

2016 A NEW CONTEXT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Risks and challenges in consolidating the progress
of targeted family farming policies

A side event organized by
COPROFAM, the IFAD Mercosur CLAEH Program and the PBA Corporation
Thursday, 18 February 2016

Working Paper produced by UCR IFAD Mercosur CLAEH Program



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the international and regional context
in Latin America and The Caribbean 2

ARGENTINA

A case involving the evolution of the institutional framework
and targeted public policies for family farming with a maturation period
of more than ten years. 6

BRAZIL

A case involving the evolution of the institutional framework
and targeted public policies for family farming with a maturation period
of two decades..... 13

COLOMBIA

A case that includes a historic challenge involving the transformation
of the Colombian countryside in support of comprehensive development
and the quality of life of the rural population and the consolidation
of the peace agreements 19

PERU

A case involving the evolution of the institutional framework
and targeted public policies for family farming with a maturation period
of less than ten years 25

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the International and Regional Context in Latin America and the Caribbean

The purpose of this meeting is to take a retrospective look at three different cases of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (Argentina, Brazil and Peru), which have been part of a process carried out over the last fifteen years, whereby a number of public policies in support of Family Farming (FF) have been consolidated in LAC, including specialized implementation bodies, increased public investment and more comprehensive coverage of services, instruments and resources for FF and the rural population. This has been the outcome of initiatives, mobilization and policy dialogue led by FFs' social organizations, COPROFAM among them.

This process has resulted in:

- i. public and political acknowledgement (visibility) of the existence and specific and distinctive features of Peasant and Family Farming in relation to farming in general and commercial agriculture or agribusiness in particular;
- ii. a paradigm shift which has meant that FF is no longer synonymous with poverty, and in fact, a great many family farmers and members of the rural population are a key part of the positive response and growth of regional economies and territories, as regards policies for rural development;
- iii. the shift from compensatory policies for farmers driven out by economic and market concentration, to active and targeted policies, which made it possible to shed light on the potential of FF and its sustainability and competitiveness;
- iv. the recognition of the role played by FF in the settlement of the population in rural areas, the creation of decent jobs, participation in countries' food security;

- v. the beginning of technical and political processes to give FF statistical visibility, with national FF records and the establishment of representative “typologies” for different situations;
- vi. the recognition of FF’s needs and the strategic role it plays at present, and can continue to play regarding the proper use and management of natural resources and how to confront the consequences of climate change.

At the same time, we shall incorporate into the discussion the case of Colombia, which is reaching the culmination of a historic process – for the country and for the whole of LAC – with the signature of peace agreements next March, between the Government of Colombia and the FARC. The development of rural territories, structural changes in the Colombian countryside and the restoration of the rights of persons displaced by the conflict are a substantial part of these agreements and FF also plays a key role in the Comprehensive Rural Reform process which is being applied as a principle of the agreement.

We shall reflect on what has been achieved with regard to public and political visibility, on targeted policies designed and applied, regional and hemispheric synchronization in bodies such as CELAC, UNASUR, Mercosur and the Central American Common Market, CARICOM, but understanding and bearing in mind the existence of a new context, which has already undergone significant changes, particularly as from 2015.

These changes can be summarized very roughly as political changes, or political trade-offs in the governmental leadership of countries (with or without the turnover of parties in power), reflected in governance issues, shifts in the focus and/or nuances of social and development policy, changes in emphasis in relation to countries’ openness to trade and an increased focus on economic integration and partnerships between trade blocs. At the same time, commitments to CELAC are strengthening, as is the use of this political/diplomatic mechanism to share experiences, channel South-South cooperation and project a political model of cooperation and complementation.

The challenges facing FF in the region involve preserving what has been achieved over the last fifteen years:

- i. recognition of and public and political visibility for FF as a socio-economic category in the organization of production and farm work, distinct from commercial or employer-based farming, and, therefore, with a need for targeted public policies which can foster its potential;
- ii. public policies with targeted tools for FF, and within this category, for at least four or five types of FF with different levels of relative development, access to production factors and market relations;
- iii. new public institutions, which have taken over the design, application and evaluation of public policies;

- iv. policy dialogue platforms with FF representatives and organizations at three levels: local, national, and sub-regional and regional;
- v. international visibility as a consequence of the political importance assigned to FF by governments and the success of the mobilization and proposals arising from social organizations, which are reflected in the high priority the matter has acquired for agencies such as FAO, IFAD, IDB, the World Bank or the IICA.

All of this against the international “backdrop” of a sustained drop in the price of commodities in general (oil or copper, for example) and agricultural commodities, particularly food, during 2014, and especially in 2015, as well as today.

This situation once again results in a change of sign and shows the growth curve in the countries of the region at an inflection point, after the ten-year period from 2003 to 2013. This, clearly, leads to implications regarding fiscal revenue and the availability of investment resources for rural development. At the same time, the appreciation of the US dollar and the hike in interest rates increase the cost of debt, which also restricts countries’ borrowing capacity and the resources available for investment and appears to close off the capital market as the governments’ preferred resource in terms of handling development funding.

New scenarios for FF leaders and their most representative organizations. Also for the IFAD, which can offer proven tools to invest in the development of the rural population and its most vulnerable sectors, as well as in FF as a driver for development and the fight against poverty.

Policy dialogue, the tool used throughout this 15-year process, is challenging itself; it should not have a “ceiling”, but project itself forward by scaling objectives and goals on the basis of its results. It should adapt continuously to changing contexts, even to those changes that are the outcome of its own endeavours. Its actions therefore, and particularly those of social organizations, should always push the boundaries of methodological innovation, in order to facilitate participation and dialogue and make increasingly demanding and efficient use of resources, taking full advantage of information and communications technologies (ICTs) and local, national and regional policy dialogue platforms, with a view to building capacity among FF representative social leadership.

At this session of the global meeting of the Farmers’ Forum 2016, we shall attempt to make a technical and conceptual contribution to the process of policy dialogue, with the purpose of setting the stage for general discussions on:

- i. a new generation of public policies for FF;
- ii. the design of hard and soft investment; synchronized, coordinated and relevant to the rural sector and FF;

- iii. the use of ICTs to close the gap between top-tier and grassroots levels in social and peasant FF organizations;
- iv. contributing to capacity building and the training of technical, political and social personnel on the basis of a technical and scientific syllabus aimed at training new human resources to face the new challenges of rural development and, particularly, production transformation;
- v. responding to the demand for trade linkages for FF on different markets – institutional, commercial, local, national or regional.

