

Policy and Institutional Priorities for Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development

Results of a Regional Workshop of the SARD-FSE Project

19-21 July 2004

Antipolo City, Philippines



Acknowledgments

The Philippines Case Study and the Regional Workshop were made possible by the generous financial support of the Governments of France and Japan.

The Workshop Organizers would also like to thank the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Luis P. Lorenzo Jr.

Mr. Arcadio Cruz, FAO Representative, Philippines Office

Fr. Francis B. Lucas

Nueva Ecija municipalities and local stakeholders involved in the case study

Participants from Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Italy,

Japan, Laos, Nepal, and Pakistan

PCARRD, SEARCA, CLSU

Workshop Chairpersons, Facilitators and Presenters

Secretariat Staff

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Regional Workshop of the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development-Farming Systems Evolution (SARD-FSE) Project was held in Antipolo City, Philippines on July 19-21, 2004. Forty-four participants from 14 countries took part in this activity, which aimed to: (1) review the methodological guidelines, lessons learned and recommendations of the SARD-FSE case study implemented in the Philippines; (2) identify the key policy and institutional issues that must be addressed in order to develop agriculture and the rural sector toward SARD in the Philippines and Asia; and (3) formulate preliminary proposals for regional and FAO HQ collaboration on SARD policy and institutional analysis and implementation, involving different actors, and in support of national efforts.

Opening remarks were given by Fr. Francis B. Lucas, chairperson of the Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC), project holder in the Philippines, emphasized the “sacredness of food” that is at the heart of the workshop. Likewise, Mr. Arcadio L. Cruz, assistant FAO representative, Philippines Office, said that sustainable agriculture and rural development has the potential to effectively tackle many of the critical problems facing the world today, and thus underlined the significance of the SARD-FSE Workshop. Philippine Agriculture Secretary Luis Lorenzo Jr. talked about the impact of globalization on small farmers and enjoined non-government organizations (NGOs) to go beyond talk of an empowered farming sector towards concrete implementation strategies to achieve such a vision.

Dr. Danilo Vargas, research team leader for the SARD-FSE Project, described the Project management structure and the rationale for the research study. His presentation included a description of the rainfed rice-based farming system in Nueva Ecija based on current trends. He then presented two scenarios: an anticipatory one, based on current trends; and an exploratory or improved scenario. The anticipatory scenario projects a continued increase in farm inputs; reconsolidation of lands by the rich; receding water levels; and deforestation. The exploratory scenario, which forecasts reduced production costs, a halt to or reversal of rural outmigration, better extension services, and improved market integration for farmers, among others, is contingent, however, on the restoration of watershed systems; the implementation of a comprehensive organic farming program; adequate provision of technology, irrigation services, and pre- and post-harvest facilities; a moratorium on land conversion; an enhanced role

for women in farm production; and better services from government agencies. Dr. Vargas concluded by offering five recommendations—in order of importance—to achieve implement SARD: (1) Increase agricultural productivity; (2) Increase investment in agriculture; (3) Review policies on trade and market linkages; (4) Strengthen people’s organizations; and (5) Improve farmer extension/education.

Dr. Miguel L. Aragon, director of the Agribusiness Program of the Central Luzon State University (CLSU), provided the stakeholders’ perspective of the study. He thought that the composition of the team and the inclusion of all stakeholders in the rainfed – lowland rice – based farming system met the requirement of a supra – disciplinary approach. He commended the “diagnosis” which he considered complete and fully elucidated. Dr. Aragon also thought that the “driving forces” were fully accounted for but that further analysis and a more complete integration of the recommendations are necessary so that the ultimate objective of SARD could be accomplished. He likewise proposed that the study shifts its focus from equitability—which Dr. Aragon said is “difficult to meet”—towards equilibrium of the farming system—which would provide for present needs of the family without damaging the resource base. Finally, Dr. Aragon regarded the recommendations set out in the study as valid and attainable, except for the widespread adoption of organic farming practices, which he thought might compromise the goals of achieving food security and increasing yield.

Workshop Session I undertook a review of SARD-FSE methodological procedures/elements. **Group I (Review of SARD-FSE methodological procedures/elements)** commended the manner in which the project was carried out, but proposed that a more flexible approach be adopted to take into account the peculiarities of Philippine culture; that bottom-up assessments be worked into the initial stages of the Project, that rice research institutions be more actively involved; and that the role of women and the youth be highlighted, among others. and provided corresponding comments on how each was done right and how it can be improved.

Group II (Review of pro-SARD recommendations and interventions)–argued that agricultural productivity would be improved by adopting mixed cropping and organic farming methods, boosting crop improvement efforts, developing seeds at community level, setting up irrigation facilities and finding alternative water sources,

among others. The group emphasized the need to increase investments in agriculture, develop efficient market linkages, set up local enterprises, strengthen people's organizations, as well as link farmer extension with local government plans and programs.

Group III (Strategic objectives and interventions for diversifying rainfed rice based farming system toward SARD)—proposed to add value to rice products by providing/improving storage and processing facilities, and giving credit support for organic farming. INRM should focus on the management of rainwater and community based watershed systems, and addressing problems of soil depletion and crop infestation. Meanwhile, the farming system can be protected from untimely events by growing drought tolerant crop varieties, legumes, fruit trees, etc.

