Info.Net.
- the “farmer” ownership of its objectives, priorities, approaches and strategies. This is a responsibility of the constituent farmers’ organisations, through the General Assembly of AgriCord;
- the developing country farmers’ organisations, through the Advisory Committee of Farmers Fighting Poverty, which formulates recommendations to AgriCord.
- the working relation between agri-agencies and farmers’ organisations, including mutual reaction to critical questioning, monitored through project level missions and customer satisfaction assessments.
- the accountability towards the back-donors, which is monitored through the Agro-Info.Net reporting system, and the quality of narrative and financial reporting.
- the appropriate financing according to development stage of the organisation ensured by Project Committee guidelines and organisational screening;
- the relevance and quality of the advisory services provided, which is monitored by systematic mission feedback by farmers’ organisations and by advisers. The level of motivation and dynamics the advisory process has contributed to, which is monitored by agri-agency liaison officers and project management teams.
External evaluations into different quality aspects of Farmers Fighting Poverty were carried out in studies commissioned by DGIS/CIDA\textsuperscript{19}, SIDA\textsuperscript{20} and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. Recommendations state that

- “overall, the Farmers Fighting Poverty does clearly add value for the producer organisations supported and their constituencies. The fact that much of the support is directed towards organisational strengthening of the producer organisations to improve their general performance is increasingly uncommon within development assistance, but highly required for capacity development. Such support may prove an important determinant for long term organisational and institutional survival of these local networks and their ability to expand and influence local and national policy making in order to serve their constituencies better.

- The most crucial point of attention for Farmers Fighting Poverty at this point would be to continue to demonstrate exactly how Farmers Fighting Poverty specific interventions collectively and in combination from local to national and international levels lead to observable synergies across the board.

- At the same time, Farmers Fighting Poverty should persist with its focus to support and ensure proper institutional backing at relevant international levels through ongoing collaborations as well as new partnerships with other well positioned international institutional actors and donors.”

A “performance review” was held in Brussels (March 2010), and concluded:

- Farmers Fighting Poverty addresses the needs of farmer organizations in a rather unique way (versatility, focus on organizational development). This focus should be maintained with increased understanding of organisational development processes.

- South/South and North/South exchanges have real specific added value, which should, however, be better assessed and documented, and remain demand driven.

- The AgriCord harmonisation/aid effectiveness agenda is very relevant for the donor community, and deserves to be documented and clarified.

- AgriCord needs to communicate on “legitimacy” of its approach, based upon (1) regular (yearly global and regional DCC meetings) inputs on strategic choices, (2) its support to and increasing contacts with regional platforms of producer organisations, and (3) the demand-driven approach, that has proven to be operational for a significant part of the producer organisations in developing countries.

KIT was asked to assess farmers’ perceptions of development practices\textsuperscript{21}, and to investigate the strategies for strengthening farmer-led economic development, and concludes that:

- A decade of capacity building of national producer organizations has made some agri-agencies experts in this field. This has certainly influenced the type of project proposals that producer organizations submit to AgriCord. Scoping for promising, grassroots initiatives in farmer-led business development, while relying on their network of local partner organizations, allows agri-agencies to identify and help develop such initiatives. This would probably increase the number of project proposal in the field of economic development.

- Peer-to-peer/farmer-to-farmer support has proven to be successful in strengthening farmer organizations as service providers to their members (practitioners share experiences with practitioners,

\textsuperscript{19} MDF Consultants and BDO Auditors, (2010): Mid-term Performance Audit of the Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme.


even though the context may be different). Agri-agencies could draw on their constituencies for hands on expertise on agri-business development (e.g. processing and marketing cooperatives) and develop peer-to-peer mechanism in this field.

- AgriCord as an alliance contains all key competences that are necessary for farmer-led business development, even if they are not all at the same time present in a given country. Many agri-agencies also do have a track record on grassroots economic development. Yet, experiences and results are not fully shared and capitalized within and amongst agri-agencies. AgriCord could be a facilitator in coordinating activities and sharing and documenting experiences. Also, in order to avoid duplication of producer organizations’ initiatives and enhance economy of scale.
6 BUDGET, FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 NEEDS OF FARMERS’ ORGANISATIONS

The task and ambition of Farmers Fighting Poverty is to support, in a comprehensive way, the broad range of needs of farmers’ organisations. Its budget, and the efforts of the agri-agencies to mobilise appropriate funding and advisory services, reflect these needs.

In 2007, when Farmers Fighting Poverty was launched, AgriCord envisioned a total budget of €114.7 mln over four years (2007-2010). This estimate was based upon the demands of farmers’ organisations, as registered by the agri-agencies before 2007. The total expenditure had an average increase of 39% per year between 2007 and 2009, but stabilised in 2010, and finally reached €84.3 mln (2007-2010). This is the total of funding mobilised by the network, plus the funding mobilised by the agri-agencies individually.