ARGENTINA

A Case Involving the Evolution of the Institutional Framework and Targeted Public Policies for Family Farming with a Maturation Period of More Than Ten Years

Since 2004, and after the creation of the Specialized Meeting on Family Farming of the MERCOSUR (REAF, for its acronym in Spanish), the term “family farming” began to appear on Argentina’s political agenda. Until then, the activity was mentioned by referring to the people involved: small and medium farmers and/or native producers among indigenous peoples.

The need created by the “Mercosur institutional framework” of establishing a National Section for Argentina in order to take part in the REAF and meet a regular agenda of semi-annual meetings, with position statements on various topics, also motivated Argentina’s authorities and social family farmers’ organizations to generate, within the REAF’s National Section, an opportunity for inward-looking reflection and institutionalized policy dialogue, giving rise to a “critical mass” of proposals which were gradually implemented by the federal government and the provincial governments.

By 2005, driven primarily by the Argentine Agrarian Federation (FAA, in Spanish), but also with the support of farmer mobilization from other traditional “peasant-based” organizations from the provinces of the Northeast and Northwest of Argentina (NEA and NOA), and with State support, new wide-ranging producers’ organizations were born; the National Family Farming Forum (FONAF), the regional forums: Centre-Cuyo-NEA-NOA-Patagonia; and the provincial forums.

FONAF encompassed over 900 FF organizations, including some 180 000 farming families, in order to reach agreements and propose equitable and inclusive rural development policies.

The FONAF was established as a forum for discussion, formalized at the time by the Secretariat of Agriculture, Livestock and Food (SAGPyA), pursuant to resolution 132 of 2006, where organizations interact with government officials with jurisdiction in several areas.

It was, therefore, as from 2006 that major changes were generated in family farming and rural development policies.

The change was considerable for the Republic of Argentina, in terms of the political recognition of the validity of the family farming socio-economic production category, and hand-in-hand with this recognition came greater public visibility and increased targeted public policy instruments, which ceased to be compensatory and became proactive. This had an institutional impact, both on the federal and on the provincial governments. A Secretariat such as the SAGPyA, which traditionally promoted public policies for the export agriculture of the humid pampas, began to commit resources and coordinate action with other institutions, aiming at the development of regional and provincial economies and to this end, relying on family farming and regional crops and production systems.

This process entailed the creation of new public bodies at national and provincial levels in order to design and implement family farming policies, new sectoral social organizations to determine the needs and capabilities of these farmers and new policy instruments in order to redirect some of the capacity of the public and private sectors.

One of the first measures we should highlight is the enactment of Law N° 26,117 of 2006, which promotes microcredit by creating consortia that support, promote and strengthen microfinance operations, providing tools for family farming sectors which lack access to the traditional financial system.

Revolving funds are a further type of financing instrument which has been increasingly used since that time. They involve a financial as well as a socio-organizational dimension, and operate as a “mass of resources” handled by the organization, which “revolves” between the organization and its member farmers.

The National Family Farming Registry (RENAF) was implemented in 2007, with the purpose of developing a registry of family farmers who would benefit from targeted policies, in compliance with Mercosur resolution 25/07, promoted by the REAF (at present there are nearly 110 000 registered farmers).

Registering with RENAF enables farmers to gain access to a number of instruments, among them, notable for its inclusive effects, is the single tax, created in 2009 with the purpose of facilitating and promoting the inclusion of family farmers in the formal economy and social protection. In social terms, this instrument provides a pension scheme and social coverage for taxpayers and their family units, including children of up to eighteen years of age and disabled children in their charge, which ensures access to basic universal healthcare. It also allows farmers to issue official invoices, become State suppliers in direct purchases and gain access to formal trade channels.

The Under-Secretariat for Rural Development and Family Farming (SDRyAF) was created in 2008, and was later upgraded to a Secretariat when the SAGPyA became the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAGyP) in 2009. The Secretariat for Family Farming (SAF) was established in 2014, separately from the Secretariat for Rural Development

(SDR), and maintained its status when the ministry recently became the Ministry of Agro-Industry, in 2015.

It is within the above framework that family farming has been gaining institutional significance in Argentina and that a number of instruments in support of the sector have been set up in different areas, the most notable of which are: support for organizations – education, gender and youth; indigenous peoples; land, habitat and rural settlement; small-scale fishing; free trade fairs and regional exchanges; registration and agricultural single social tax; programmes for sustainable municipalities; production infrastructure and industrialization; programmes and projects; preservation of artisanal productivity; financing and credit; value chains. Basically, tools for training, technical assistance and non-refundable resource allocation for FF and/or its organizations are combined in the different areas, for a variety of purposes. Members of the sector receive support to gain access to external funding projects handled by the ministry itself through a specialized unit created in 2009.

This unit – the Unit for Rural Change (UCAR) – coordinates all of the internationally funded projects targeting the agricultural sector (IBRD, IDB, IFAD, CAF, FONPLATA, etc.). UCAR's portfolio amounts to USD 1.3 billion over ten years, of which 20% is earmarked exclusively for family farming projects and 45% includes family farming among its beneficiaries. These projects are implemented with a territorial focus and/or a value chain approach, which implies an average allocation of up to USD 750 per family farmer enrolled in RENAF, per year, over ten years.

Instruments in support of the development of family farming production chains were also created (e.g. the Chamber of Family Farming Machinery and Tools).

These changes were accompanied by various decentralized ministry agencies, such as the National Agricultural Technology Institute (INTA), and the National Agrifood Health and Quality Service (SENASA).

The INTA restated its institutional focus by including family farming in its Strategic Plan 2005-2015. This entailed a reevaluation of the rural extension area, which had suffered several cuts in the 1990s. In addition, the first family farming technological research and development institutes were established: the nationwide Centre for Technological Research and Development for Small-Scale Family Farming (CIPAF) and regional Institutes for Technological Research and Development for Small-Scale Family Farming (IPAF) in the following areas: Pampa-Northwest-Northeast-Cuyo-Patagonia.

SENASA's Family Farming Commission was formed in 2009, in order to address the problems of family farming in connection with agrifood health and quality; and resolution 562 was adopted in 2015, which provides for specific manufacturing requirements for various FF activities; thus ensuring the quality and safety of its products.

The Council for Family, Peasant and Indigenous Farming was created in 2014, by means of resolution 571, as a senior level of FONAF, whose technical secretariat is within the

purview of the Secretariat for Family Farming (SAF) in the present ministry, with a view to continuing to design targeted policies based on policy dialogue.

On the whole, the public policies of the last ten years, reviewed above, focus on strengthening and providing technical and financial assistance to family farming groups and cooperatives, in order to achieve production sustainability and a certain degree of market insertion, by using a number of instruments involving training, technical assistance, credit, direct transfers, exchanges, etc. However, the role played by the State (national, provincial and municipal) in key issues such as access to land and water for production has not been very clear.

These issues came up particularly with the enactment of Law Nº 27,118 – the Act for the historical reparation of family farming for the construction of a new rurality in Argentina – of December 2014, for which an annual budget of 1500 million pesos was announced for 2016 (approximately USD 100 million), but which has not yet been applied.

In the matter of Access to Land, Law Nº 27,118 provides for:

- i. The creation of a FF Land Bank, with the purpose of making suitable land available for the development of productive enterprises in the sector. The Land Bank is composed of: 1) Land belonging to the State which the government allocates to that purpose by decree. 2) Land donated or bequeathed to the State in order to be assigned to the Bank. 3) Land transferred to the State by provinces or municipalities. 4) All rural land which becomes part of the nation's assets through different judicial, administrative, tax-related or any other means. Such lands are to be awarded progressively to family farmers enrolled in RENAF, and/or urban dwellers who for various reasons show their willingness to settle and work on FFs, by means of allocation through sale, lease or donation.
- ii. The implementation by the ministry of a specific and permanent programme for the survey, analysis and comprehensive approach of the ownership situation of FF lands. To this end, a Permanent National Commission for the Land-Title Regularization of Rural Lands has been formed. At the same time, all executions of procedural or de facto acts and sentences relating to the eviction of FFs who, at the time of the entry into force of this law are in the situation of usucaption regarding the rural lands they possess are suspended for three years, and the appropriate authorities are entrusted with finding immediate solutions in order to ensure tenure and access to land of those involved.

In the matter of access to water for production (and other public goods and services), Law Nº 27,118 stipulates that:

- i. The National Executive, through the ministry and its UCAR, will prioritize provisioning policies and the improvement of rural infrastructure in all of

its dimensions, such as: transport infrastructure, roads, housing, rural electrification, infrastructure on properties in keeping with their production activities, information and communication technology, water and irrigation in all its variations according to the potential of the territory, social infrastructure, basic sanitation targeting rural development, settlement and harmonious land occupation.

- ii. It must also undertake to design an ongoing programme to improve and increase farm and community equipment and infrastructure intended to serve the population's production or social needs. Financing will be evaluated according to revenue sector and equipment or infrastructure requirements and may range from direct subsidies, to microcredit systems, revolving funds, rural banking, credit unions and/or bank loans at subsidized rates.

In addition to placing issues involving access to land and water for production on the agenda, this law has also raised the legal standing of other types of intervention which were taking place in compliance with decrees, resolutions, programmes and projects. The main examples of this are listed below.

- i. Environmental Services: the ministry has been instructed to design and implement Environmental Service incentives which will contribute to FF. These incentives could include direct subsidies, increasing microcredit and revolving funds, tax relief, loans from the National Bank at subsidized rates, and prevention, mitigation and restitution plans to confront climate-related disasters and emergencies.
- ii. Trade: a greater emphasis on holding local, area and national fairs, and particularly on 1) Forming a national marketing chain, synchronizing farmers' own organizations, producers' cooperatives or mixed bodies. 2) Promoting trademarks and designations of origin and other means of certification, as a strategy to enhance the value of FF products (a first concrete step in this regard is the creation of the FF Seal, through MAGyP resolution 419 of 2015). 3) Placing an absolute priority on the purchase of FF products in direct procurement contracts entered into by the State for the provision of food to hospitals, schools, community kitchens, institutions within the national prison system, the armed forces and other public institutions answering to the State.
- iii. Plant and Animal Health: the ministry must implement plans, programmes and projects to strengthen compliance capacity in relation to current national health legislation and the food quality standards required in each territory.

- iv. Tax Benefits: FFs will benefit from progressive tax discounts when the enforcement authorities certify practices involving added value in terms of origin and environmental services in their various expressions.
- v. Social Security: a special social security system will be promoted for FFs in accordance with Law Nº 26,727 – the Agricultural Work System (57 years of age and 25 years of pension contributions).
- vi. Certification: the Executive Branch, through its authorized technical bodies, will ensure quality certification or other international market requirements, when FF sectors need to export. The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Food will ensure the certification of processes and products circulating within the country, by means of a Participatory Certification System.
- vii. Insurance: comprehensive insurance for FF will be promoted with a view to mitigating the damage and losses suffered as a result of emergencies or catastrophes, work-related accidents, loss or theft of animals, forestry or agricultural products, rural machinery and equipment.
- viii. Credit: The ministry shall agree with the Banco de la Nación Argentina (the national bank of Argentina) on the establishment of specific lines of credit with subsidized interest rates and guarantees compatible with the features of the activity, to provide long-term financing for the purchase of real estate, machinery and vehicles, and in the short term, to cover the purchase of inputs, marketing expenses, transport, etc. Credit up to the amount of ten basic food baskets will require that farmers be enrolled in RENAF and the single social tax system and that they should have an investment plan technically endorsed by a relevant national or provincial body (the National Agricultural Technology Institute, INTA; the National Industrial Technology Institute, INTI; or the Secretariat for Family Farming, SAF).

The case of Argentina can, therefore, be summarized by highlighting five main aspects:

- i. The creation of a specific institutional framework to serve FF and its upgrading within the hierarchical structure of the relevant authorities (a Secretariat for Family Farming is currently in operation), with a variety of intervention instruments to focus on the population enrolled in the RENAF.
- ii. The creation of an institutional framework for the administration of internationally funded projects, engaging to steer resources towards FF, and the generation of public goods and services in line with the development of FF (UCAR).

- iii. The recent enactment of a law which refers specifically to FF and provides for a considerable budget for the implementation of the measures it contains, including not only support for production and marketing for FFs and their organizations, but also issues related to access to and use of two such fundamental resources for FF as land and water for production.
- iv. Ongoing policy dialogue opportunities have been established for government authorities at different levels (provincial, regional, national) in order to work on designing and implementing targeted public policies for FF.
- v. A FF registry is in operation and makes it possible to focus the allocation of resources of different kinds on the target population (involving not only the sector's ministry, but also other institutions; for example, the single agricultural tax implemented with the Ministry of Social Development, and the special pension scheme to be implemented with the National Social Security Administration).