In recent years, an average of €20 to €25 mln of support to farmers’ organisations per year was implemented as part of Farmers Fighting Poverty, on the basis of realistic and eligible proposals from farmers’ organisations.

To a large extent, farmers’ organisations in developing countries remain dependent of external (grant) funding. There is increasing interest for service delivery (services paid by farmers), for economic initiatives and business-type ventures, some of which could contribute to self-financing.

Agri-agencies often are brokers between farmers’ organisations and financial institutions, and promote non-grant financing of projects, wherever appropriate. On the basis of existing activities and dynamics of farmers’ organisations, all agri-agencies confirm that more development-relevant activities can be supported if more funding is available.

6.2 MOBILISATION OF FUNDING

Since the start in 2007, Farmers Fighting Poverty has received support from:
- DGIS, Netherlands, with LTO and Agriterra
- ACDI/CIDA, Canada, with UPA and UPA DI
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland, with MTK
- SIDA, Sweden, with LRF and SCC
- AFD, France, with FNSEA… and Afdi, and with Céréaliers de France… and FERT
- IFAD, Rome, as part of IFAD’s Farmers’ Forum process
- DGD, Belgium, with Boerenbond and Trias, and with FWA and CSA
- the European Commission, with Afdi.

Agri-agencies and their farmers’ constituencies also raise funds and mobilise resources for Farmers Fighting Poverty from their own membership, from the general public, and from other private sources.

In a joint statement “Look again at how to combat poverty” (World Food Day 2009), the farmer leaders of the countries involved in AgriCord, called upon OECD governments for a major and increased effort to invest in farmers’ organisations in developing countries. This call22 remains relevant.

6.3 BUDGET STRUCTURE

Farmers Fighting Poverty follows the 70/20/10 rule: an average of 70% of each budget is direct funding to farmers’ organisations, 20% for farmer-to-farmer advisory services, and 10% for programme and project management.

---

This rule reflects
- the concern to transfer the main part of the funding (70%) to the farmers’ organisations directly, as they are in charge of project implementation.
- the 2-pronged approach, where direct funding to the farmers’ organisation is linked to advisory services (20%), as secured (not necessarily provided) by the agri-agency. This component can include external evaluations and audits at programme level.

This is reflected and confirmed by the following overview of expenditure for the recent 4 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007-2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. farmer-to-farmer missions</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. advise missions and days</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. consultant missions and days</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. events</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. projects (funds transferred to farmers’ organisations)</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. administrative costs</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each backdonor, Farmers Fighting Poverty presents and submits workplans and reports, taking into account the specific thematic (work areas, deliverables) focus, as well as the geographic policy of the backdonor (countries eligible for aid).

### 6.4 IMPLEMENTATION

Farmers Fighting Poverty operates as a multi-donor trust fund, managed by AgriCord. Funding is either contracted with a member-agency (the backdonor coordinator), or directly with AgriCord.

Project proposals can be submitted to AgriCord via one of the member agencies only (the supporting agri-agency). The project cycle starts as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cycle Farmers Fighting Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check eligibility for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agro-info.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of AgriCord decides on allocation of funding, taking into account the specific requirements of each donor government or institution (geographical focus, thematic priorities, duration of the funding agreement, timing...). The Board also takes into account the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.
Agri-agencies have a solid track record of support to farmers’ organisations in developing countries: the total volume of activities managed by the different agri-agencies (including Farmers Fighting Poverty) ranges between €50 and €75 mln per year. Within the network of agri-agencies, the procedures for planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) are operational. Information flows are transparent (Agro-Info.Net). Over the past years, the Agro-Info.Net internet platform has proven to be a powerful and dynamic tool for project planning, monitoring and evaluation, and a reliable international networking environment.

(c) AgriCord
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### Annex 1a
Logframe: Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable targets</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT GOAL OF FARMERS FIGHTING POVERTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced rural poverty and hunger</td>
<td>(i) democracy and governance (ii) economic growth (iii) income distribution</td>
<td>♦ Country, region or area statistics ♦ Stories of change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PURPOSE OF FARMERS FIGHTING POVERTY** |                       |                   |
| Stronger and more effective farmers’ organisations improve |                       |                   |
| (i) democracy and governance | ♦ Profilings ♦ Stories of change, “evidence of impact” ♦ Work area reports ♦ Thematic evaluations | ♦ Favourable overall economic environment ♦ National governments establish constructive dialogue with FOs ♦ AgriCord mandated by OECD and developing country FOs to support FO development |
| (ii) economic growth |                       |                   |
| (iii) income distribution |                       |                   |
| Deliverables for work area 1: |                       |                   |
| Organisational strength and inclusiveness |                       |                   |
| 1. member participation |                       |                   |
| 2. human resources |                       |                   |
| 3. financial management |                       |                   |
| 4. governance |                       |                   |
| 5. membership base |                       |                   |
| 6. specific groups |                       |                   |
| Deliverables for work area 2: |                       |                   |
| Institutional development |                       |                   |
| 7. networking |                       |                   |
| 8. formal arrangements |                       |                   |
| Deliverables for work area 3: |                       |                   |
| Policy elaboration and advocacy |                       |                   |
| 9. participatory policies |                       |                   |
| 10. joint positions |                       |                   |
| 11. policy communication |                       |                   |
| 12. policy adoption |                       |                   |
| Deliverables for work area 4: |                       |                   |
| Farmer-led economic development |                       |                   |
| 13. access to resources |                       |                   |
| 14. access to inputs |                       |                   |
| 15. processing and handling |                       |                   |
| 16. marketing |                       |                   |
| 17. rural enterprises |                       |                   |

**Activities**

in 4 work areas implemented by farmers’ organisations

| Agro-Info.Net database | Assumptions and risks as defined in the individual project log frames |
### Annex 1b

**Logframe: Deliverables and their connection to work areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>work areas</th>
<th>deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Organizational strength and inclusiveness | 1. The farmer organization plans, implements and monitors policies and operations within a strategy agreed by its membership in a participatory manner.  
2. The farmer organization has adequate and sustainable resources (infrastructure, finance, human resources and others) and manages them appropriately.  
3. The farmer organization operates appropriate financial management systems to provide correct, timely and transparent financial information that guarantees accountability towards its members and donors. The farmer organisation management utilizes the financial reports for planning, control and decision-making.  
4. The farmer organization is democratically governed and functions with the full participation of its informed members.  
5. The farmer organization has an active and representative membership, mandated by and structurally aligned with well functioning local basic groups with increased membership base.  
6. The farmer organization empowers youth, women and vulnerable groups to participate and to exploit their economic and social potential. |
| II. Institutional development        | 7. The farmer organization has positioned itself strategically in the external environment in its own country and abroad, and is networking with other organisations. It has built visibility for increased credibility and influence.  
8. The farmer organization has established formal institutional arrangements with relevant private, public and donor institutions with the aim of improving service delivery to its members. |
| III. Policy elaboration and advocacy | 9. The farmer organization has analysed and decided on its strategic positions regarding policy issues in a participatory way.  
10. The farmer organization has developed an exchange process and joint positions with national, regional and international organizations of family farmers and other actors on issues related to agriculture and food security.  
11. The farmer organization communicates on its policy positions.  
12. The farmer organization’s policy positions have been integrated in national strategy documents. |
| IV. Farmer-led economic development  | 13. The farmer organization facilitates fair access to resources (such as land, rural credit and risk management products) for individual members, local farmer groups, sub-national or national level farmer organisations.  
14. The farmer organization facilitates or provides sustainable and timely access to adequate, cost-efficient inputs and new techniques for agricultural production and for other rural income-generating activities. This includes knowledge dissemination (extension) and strengthening the management capacities of members and local farmer groups.  
15. The farmer organization facilitates or provides integrated services for individual farmers or local farmer groups to achieve a sustainable increase in processing, decreased post-harvest losses and improved product quality.  
16. The farmer organization leads collective action to improve product marketing (better conditions including price, timely marketing, more value added and shorter chain) to increase the market power of family farmers and to achieve higher incomes.  
17. The farmer organization has promoted transparent farmer-led rural enterprises with good potential for sustainability (agricultural inputs, marketing, processing and trading). |
### Annex 1c: Logframe: Measurable targets – Means of verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable targets</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>At baseline</th>
<th>At reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work area 1</strong> Organisational strength and inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deliverable 1 (member participation)**

The farmers’ organisation plans, implements and monitors policies and operations within a strategy agreed by its membership in a participatory manner.

1. **Strategic plan including operational priorities is being implemented**
   - Updated strategic plan of organisation is documented
   - Strategic plan implemented (y/n)

2. **Members are aware of the farmers’ organisation’s strategic priorities and achievement**
   - Members trained in subject
   - % satisfied

3. **Members are satisfied with farmers’ organisation’s priorities**
   - Member survey
   - % satisfied

4. **The farmers’ organisation implemented M&E procedures**
   - M&E procedures documented
   - Proc. implemented (y/n)

**Deliverable 2 (human resources)**

The farmers’ organisation has adequate and sustainable resources (infrastructure, finance, human resources and others) and manages them appropriately.