Despite this progress, which is considerable, it is still possible to identify a number of challenges to be faced in the near future, primarily related to three aspects:

- i. The fiscal possibilities of at least maintaining the allocation of resources anticipated for the ongoing operation of the institutional framework and the resources needed for current instruments in a new economic and financial scenario, and moving forward from planning to implementing actions in connection with land and water for production, allocating the resources provided for the implementation of the new law. In other words, being able to preserve the sector's political priority during decision-making by the most senior government authorities and making progress in providing coverage for FF with the various policy instruments (at present only just over 100 000 FFs are enrolled in RENAFA, while the potential universe of beneficiaries involves about 250 000).
- ii. The capacity to keep the channels for dialogue open between representatives of FF organizations and government authorities in a new political scenario, adjusting the characteristics of the sector's demands to general macro policy guidelines. In other words, work needs to be done on designing a common collaborative (rather than confrontational) agenda.
- iii. Maintaining and/or strengthening experience sharing in the area of targeted policies and intervention instruments for FF in the region (REAF), which has done much to enhance both FF organizations and government authorities, in order to adjust the institutional architecture that caters to the sector and test new work tools. In other words, maintaining an active regional setting in terms of the design and application of specific policies for the sector.

BRAZIL

A Case Involving the Evolution of the Institutional Framework and Targeted Public Policies for Family Farming with a Maturation Period of Two Decades

Gritos de la Tierra en Brasil (“Cries of the Land in Brazil”) led to the creation, in 1995, of the National Family Farming Programme (PRONAF, for its acronym in Portuguese), reporting to the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (MAPA, in Portuguese).

PRONAF was established as a policy for rural credit, and the training and professionalization of family farmers. It was the first national family farming policy and signalled the Brazilian State’s political and institutional recognition of this social category and of the need to create policies suited to its features. PRONAF’s budget allocation has increased every year, until it reached BRL 28.9 trillion last season, 2015-2016 (USD 7 billion; equivalent to approximately USD 1500 per farmer enrolled in the national FF registry).

It was only in 1999 that the Ministry of Agricultural Development (MDA) was created, together with the Family Farming Secretariat (SAF). They took responsibility for PRONAF, thus bringing about a separation in Brazil’s political and administrative structure for the agricultural sector (MDA and MAPA).

In 2002, another public policy known as the Harvest Guarantee Programme was developed, targeting family farming and catering to the country’s Northeast. It is linked to the MDA and guarantees the income of farmers who suffer harvest losses owing to drought or excessive rainfall.

In the early days of President Lula da Silva’s government (2003), the Zero Hunger Programme (Programa Fome Zero) was launched, the Food and Nutrition Security Council (CONSEA) was reestablished as a consultancy and advisory body to the Presidency of the Republic, and the ministry now known as the Ministry of Social Development and the Fight against Hunger (MDS) was formed, which made significant contributions (as a complement to the MDA) in the design and implementation of family farming policies.

One of the CONSEA's first tasks, in line with the Zero Hunger Programme, was to contribute to the creation of the Food Procurement Programme (PAA) in 2003, underscoring the need to coordinate support for consumers and family farming.

The PAA synchronizes agricultural policy and food and nutrition security policy. The State purchases food from family farmers and distributes it to socially vulnerable people, donating it to public food and nutrition networks, to social welfare institutions and to schools, or devotes it to building up public reserves. The PAA is implemented with MDS and MDA resources and is operated by the National Supply Company (CONAB), which reports to MAPA and to state and municipal governments.

In 2003, the Brazilian government also began to operate the MDA's Family Farming Harvest Plan, at the same time as the Agriculture and Livestock Plan produced annually by the MAPA.

The Family Farming Harvest Plan announces family farming policy conditions and resources for the forthcoming crop year and is developed through dialogue with the sector's principal social movements and organizations (including the National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, CONTAG).

The main instruments of the Harvest Plan (2015-2016) are currently: credit, insurance, technical assistance, strengthening family agribusiness, expanding markets, cooperatives, seeds and seedlings, living in semi-arid regions, youth and rural settlement, women and autonomy, traditional peoples and communities and land development.

One of the innovative public policies which was put into practice with the Harvest Plan in 2005, was the National Programme for the Sustainable Development of Rural Territories (PRONAT), answering to the MDA's Territorial Development Secretariat (SDT/MDA). With the support of an institutional framework, local stakeholders are encouraged to build, select, develop and exert social control over the collective projects which address the productive, economic, cultural, environmental and social requirements of the territories. Based on this experience, in 2008, the Federal Government launched a Citizenship Territories Programme (PTC) as a synchronization device at the territorial level of public programmes, with the purpose of focusing public action and boosting development in low economic and social performance areas.

Neither of these programmes, PRONAT and PTC, are specifically family farming programmes, but in the demarcation and identification of territories, priority was given to contexts where this type of farming prevailed, so this sector of the population in fact constitutes the bulk of the beneficiaries of the programmes' interventions.

Expanding the landscape of notable policies that have an impact on rural development, although not within the purview of the MDA, we should point to the creation of the National Rural Dwelling Programme (PNHR) in 2003. This programme is implemented by the Caixa Econômica Federal (a federal savings bank) with resources from the country's General Budget. It guarantees financial subsidies for the purchase of construction materials

or the conclusion/reform/expansion of dwellings in rural areas for family farmers and rural workers who meet the criteria established by PRONAF and are holders of PRONAF's Declaration of Suitability (DAP).

The One Million Cisterns Programme was also created during this period (2003) as an initiative of the Zero Hunger Programme. The programme aims to provide safe water for drinking and cooking through the construction of cisterns and it is implemented with resources from the MDS and in partnership with Brazilian Semi-Arid Coordination (ASA).

As a complement to the actions of the Harvest Guarantee Programme (with partial territorial scope in the Northeast), in 2004 and 2006, the Federal Government created two national mechanisms to protect family production against climate-related adversities, diseases and pests, and against the drop in the prices of financed products.

These mechanisms are linked directly to PRONAF, under the responsibility of the MDA and are known as the Family Farming Insurance (SEAF) and the Family Farming Price Guarantee Programme (PGPAF). SEAF guarantees 100% of the value funded by PRONAF Costeo (PRONAF Defray), plus 6% of the anticipated income when losses occur which are greater than 30%, caused by drought, hail, excessive rainfall and winds, among other events. PGPAF provides family units enrolled in PRONAF with guarantees against a drop in the price of products which were financed, a discount on payment of funding equivalent to the difference between the market price and the guaranteed product price. The PGPAF currently includes nearly 50 products.