1. **The FO has access to adequate facilities for its operations**
   - Asset appraisal
   - % satisfied

2. **HR guidelines define and implemented**
   - HR guidelines documented
   - % satisfied

3. **Qualified staff incl. management**
   - Manager and staff qualifications
   - % satisfied

4. **Management and staff trained**
   - Management and staff training
   - % satisfied

5. **Board members trained**
   - Board member training
   - % satisfied

6. **Staff performance**
   - Annual staff appraisal/evaluation
   - % satisfactory performance

7. **Roles and expectations of officials clear**
   - Annual staff appraisal/evaluation
   - % satisfied

8. **Adequate staff information provided by management**
   - Annual staff appraisal/evaluation
   - % satisfactory information

**Deliverable 3 (financial management)**

The farmers’ organisation operates appropriate financial management systems to provide current, timely and transparent financial information that guarantees accountability towards its members and donors. The farmers’ organisation management utilizes the financial reports for planning, control and decision making.

1. **Long-term financial plan secures solvency**
   - Long-term financial plan
   - Financial plan (y/n)

2. **Farmers’ organisation’s operations are profitable**
   - Operational surplus/loss
   - Profitable operations (y/n)

3. **An annual budget has been approved by the Board**
   - Operational budget
   - Approved budget (y/n)

4. **The accounting system is approved by the controlling body (Ministry of Cooperatives or auditor)**
   - Approved accounting system
   - % satisfied

5. **Previous audits give a true and fair view and no major audit queries remain unresolved**
   - Declaration of approval by external auditor
   - Audit is approved (y/n)

6. **A handbook of the accounting system is available**
   - Accounting handbook/manual available
   - % satisfied

7. **Guidelines of cash control and banking are available**
   - Guidelines for cash handling
   - Cash handling guidelines available (y/n)

8. **Head of financial administration is qualified and trained**
   - Qualification of head of financial administration
   - % satisfied

9. **Discussion of financial report is standard part of agenda of the BoD meetings**
   - Minutes of Board meeting
   - Financial report part of agenda (y/n)

10. **Members are satisfied with FO’s financial performance**
    - Member survey on topic
    - % satisfied

11. **Farmers’ organisation has a computerised accounting system**
    - Computer accounting system
    - % satisfied

**Deliverable 4 (governance)**

The farmers’ organisation is democratically governed and functions with the full participation of its informed members.

1. **FO’s constitution approved by members and registered**
   - Registered constitution
   - % satisfied

2. **Members are trained and aware of their rights and obligations**
   - Training in subject
   - % satisfied

3. **FO implements a formal bottom-up consultation process for specific policy issues**
   - Member survey
   - % satisfied

4. **General assembly is well documented (agenda, participants, minutes)**
   - Availability of relevant documentation
   - % satisfied

5. **The farmers’ organisation has a formal member communication system and regularly distributes relevant information to members**
   - Member information system
   - % satisfied

6. **Democratic elections are held according to constitution**
   - Comprehensive documentation of elections
   - Election democracy (y/n)

7. **Members are informed, satisfied and participate actively in farmers’ organisation affairs**
   - Member survey on topic
   - % satisfied

**Deliverable 5 (membership) lead**

The farmers’ organisation has an active and representative membership, managed by and structured aligned with well-functioning local basic groups.

1. **Board’s member relations committee has work plan and budget**
   - Committee work plan
   - % satisfied

2. **Local groups for economic development established**
   - Local groups established
   - % satisfied

3. **Members are satisfied with services provided by FO**
   - Member survey
   - % satisfied

4. **FO’s active membership is a majority of potential membership**
   - Active members and potential
   - % satisfied

5. **Farmers’ organisation membership has increased**
   - Member records, registered actual number of members (y/n)
   - Increased membership (number)

6. **Local groups represented in the Board**
   - Documentation showing board composition
   - Local groups represented in board (y/n)

7. **Good leadership and management capabilities of local groups**
   - Appraisal by farmers’ organisation of quality local groups
   - % satisfied

**Deliverable 6 (specific groups)**

The farmers’ organisation empowers youth, women and specific vulnerable farmers to participate and to exploit their economic and social potential.

1. **Increase in membership of specific groups**
   - Membership appraisal
   - % satisfied

2. **FO has a development programme for specific groups**
   - Programme for specific groups
   - % satisfied

3. **Specific groups are represented at Board meetings**
   - Farmers’ organisation board composition
   - % satisfied

4. **FO has introduced new agricultural techniques for women, HIV households, individuals**
   - New agricultural techniques
   - % satisfied

5. **Local members are involved in HIV/AIDS education**
   - Groups in HIV/AIDS training
   - % satisfied

6. **Farmers’ organisation implements programmes to improve access to social services (incl. literacy courses)**
   - Training records
   - % satisfied

7. **Specific groups are satisfied with farmers’ organisation’s services**
   - Member survey among specific groups
   - % satisfied
## Measurable targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work area 2</th>
<th>Institutional development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 3 (networking)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation has positioned itself strategically in the external environment in its own country and abroad, and is networking with other organisations. It has built visibility for increased credibility and influence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation participates in local/national policy meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited participation in local/national meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in local/national meetings (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Farmers’ organisation participates in international policy meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited participation in international meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers’ organisation has internet access/web site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access/web site available yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measurable targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work area 3</th>
<th>Policy elaboration and advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 4 (participatory policies)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation has analyzed and decided on its strategic positions regarding policy issues in a participatory way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation has staff trained in participatory policy generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of my/nt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Farmers’ organisation receives support and funding for advocacy and lobbying work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial results of farmers’ organisation (in funding for advocacy and lobbying work)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funding %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policy proposals related to agriculture and food security have been developed with participation of members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of participation of members in development of policy proposals on agriculture and food security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy proposals developed participatorily(%)/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Members are satisfied with achieved results of lobbying and advocacy activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal survey held with members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members satisfied with results of lobby activities (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measurable targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work area 4</th>
<th>Policy communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 5 (policy communication)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation communicates on its policy positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation policy position and analysis table to official counterparts are reported by newspapers and by public documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in newspapers or public documents, referring to the farmers’ organisation policy position to official counterparts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Measurable targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work area 5</th>
<th>Policy adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable 6 (policy adoption)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy positions of the farmers’ organisation have been integrated in national strategy documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of policy proposals of farmers’ organisation integrated in national governmental strategy documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of integration of farmers’ organisation’s policy proposals in governmental strategy documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals integrated in national policy (number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable targets</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defineable 14 (access to resources)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation facilitates fair access to resources (such as land, rural credit and risk management products) for individual farmers, for local farmer groups or for sub-national or national-level farmer organisations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation has a business plan with targets for rural credit</td>
<td>Business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PF contributed to land reform (legal) support units, land tenure</td>
<td>Business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers’ organisation cooperates with financial service providers</td>
<td>Farmers’ organisation’s annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local farmers groups participate in saving and credit activities, supported by the farmers’ organisation</td>
<td>Farmers’ organisation’s annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farmers’ organisation operates its own savings and credit</td>
<td>Annual accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members are trained in financial literacy</td>
<td>Training records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Members participate in farmers’ organisation facilitated insurance/risk management schemes</td>
<td>Farmers’ organisation’s annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Members benefit and are satisfied with PO services</td>
<td>Member survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defineable 15 (processing and handling)**

The farmers’ organisation facilitates or provides integrated services for individual farmers or local farmer groups to achieve a sustainable increase in productivity, decreased post-harvest losses and improved product quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable targets</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>At baseline</th>
<th>At reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defineable 15 (processing and handling)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation facilitates or provides integrated services for individual farmers or local farmer groups to achieve a sustainable increase in productivity, decreased post-harvest losses and improved product quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation has a business plan and targets for processing, post-harvest losses and improved product quality</td>
<td>Business plan</td>
<td>Targets for processing (€/%)</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Members making use of facilities for processing improvements, decreasing post-harvest losses and improving product quality</td>
<td>Farmers’ organisation’s membership registration system or other monitoring instruments</td>
<td>Members making use of processing improvement initiatives (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Members benefit and are satisfied with farmers’ organisation services in processing</td>
<td>Member satisfaction survey</td>
<td>% satisfied with processing services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defineable 16 (marketing)**

The farmers’ organisation leads collective action to improve product marketing (better conditions including price, timely marketing, more value added and shorter chains) to increase the market power of family farmers and to achieve higher incomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable targets</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>At baseline</th>
<th>At reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defineable 16 (marketing)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation leads collective action to improve product marketing (better conditions including price, timely marketing, more value added and shorter chains) to increase the market power of family farmers and to achieve higher incomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation has a business plan with targets related to marketing improvements</td>
<td>Business plan incl. marketing targets</td>
<td>Business plan to improve marketing (€/%)</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Farmers’ organisation has a business plan with targets related to marketing improvements</td>
<td>Marketing plan</td>
<td>Chain analysis available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Farmers’ organisation has strengthened access to market information for its members</td>
<td>Demonstrable systems in place that provide market information to members (possibly through use of ICT)</td>
<td>Access to market information (€/%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trade capacity of members of Farmers’ organisation has increased</td>
<td>Trade contacts or participants in training on trade capacity</td>
<td>Improved trade capacity (no)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of new linkages with market outlets</td>
<td>Trade agreements/contracts</td>
<td>Linkages with market outlet (number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members are satisfied with farmers’ organisation services in product marketing</td>
<td>Appraisal held with local groups on farmers’ organisation services in product marketing</td>
<td>% members satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defineable 17 (entrepreneurs)**