A further example of a targeted policy is the National Biofuels Programme, implemented as from 2004, which offers tax exemptions to businesses that purchase the products of family farmers as raw material in the production of biodiesel.

In 2009, Law Nº 11,947 brought about a major change for family farming. It altered the National School Meals Programme (PNAE) and determined that at least 30% of the total resources allocated by the National Education Development Fund should be used to purchase foodstuffs deriving from family farming.

This was a very significant change for family farmers and opened the door to a new market. The Family Farming Harvest Plan 2015-2016 anticipates the execution of BRL 1.6 trillion (USD 400 million) on the purchase of food from family farming in order to cater to school meals.

In recent years, Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE; or ATER in Portuguese) has also undergone major changes, such as the transfer of the Department of Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (DATER) from the MAPA to the MDA in 2003, and the creation of the National Policy for Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (PNATER) in 2004.

More recently, the General TARE Act was enacted in 2010, which defined principles, objectives and beneficiaries, regulated accreditation and forms of recruiting TARE

implementing agencies, as well as forms of providing support, control, supervision and evaluation of the outcome of the services which they carried out.

Finally, the National Agency for Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (ANATER) was established in 2013. Some of the principal developments of the new TARE policy are:

- i. the stipulation that family farmers, land reform settlers, extraction workers, indigenous peoples, *quilombola* communities (descendants of escaped African slaves), artisanal fisheries and other beneficiaries of MDA programmes are to become TARE's exclusive target population;
- ii. the definition of a technological matrix based on agroecology, with the purpose of achieving food and nutrition security and the sustainable use of natural resources;
- iii. it provides the option of a "participatory" methodology, which "favours citizenship-building opportunities" through the adoption of methods such as the Participatory Rural Diagnosis;
- iv. it establishes a new role for extensionists as "knowledge and expertise mediators" and "driving agents in the development of rural communities";
- v. it promotes the participation of NGOs in the implementation of the Programme, and;
- vi. it encourages public calls for TARE, as well as to provide targeted services to production chains, specific sectors or territories.

Political and institutional recognition of family farming through public policies was also accompanied by the expansion of domestic financial resources. As an example, we can cite the resources allocated to PRONAF, which rose from approximately BRL 650 million in 1996 to almost BRL 29 trillion in 2015. Equally, the resources allocated to TARE, which rose from BRL 46 million in 2005 to BRL 1.7 trillion in 2015, while at the PAA, the increase was from close to BRL 165 million in 2003 to BRL 1.6 trillion in 2015.

Altogether, the last Harvest Plan 2015-2016 for Family Farming allocated funds amounting to BRL 45 trillion (about USD 11 billion, equivalent to USD 2200 per DAP holding family farmer, just over 5 million producers).

To some extent, access to public policies in support of family farming production – for example, PRONAF, PAA, PNAE, SEAF, PGPAF, Harvest Guarantee, etc. (as well as policies unrelated to agricultural production, such as PNHR) – is mediated by the "DAP" instrument, which makes it possible to focus public investment on family farming.

Social security for farmers in a family-based economic system is also notable as a policy which contributes to the social reproduction of family farming. This rural social security ensures a minimum wage for rural women over the age of 55 and for rural men over 60.

So far we have highlighted the principal developments which have occurred in institutional settings and policies in support of family farming in Brazil, mainly based on the creation of instruments handled by two ministries established in the early 2000s (the MDA and the MDS). However, we should also point out that policies to foster access to land, an ongoing FF demand, particularly in relation to land reform, have not been so dynamic.

Since the government of President Lula da Silva, the main focus appears to have been the assessment of settlements which are already established, improving their infrastructure and production, while the creation of new settlements has taken a back seat and is being carried out, basically, by incorporating public lands in the North and Northeast regions.

In addition, legislation limiting the purchase of land by foreigners has been reviewed, and a ceiling has been set of 5000 hectares, and up to 25% of the surface area of a municipality. However, there are no significant restrictions to the concentration of land in the hands of domestic entrepreneurs.

The case of Brazil can, therefore, be summarized by highlighting five main aspects:

- i. The consolidation of an institutional framework with several actors handling instruments that aim to benefit FF, and with the budget to do so. The most notable case, which complements the institution directly responsible (the MDA), is that of the MDS, but there are other institutional bodies, such as the CONAB (answering to the MAPA), which also play their part.
- ii. The broad coverage achieved in identifying FFs who are potential public policy beneficiaries, with over five million DAP holders, a figure which exceeds the potential universe of FFs estimated on the basis of the last Agricultural Census of 2006.
- iii. The existence of a culture of policy dialogue for the annual design of the Harvest Plan, including representatives of FF organizations and government officials.
- iv. The sustained upward budgetary allocation trend for the sector since it was included on the political agenda.
- v. The country's leadership in relation to targeted public policies for FF, as a regional (REAF) and international benchmark, with several of its instruments being used as models (after suitable adjustment) by other countries.

Despite the institutional and instrumental progress we have observed in catering to FF – among the greatest in the world – it is still possible to identify a number of challenges to be faced in the near future, primarily related to three aspects:

- i. The fiscal-related possibility of avoiding a reduction of resources allocated to the operation of institutional structures and instruments currently in operation in a new economic and financial scenario. In other words, being able to maintain the sector's political priority at the highest level of governmental decision-making.
- ii. That the various institutions devoting efforts and resources to complementing what the MDA is doing on behalf of FF should remain available to do so in order to prevent some of the coordinated actions that respond to the sector's needs from being affected (e.g. PNEA).
- iii. That the quality of the performance of Family Farmers' Organizations (OAF) should continue to improve in their use of targeted public policy instruments, in order to justify their usefulness, and thus make it possible for their political prioritization to continue to go hand-in-hand with an increasing trend with regard to funding.

COLOMBIA

A Case That Includes a Historic Challenge Involving the Transformation of the Colombian Countryside in Support of Comprehensive Development and the Quality of Life of the Rural Population and the Consolidation of the Peace Agreements

Moving towards a new countryside for Colombia and a comprehensive land reform is the main objective of the first peace agreement entered into in Havana, Cuba, in June 2014, by the Government of the Republic of Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC-EP). At present, February 2016, with the parties having reached an agreement on four main points,¹ the final signature of the Peace Agreement is expected to take place next March. Once this has occurred, the commitments embodied in the document of 6 June 2014 shall enter fully into force and it will be necessary to implement policies and apply instruments and resources, with a view to making its propositions a reality and fulfil expectations.

The Agreement's guiding principles are:

- i. structural transformation;
- ii. well-being and quality of life;
- iii. comprehensive agricultural development applied universally in the context of sustainable development;
- iv. restoration of all rights over territories, production factors and methods of production for victims of displacement and dispossession and the reversal of their consequences;

1. The last agreement, which has just been endorsed in Havana is related to disarmament, ceasefire and international observers under UN supervision.

- v. restoration and regularization of property rights;
- vi. democratization of access to land and its proper use;
- vii. democratic participation, citizenship and policy dialogue.

The principal premises through which the above principles related to the development of rural territories and communities will be achieved are:

- i. promoting the appropriate use of land and fulfilling its social function;
- ii. national plans, financed and promoted by the State to achieve comprehensive rural development and well-being and a good quality of life for the rural population;
- iii. the recognition of the fundamental role played in the countryside by the rural economy and family and community farming, in eradicating hunger through food production, generating decent jobs and income and formalizing work;
- iv. ensuring access to food, and a rich and nutritionally balanced diet for all the population by boosting family farming and production;
- v. the coexistence and complementary coordination of peasant family farming with other forms of agricultural production;
- vi. effectiveness, transparency and good management of development resources and investments, underpinned by the extensive participation of rural communities, on the basis of participatory and democratic opportunities for policy dialogue;
- vii. recognizing, creating and supporting Peasant Reserve Areas related to the recognition of rights and the contribution of the various ethnic communities to the development of their territories;
- viii. interventions, programmes and projects which are part of the Comprehensive Rural Reform (RRI, for its acronym in Spanish) endowed with a territorial approach.

Several of these principles are translated into key issues and actions for the future and for PEACE building as the primary objective, and for the sustainability of FF as the socio-economic group or category which drives rural development.

- Democratizing land tenure, access and use; formalizing access and tenure procedures.

- Formalizing and strengthening small-scale peasant and family farming.
- The presence of the State, in order to safeguard the rights of all citizens and to build citizenship and access to basic goods and services.
- The restoration of the rights of displaced persons.

All of these matters must move beyond their declarative format to become instruments for action and operate as such. To this end, there should be a political strategy, a set of public policies with specific instruments, allocated resources and mechanisms for their effective distribution, all of which should be contained within an institutional framework for its application, with clear and verifiable roles and responsibilities.

In recent years, the government of Colombia has already been moving forward in updating its public agricultural and rural institutions, as well as its mechanisms to plan, design and implement public investment in the territories and for rural communities.

The Mission for the Transformation of the Countryside² adopted a document at the end of last year, the “Production Inclusion and Family Farming Strategy”, which, in fact, suggests general guidelines at the highest political/institutional level in order to implement the actions required and established in the Peace Agreement.

The public institutional framework to address agricultural and rural development is currently still being built, so that it can comply fully with the principles and objectives of the Agreements and the Strategy. The two principal policy design entities are the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR, in Spanish) and the National Planning Department, which reports directly to the Presidency of the Republic. The latter institution plays a highly significant role in ensuring coordination and the complementarity of resources for different territories and provinces. Regarding the challenges that lie ahead, the State must use its capacity to the fullest extent in order to achieve maximum effectiveness, efficiency, coordination and complementarity in policy application and the distribution of resources, inasmuch as the comprehensive development of rural territories is the cornerstone of the peace agreements and the structural transformation strategy for the Colombian countryside.

Three new development agencies reporting to the implementation authorities mentioned above are in the process of being reformed and created: (i) the Territory Renewal Agency; (ii) the Rural Development Agency and (iii) the National Land Agency.

Meanwhile, the Agricultural Financing Fund (FINAGRO) has already started work on the design and the market placement of new financial products and services, which fall within

2. A Mission created by the President of the Republic in order to propose mid- and long-term rural and agricultural development policies, composed of former ministers, senior government managers and leading national and international experts.

the framework of the Colombian countryside structural transformation strategy. Committing capital to peasant and family farming (PFF) sites, providing funding for production and access to markets (marketing), technology incorporation, production partnerships, rural microcredit.

Family farming in Colombia plays a highly significant role from social, economic, productive, environmental, and domestic food security perspectives, as well as from a commercial point of view. In Colombia, 12% of all households were classified under FF (in 2007), and at the same time, FFs represented 87% of the country's farmers.³ The workforce participation of FF in the overall workforce employed in Colombian agricultural activities increased 33% in 2011, according to studies conducted by RIMISP.

FF in Colombia includes 737 000 agribusinesses, equivalent to 87% of the total number of farms, occupies approximately 66% of the surface area devoted to agriculture and contributed 41% of production value and 57% of the sectoral work in 2007.⁴

The role it plays in feeding Colombians is even more significant, since close to 80% of the principal foodstuffs consumed are supplied by FF.⁵

From a territorial perspective, the greatest concentrations of FF as a production system are to be found in the Andean area (66.8 %) and in the Caribbean region (23.8%). Close to 22% of the people who work on their farms also live on them, since they constitute the family seat, and in many cases, two or three generations live together on the same production unit. The average age of family farmers is high. Income received by members of the family is derived mainly from agriculture, although the proportion of non-farm income in the household economy is progressively increasing, owing to the employment of some family members off-farm and in non-agricultural sectors.⁶

Farms are basically organized to ensure the family's self-support in food terms, the sale of surpluses in local markets and, increasingly, the incorporation of income crops, which generate indispensable revenue (monetary) for the purchase of goods and services.

The highest rates of rural poverty appear in regions where most people are employed in subsistence FF, with very little access to essential production assets and no access to the public goods and services which are indispensable for a good quality of life and productive activity.

The paper "Production Inclusion and Family Farming Strategy" clearly determines the role allocated to FF in the comprehensive development of the territories, and its significance, as well as the actions expected within the framework of a comprehensive strategy, which, in

3. Source: Production Inclusion and Family Farming Strategy, a paper based on information provided by FAO/IDB 2007.

4. Source: FAO/IDB 2007.

5. Source: Production Inclusion and Family Farming Strategy.

6. Source: Ibid.

establishing investment priorities, relies on policy dialogue and information provided by FF records, handled with the participation of representative FF social organizations in the different provinces and territories.