The farmers’ organisation has promoted transparent farmer-led rural enterprises with good potential for sustainability (agricultural inputs, marketing, processing and trading).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable targets</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>At baseline</th>
<th>At reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defineable 17 (entrepreneurs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farmers’ organisation has promoted transparent farmer-led rural enterprises with good potential for sustainability (agricultural inputs, marketing, processing and trading).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmers’ organisation has targets for rural enterprise development</td>
<td>Business plan + targets for rural enterprise development available</td>
<td>Targets for rural enterprise development available</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Farmers’ organisation develops skills and leadership in rural enterprise development</td>
<td>Number of trainings on trade capacity for leaders and staff of farmers’ organisation</td>
<td>Staff and leaders trained on rural enterprise development (number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of new agreements with private sector parties with the aim to support rural entrepreneurial activities for the members</td>
<td>Agreements with private sector</td>
<td>Agreements with private sector (number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Farmers’ enterprise is profitable</td>
<td>Records of turnover and profit are available</td>
<td>Rural enterprises profitable (€/%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Farmers’ organisation has joint ownership of rural enterprises with other investors</td>
<td>Rural enterprises in joint ownership with other investors</td>
<td>Rural enterprises in joint ownership with other investors</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members are satisfied with farmers’ organisation services in enterprise development</td>
<td>Appraisal held with members on farmers’ organisation services in enterprise development</td>
<td>Members satisfied with services in enterprise development (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rural enterprises of farmers’ organisation are transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rural enterprises of farmers’ organisation have a sustainable position in the value chain</td>
<td>Evidence of (long-term) profitability in their position in the value chain</td>
<td>Sustainable position in value chain (€/%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2

**Standard questions for cross-cutting concerns and themes.**

Monitoring is based on answers to the following standard questions. Initial baseline is to be given by the FO before first advance payment. Answers are registered by the agri-agency (with the FO) as given by a (relevant) focus group. The results are recorded in the AIN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base-line</th>
<th>End of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmers’ income improvement and food security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Did the project target direct income improvement of the farmers? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Did the focus group observe income, food security or material improvement in the livelihood of farmer households that can be attributed to the project or to the activities of the FO? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Through increased yields? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Through better prices? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Through improved storage, processing, marketing? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Did the number of participating farmers increase? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the organization have a women’s section? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the organization have women in management positions? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the FO have a board member assigned to the topic ‘gender’ or ‘women’? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the organization have a gender policy document? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Does the organization promote specific women-oriented economic activities? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the FO have a skilled and qualified book-keeper, whose work is supervised by the manager and the committee? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are the payments to members of the farmers’ organization (that sells members’ produce) correct, timely and transparent? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Are the annual financial statements of the farmers’ organization timely and approved? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are the activities of the farmers’ organization likely to cause intended or unintended harmful effects to the environment, efficient energy use or occupational health? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Has the FO made any corrective action to mitigate such harmful effects? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Has the focus group noted any improvements attributed to the project activities? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer-to-farmer cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Has a farmers’ organization or cooperative society from OECD countries been involved in this project with advisory or other support. Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Has the farmers’ organization that implements the project visited an OECD country for exchange and/or advisory purposes. Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The farmers’ organization carrying out the project has been visited by an OECD country’s farmers’ organisation for exchange and/or advisory purposes. Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing of knowledge and innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the FO have a training programme? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the FO have a training centre? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the FO have a cooperation agreement with a research institute or university. Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Is there a youth department within the FO? Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Does the FO stimulate farmer-to-farmer exchange and learning. Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3
Examples and cases referring to activities of farmers’ organisations.

AgriCord prepares, each year, a report on “Evidence of impact”. Most of the examples below are selected from the last (2012) report. These reports give a brief of the on-going efforts of farmers’ organisations to improve the living conditions of farmers and their families in many developing countries. They are composed of real-life experiences of farmers, highlighting how their work and livelihoods are closely linked to the services provided by their organisations. “Evidence of Impact” is compiled from reports of the farmers’ organisations themselves, as well as from external and independent evaluations conducted in the field. “Evidence of Impact 2012” is the fourth annual report of this series, which is supported by Finland’s Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Earlier documents are available - please contact us at info@agricord.org or have a look at our website.