The instruments to be applied will be:

- Access to land, by means of three mechanisms: (i) land allocation by the Land Fund (which will be handled by the National Land Agency); (ii) flexible subsidy mechanisms, and (iii) regulated mechanisms for direct land purchases.
- Formalizing land tenure by acknowledging the rights acquired by PFFs and setting up land titling and regularization.
- Providing access to appropriate technologies, synchronized according to the value chain. Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (TARE) will make it possible to provide systemic and interdisciplinary support to family units, increase farm productivity and competitiveness and increase income, in relation to both personal consumption and income crops.
- Extending the supply and quality of financial services, on the basis of interventions on the financial market by FINAGRO, promoting the registration of the credit history of family farmers and microcredit, linked to microsavings and microinsurance, and implementing revolving funds to boost rural capitalization.
- Irrigation and soil and water management, offering support to organized FFs in order to reestablish or build small irrigation districts and, especially, strategies for low-cost storage, transfer and use of water for irrigation.
- Encouraging peasant family farmers to form associations, in terms of both production and for marketing and comprehensive support. Promoting the legal formalization of associations and cooperatives, training their members, leaders and technicians, simplifying procedures, providing access to funding for organizations, building second-tier platforms or organizations which will enable scaling-up and promoting experience sharing.
- Trade and markets, based on the promotion of: (i) proximity circuits; (ii) public purchases; (iii) inclusive partnerships; (iv) differentiated markets.
- Environmental goods and services, through the overall adjustment of laws, recognizing, quantifying and remunerating the “economic fact” of environmental services, supporting organizations and communities through TARE services.

- Risk management programmes and widespread availability of insurance and microinsurance.
- Targeted strategies: (i) ethnic communities; (ii) fishermen and aquaculturists.

For a correct analysis of the case, it should be reiterated that both the new strategy and the new institutional framework are still under construction; many of the decisions have been made very recently (2015) and have not yet been fully implemented.

Therefore, immediate challenges involve:

- ensuring the consistent implementation of the strategy and its instruments, and the consistent distribution of resources, so that they may reach recipients effectively in each and every one of the priority areas which, in addition, are hugely sensitive, in political and social terms;
- coordinate public investment in the territories, as regards both the flow of resources and institutional and technical implementation capacity.

PERU

A Case Involving the Evolution of the Institutional Framework and Targeted Public Policies for Family Farming with a Maturation Period of Less Than Ten Years

During the period of economic liberalization, between the years 1990 and 2011, Peruvian public policies considered family farming more as an object of social welfare than as an active player in its own development.

However, within the framework of the new general agricultural policy of the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MINAGRI, for its acronym in Spanish), implemented as from 2008, and the creation of the Ministry of Social Inclusion (MIDIS, in Spanish) in 2011, certain public policy programmes and instruments have been gradually seeking to promote the development of the sector.

The Agrarian and Rural Production Development Programme (AGRO RURAL) was established by means of Legislative Decree N° 997 of 13 March 2008, with the purpose of promoting rural agricultural development by financing public investment projects in rural areas with little economic development. The programme has been formed as an Executive Unit attached to the Sub-Ministry of Agriculture and was created as a result of the merger of and synergy between decentralized public bodies (DPBs) and active MINAGRI programmes such as Pronamachcs, Proabonos, Prosaamer, Marenass, Aliados, Corredor Puno Cuzco, the Sierra Norte Project and the Sierra Sur Project.

The Agrarian and Rural Production Development Programme (AGRO RURAL) is the branch of the Ministry of Agriculture specializing in fighting rural poverty by promoting strategies, activities and mechanisms that make it possible to improve the income and quality of life of rural families. Some of its functions are:

- to design and implement policies and strategies for rural development management in poverty areas;
- to develop the human capital of persons in poverty;

- to improve access to domestic and international goods and services markets for farmers, on the basis of technical assistance, training and information management;
- to strengthen the capacity of families and community organizations, by means of training, coaching and communication; - to promote the establishment of strategic partnerships at all levels, with a view to optimizing resources.

In July 2008, the MINAGRI issued a Multi-Year Strategic Sectoral Plan for Agriculture 2007-2011 (PESM), which maintains export strategies and strengthens a model led by large agricultural export businesses, which in an ideal scenario would also include small-scale farmers, united in specific production chains, targeting specific international markets.

The development of small-scale agriculture was to be achieved by means of the strategic focal point of rural development, seeking to focus intervention on poor areas, mainly in the mountain and jungle, in order to ensure that small-scale farmers could gain access to basic and productive services. This rural development strategy was to be represented by the establishment of AGRO RURAL, with an approach emphasizing inclusion in local and regional markets, which leads to boosting small-scale farming with production capacity and resources in order to achieve such an inclusion. For small-scale farmers with little chance of connecting to the market, all that remains is social welfare policies, and they are excluded from any of the State's promotion actions.

There are certain programmes that stand out among policies and programmes for rural and agricultural development in Peru and which complement the actions of the Ministry of Agriculture. These programmes aim to improve basic services and rural infrastructure, such as water, electricity and roads.

In this regard, the Fund for Economic Inclusion in Rural Areas (FONIE), reporting to the MIDIS, was established in 2013 by means of Article 23 of Law Nº 29951 – the Public Sector Budget for Fiscal Year 2013 Act. Its purpose is to finance pre-investment studies and implement public investment projects presented by regional and local governments, the sector itself, or private legal entities, for the improvement of water and sanitation, electrification, telecommunications and secondary roads, preferably simultaneously, with a view to generating an impact on well-being and an improvement of the quality of life in rural households.

More recently, the Ministry of Agriculture adopted a National Family Farming Strategy 2015-2021, by means of decree 009 of June 2015.

Specific Objectives of the Strategy:

- i. to promote timely, equitable and quality access for FF to production factors, services and public assets, as well as the sustainable management of resources;

- ii. to bolster knowledge management and capacity in order to ensure the sustainability of FF development opportunities and that the role played by FF be recognized;
- iii. to coordinate a domestic, regional and local institutional framework with a view to boosting FF outcomes.

Expected outcomes:

- i. Increased FF production and productivity;
- ii. Increased social inclusion and food security for FF;
- iii. Increased efficiency in the sustainable management of resources such as water, soils, vegetation cover, flora, fauna and agri-food systems, as well as in institutional coordination regarding mitigation, prevention and adaptation to climate change, thus improving FFs' standard of living.

The strategy contains nine guidelines, which are based on the points approved at the Fourth Meeting of the Andean Council of Ministries of Agriculture of the Andean Community (in June 2013):

1. Access to production factors. Promotes access and security of tenure and use of land and water for irrigation, and the adjustment and/or extension of the necessary funding instruments in order to achieve agricultural capitalization (in the case of properties, as well as of communities and different kinds of FF organizations).
2. **Comprehensive support for innovation based on local resources.** Promotes the widespread use of good quality seeds and inputs, as well as the development of rural agribusinesses which can comply with the required standards of health and safety, as well as achieve the certifications necessary for product differentiation (e.g. organic products).
3. **Strengthening the practice of association.** Promotes different forms of association which FFs may choose in order to facilitate their access to public goods and services, as well as their linkage to inputs and products markets.
4. **Integrating FF to markets.** Promotes the supply of technical assistance for FFs and their organizations, with a view to designing business plans which will enable them to connect with suppliers of goods and public services and with private financial and commercial operators, bearing in mind a range of aspects, from direct sales and final consumers to public purchases.