Ad 1.1. Democracy, economic growth, income distribution

Farmers Fighting Poverty’s impact on poverty in Benin
Source: Farmers Fighting Poverty - Evidence of Impact, 2009

FUPRO (the Benin national farmers’ organisation) has been able to improve farmers’ technical capacity in producing pineapples and their integration into the market chain. As a result of the improved services and local lobbying, FUPRO members have increased pineapple yields and higher market prices. Between 2006 and 2008, the average yields increased from 25 to 65-85 tons/ha. The percentage of export quality pineapples rose from 22% to 48%. With improved quality and better market linkages, the price farmers receive for their pineapples almost doubled. FUPRO also improved service delivery to its members growing rice and cassava. Cassava yields have improved from 15 to 35 tons/ha between 2006 and 2008; rice yields from 2.5 tons/ha to 6 tons/ha. Outreach 1,200 farmers.

Ad 1.4. Women in the activities of farmers’ organisations

Women see changes in their lives – Benin
Source: Evidence on Impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty 2009

The treasurer of Tikonna farmer association said that being involved with the association had given her a ‘total life change’. She now dares to speak in public and knows how to organise meetings; her involvement as literacy trainer has boosted her confidence further. Her increased motivation and confidence have enabled her to stand as candidate in the village elections, with the full approval of her husband. Thanks to her higher income she can look after the education of the children, household hygiene and clothing better, and can afford to take her husband to the health centre when he is sick. She feels that her husband consults her more in crucial issues and that he appreciates her advice more than before. Another woman, a member from Tofo, reports increased motivation and energy resulting from joining a local farmers’ group. She received credit for herbicides and support to improve her maize store. The increased motivation and economic advantages encouraged her to increase the size of her maize field and to employ labourers in peak times. She can decide herself how she spends her profits; most of it is invested in her children’s education.

Women only – COAMIS RL, Nicaragua, AIN 5633
Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

The Unión Nacional de Agricultores y Ganaderos (UNAG) stimulates and supports grassroots membership amongst farmers. In 2001, women of the Chinandega region joined forces and set up a cooperative for processing jicaro (Crescentia alata) seed, COAMIS RL, which is part of the UNAG-Chinandega. Now COAMIS has 56 members, and a local NGO provided a machinery to produce a drink known as semilla de jicaro, which is made from the jicaro seeds ground with rice and spices. The drink is made with cold milk and sugar, and is very popular nationally. Women earn a stable income from jicaro. Some members of the cooperative also organise adult education in their neighbourhood; the ministry of education donated videotapes to record the lessons and show them on television to a wider audience.

Ad 2.1. Organisational strengthening

Improved organisational capacity has a positive impact – Uganda
Source: Evidence on Impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty 2009

In Mukono district, a group of farmers joined forces to store and sell rice in a warehouse receipt scheme. They received training and advice from the Uganda Cooperative Alliance (UCA). The farmers now store their rice in a common warehouse and decide themselves when they want to sell their harvest. They can take out loans against their warehouse stocks.
Overlook the Code Agricole. Thanks to intensive lobbying, it is now recognised that family farming is the cornerstone of DRC. Collaborating closely with other farmers’ organisations, they kept up pressure on members of parliament. FOPAC, the farmers’ organisation in North Kivu, was one important player together with REPAM, active in the west of DRC. Lobbying for the new legislation on agriculture, the Code Agricole. Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

Cotton farmers get a better deal – the Cotton Association of Zambia, AIN 5485

Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

Board Members of the Cotton Association of Zambia (CAZ) have been trained in contract negotiations and the Association has built an effective negotiating team. Farmer members now have a good understanding of cotton pricing mechanisms, and there has been a reduction in side-selling and an improvement in the understanding of contracts. Farmers can now engage better with the contract farming companies. CAZ has negotiated more effective agreements with cotton outgrower companies than in previous years - the cost of input packages reduced by 38%. Final seed cotton producer price increased on average by 40%, which has encouraged more farmers to grow cotton.

Successful lobbying for new farming laws – FOPAC, REPAM and others, Democratic Republic of Congo, AIN 5776

Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

Lobbying for the new legislation on agriculture, the Code Agricole - which became law in May 2011 –was a joint effort. FOPAC, the farmers’ organisation in North Kivu, was one important player together with REPAM, active in the west of DRC. Collaborating closely with other farmers’ organisations, they kept up pressure on members of parliament not to overlook the Code Agricole. Thanks to intensive lobbying, it is now recognised that family farming is the cornerstone of
the Congolese economy. The Code Agricole gives legal force to the country’s agricultural policy. It provides for a national foundation for agricultural development, as well as an agricultural advice service. And government is obliged to construct and maintain the transport infrastructure so vital for trading bulky agricultural products.

Ad 2.4. Farmer-led economic activities

Ugandan farmers set up agro-enterprises (Mbadifa)
Source: Evidence on Impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty 2011

Smallholders in the Mbarara district of Uganda have until now depended largely on subsistence agriculture. Parts of the district suffer from a shortage of land and a lack of storage facilities for food crops, and in some places there are severe periodic food shortages. A project to improve food and nutrition security has shown good results, with 70% of the target 3,000 households adopting basic soil conservation practices. Through farmer field schools and demonstrations, the effects of adding manure to improve fertility and mulching for water conservation were clearly visible. As well as focusing on food security, the project also supports the farmers’ organisations to improve. Once they had the required structures in place (a constitution, proper record-keeping etc), organisations were supported to choose an enterprise for collective marketing and then develop a business plan. Sixty-four groups made links with specific buyers, and 38 groups were active in collective marketing. Seventy-eight groups increased yields (mainly of banana but also millet and beans), had a higher sales volume and made more profit. Most farmers saw their profits increase by at least 50%.

Vacuum-packed guinea pig tempts consumers - Corporation Señor Cuy, Ecuador, AIN 5586
Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

To develop the guinea pig value chain, breeders are being trained to improve production, processing and sales. Their organisations are also learning how to draw up business plans so they can become financially independent. As part of the effort to become independent, the Corporación Señor Cuy has set up a small business with a processing unit. The manager sells – mainly young live guinea pigs - to regular retail customers. Some go to restaurants. The processing unit is experimenting with packaging, to encourage consumers to make guinea pig a more regular part of their diet. Guine pig meat is a healthy product, rich in protein and low in cholesterol. Señor Cuy plans to develop different products such as whole vacuum-wrapped guinea pig, guinea pig sausages and nuggets.

Ad 3.3. Peer-to-peer policies and practices

Increasing the value of acacia woodland – Thu Thien Hue Cooperative Alliance, Vietnam, AIN 5572
Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

Vietnam is in the top ten global producers of wood products. It exports 90% of its furniture production, but 80% of the raw materials have to be imported. Increasing domestic supply would benefit the country and the tree growers, if the quality of local timber can be improved and certified. Acacia is the most common tree planted by smallholders and finds a ready market at factories that produce wood chips for pulp production. But until recently middlemen were taking most of the profit. A project to support the establishment of forestry service groups has started in a twinning partnership with a Finnish forest producers’ association. In the initial year, a study tour to Finland was followed by a start-up workshop, and members later learned about tree production, nursery techniques and marketing. Demonstration plots were set up and surveys of forest areas carried out. Training has included how to manage household and cooperative forestry plots; the acacia value chain and timber certification. The project continues.

Ad 3.6. Key indicators, income diversification and or representativity

From coca to cacao – CAC Divisoria, Peru, AIN 5733
Source: Evidence of impact from Farmers Fighting Poverty, 2012

In the 1980s and 1990s, almost the only crop grown in the Pumahuasi region of eastern Peru was coca to supply the illegal drugs trade. But now, many farmers are growing coffee and cocoa instead. Both products are good alternatives, because of the high prices for organic coffee and cocoa. Farmers now grow legal crops with confidence and, with the financial and technical support from the cooperative, earn a good income. Many farmers help the cooperative to finance the purchase of coffee or cocoa by allowing the coop to defer payment until export customers have made payment. This saves money for the coop, because it can avoid taking out a bridging loan from the bank to cover the interval between buying in the coffee and exporting it.
Annex 3
AgriCord, agri-agencies, members and associated members.

Afdi-Nationale (France)
+33 (0)1 45 62 25 54
afdi@afdi-opa.org / www.afdi-opa.org

Agriterra (The Netherlands)
+31 26 44 55 445
agriterra@agriterra.org / www.agriterra.org

FERT (France)
+33 (0)1 44 31 16 70
fert@fert.fr / www.fert.fr

Trias (Belgium)
+32 (0)2 513 75 34
trias@triasngo.be / www.triasngo.be

UPA Développement international (Canada)
+450 679-0530
upadi@upa.qc.ca / www.upa.qc.ca

SCC Swedish Cooperative Centre (Sweden)
+46 (0)8 120 371 00
info@utangranser.se / www.utangranser.se

MTK (Finland)
+358 20 4131
kirjaamo@mtk.fi / www.mtk.fi

CIA, Confederazione Italiana Agricoltori (Italy)
+39 (0)6 32687306
ufficiointernazionale@cia.it / www.cia.it

UPA, Unión de Pequeños Agricultores y Ganaderos (España)
+34 91 554 18 70
upa@upa.es / www.upa.es

CSA, Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (Belgique)
+32 (0)2 412 06 60
secretariat@csa-be.org / www.csa-be.org

CAP - Confederação dos Agricultores de Portugal (Portugal)
+351 21 710 00 00
cap@cap.pt / www.cap.pt

AsiaDHRRA (The Philippines)
+632 436-4706
asiadhrra@asiadhrra.org / www.asiadhrra.org

ASPRODEB (Sénégal)
+221 33 824 48 73
www.asprodeb.org