5. **Sustainable management of natural resources in the face of climate change.** Promotes the dissemination of traditional crops and agricultural biodiversity, with a focus on organic and/or ecological production, with the purpose of building the climate change resilience of FF systems.
6. **Social inclusion and food security.** Promotes cross-sectoral and intergovernmental coordination in order to develop programmes which will generate and technically upgrade capacity in agricultural and non-agricultural production activities, with the purpose of diversifying family income, and to boost food production diversity on FF sites.
7. **Greater investment for the provision of public goods with a territorial approach.** Promotes the coordinated implementation of basic services packages in the territories: electricity, water, education, health, housing, telecommunications, sewerage and road infrastructure, which will enable FFs to gain access to collection and transformation points, and marketing and support services for farmers.
8. **Institution building.** Promotes the consolidation of a decentralized, flexible and multisectoral institutional framework, suited to the special features of the territories, in which public and private sectors and civil society can work together in harmony. This involves the systematic synchronization of dialogue opportunities between FF representatives and the managers of public policy instruments, in order to agree on development measures.
9. **Knowledge and innovation management.** Promotes the extensive use of technical assistance and horizontal training models, by sharing knowledge and lessons learned among FFs, in coordination with universities and research centres, in order to contribute to innovation.

The implementation of the Strategy will be the responsibility of a Multisectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Commission established by the same decree, attached to the MINAGRI and including: A MINAGRI representative acting as chair; a representative of the Ministry of the Environment; a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism; a representative of the Ministry of Culture; a representative of the Ministry of Development and Social Inclusion; a representative of the Ministry of Education; a representative of the Ministry for Women and Vulnerable Populations; a representative of the Ministry of Production; a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; a representative of the Ministry of Health.

The Commission's Technical Secretariat is exercised by the MINAGRI through its Agrarian and Rural Production Development Programme (AGRO RURAL).

The institutions on the Commission will take the guidelines of the Strategy into account when producing their Annual Institutional Operating Plans, which are provided for in their budget (there is no explicit mention of a greater allocation of resources).

Finally, in November 2015, Law N° 30355 was passed: the Family Farming Promotion and Development Act, which seeks to establish State responsibilities in the promotion and development of FF, understood as family farming units whose main source of revenue is derived from production, obtained through the direct work of the farm owner and other family members, who may hire casual or permanent workers (there are more than two million farmers).

As governing body of the agricultural sector, it is up to MINAGRI to take responsibility for promoting and developing FF, with certain institutional “partners” which the law has specifically indicated:

1. The National Agrarian Innovation Institute (INIA) and the Peruvian Amazon Research Institute (IIAP), entrusted with facilitating technology transfer and technical assistance, and the supply of seeds, seedlings and high genetic value breeding stock to FF.
2. The Agricultural Health Service (SENASA), which is responsible for providing advice and support in order to ensure the quality of FF products.
3. Local and regional governments, entrusted with providing the necessary infrastructure to generate markets and fairs for FF.
4. The Development Finance Corporation (COFIDE) and the Agricultural Bank (Agrobanco) are in charge of developing credit and insurance programmes specifically catering to FF.

In all cases, the responsibilities assigned to MINAGRI itself and its partner institutions must be covered by current institutional budgets, without the allocation of any additional resources from the State Treasury. This is expressly stipulated in the law.

The MINAGRI has persistently and enthusiastically supported the design of the Strategy and the adoption of the Act, but in order to move forward in its implementation, the advocacy capacity of the most influential family farming organizations – Peru’s Peasant Confederation (CCP), the National Agricultural Confederation (CNA), the National Federation of Peasant, Artisan, Indigenous, Native and Salaried Women of Peru (Femucarinap), and the National Peruvian Agricultural Convention (Conveagro), among others – will be put to the test in order to ensure that the budgetary allocations of the various institutions serve the targets proposed.

The case of Peru can, therefore, be summarized by highlighting three main aspects:

- i. Despite the relative importance of peasant family farming in Peru, the process of increasing its public and political visibility, as well as devoting to it specialized policies, instruments or an institutional framework took place later – in the 2000s – than in the Mercosur countries.

- ii. It was only as from 2008, with the creation of the AGRO RURAL programme, which merges a number of different institutions and projects designed to provide support to small-scale peasant farming, that work began on value chains within the framework of a sectoral inclusion strategy (not yet clearly identified as FF), which pushed this agricultural segment beyond the stage of being exclusively the object of social policies.
- iii. The express recognition of FF and the need to act with the purpose of fostering its development with targeted tools, only became really apparent in 2015, when the National Strategy and the Family Farming Promotion and Development Act were passed. Both initiatives involve not only the sector's ministry (agriculture), but also other government agencies in taking part in the supply of the public goods and services required by FF for its inclusive development, but without devoting a new budget to this. That is, the responsibilities of several institutions have been extended, but they are expected to fulfil them by using only their regular resources. This means that FF representative organizations will need to work hard in the area of policy dialogue in order to be successful in redirecting existing budgets and reestablishing priorities in their actions.

Progress in the recognition of the FF sector and the need to address it with specific instruments in support of its inclusive development is undeniable. Nonetheless, failure to allocate specific resources in order to move ahead in this and the involvement of a significant group of institutions which must work within a framework of coordination led by the MINAGRI suggest that development will be slow.

The case shows that there is a need to “persevere” in terms of policy dialogue and social mobilization, in order to ensure that the objectives, principles and instruments of the law become operational as soon as possible. A significant aspect appears to be the capacity of social organizations to establish policy dialogue channels. These are not formally addressed by the Strategy's Multisectoral Monitoring and Evaluation Commission and advocacy should take place at this level (at least) when the time comes to draw up the Annual Institutional Operating Plans included in the budgets of each of the intervening government agencies.



www.coprofam.org



Edificio Mercosur
Luis Piera 1992, piso 2
Montevideo, Uruguay
Teléfono/Fax: (598) 2413 6411 / 2413 6381
info@fidameracosur.org - www.fidameracosur.org



Calle 40 A. N° 13-09
Oficina 202
Bogotá, Colombia
Teléfono: (571) 2858688