Group IV (Strategy for communicating with relevant key stakeholders for SARD advocacy and collaboration) considered five key stakeholder groups (*i.e.*, policy makers; local government units; women and youth farmers or producers; academic and research institutions; and training centers, and determined the priorities for mobilizing each group and how best to get their attention.

Workshop Session II tackled four themes for regional collaboration for SARD.

Workshop Group I (Rural Enterprises and Markets) put together five recommendations: (1) Promoting better understanding of market opportunities and requirements; (2) Establishing links with the market and building the negotiating capacity of small farmers; (3) Promoting rural enterprises for livelihood diversification; (4) Support services and infrastructure; (5) Social marketing of SARD itself for environmental services and building community cultural identity.

Group II (Solidarity Network and Information Exchange) includes a recommendation to “Build up cooperation & partnership among NGOs/GOs/ CSOs/Private sectors and UN/donors and enhancing policy advocacy for SARD”, which should lead to the establishment of an information network secretariat, putting together a SARD databank, research and development, and enhanced policy

advocacy. The second recommendation—“Strengthening capacity (human and institutional) for SARD”—should result in increased capacity for SARD at regional, institutional and local levels, development of a course curriculum for SARD, and empowerment of women, youth and marginalized and senior farmers.

Group III (Land Reform and Resource Rights) includes proposals to make SARD a people-centered process; reduce conflict, and create an environment in which SARD can succeed; rally public opinion to the cause of the poor and achieve a more equitable distribution of resources, among others. Putting a halt to or reversing the trend of giving the corporate sector more and more control over land and other resources; making land reform a priority agenda; preventing migration; and enabling more landless people to gain access to land and thereby join the SARD process are additional proposals.

Group IV (Capacity-Building/Good Agricultural Practices) recommends “Identification and promotion of good Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) practices for SARD” by first identifying best practice in INRM, as well as SARD models, like diversified and integrated farming systems. “Building and enhancing the capacity of stakeholders to promote SARD” requires appropriate training and training materials as well as judicious use of information and communication technologies (ICTs). “Identifying suitable mechanisms to communicate policy recommendations for SARD” involves strengthening of advocacy groups and development of policy briefs and recommendations.

Workshop participants (*i.e.*, FAO, ANGOC, PCARRD, SEARCA, CLSU, and others) were requested to explore, promote and negotiate interest, political will, collaboration and resources to implement the workshop recommendations. The FAO team committed to do the following: (1) Insert the workshop proposals into ongoing programs and initiatives; (2) Use the proposals to complement and strengthen project proposals that are being negotiated with potential donors; and (3) Develop the recommendations into fully fledged proposals in accordance with the workshop's intentions.

Report of Proceedings of the Regional Workshop on the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development-Farming Systems Evolution Project

19-21 July 2004

Antipolo City, Philippines

Opening Ceremonies

Welcome Remarks

1. The Regional Workshop on the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development-Farming Systems Evolution (SARD-FSE) Project opened with welcome remarks from Fr. Francis B. Lucas, chairperson of the Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC), and Mr. Arcadio L. Cruz, Assistant Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Representative, Philippines Country Office.

2. Speaking in Filipino, Fr. Lucas welcomed the participants to the workshop, numbering 45 from Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Laos, Nepal, and Pakistan. (*For the list of workshop participants, please see Annex A.*) He said that the “sacredness of food” is at the heart of the workshop and that the whole point of the activity was to plan for food sustenance in Asia and in the rest of the world.

3. Meanwhile, Mr. Cruz said that by sharing ideas, experiences and lessons learned in the implementation of SARD-FSE in the Philippines, the participants should be able to:

- ✍ Identify and address institutional issues confronting agriculture and rural development not just in the Philippines but in the whole Asian region;
- ✍ Discuss examples of enabling policies that have been implemented by governments to support sustainable land management and sustainable agriculture and rural development (SARD);
- ✍ Identify rural development outcomes that have resulted from the successful implementation of SARD; and
- ✍ Recommend novel institutional partnerships and joint working arrangements that can be developed for the implementation of SARD.

For the text of Mr. Cruz’s Welcome Remarks, please see Annex B.

Keynote Address

4. Outgoing Philippine Secretary of Agriculture Luis P. Lorenzo Jr. gave the Keynote Address. Setting aside his prepared speech, Sec. Lorenzo tackled the issue of globalization and how this phenomenon has impacted on Asia’s small farmers. He echoed widespread objections about “free trade”, citing in particular the huge subsidies paid by developed country governments to their agricultural producers. “How can we compete in an environment where the cards are stacked against us?,” Lorenzo asked.

5. Nevertheless, Sec. Lorenzo said that globalization is “an irreversible situation”, and that, depending on their response, countries will either sink or swim with it. For one thing, developing country governments



must determine where and how best to use their negotiating skills for the benefit of their small farmers.

6. At the same time, he said that there must be an effort to change the mindset of people and to build their confidence. Small farmers must be convinced that they can make a difference in society, and that they have the ability to improve their lives. This confidence-building process can be helped along by propagating the idea that the vision of an empowered farming sector is achievable. NGOs must for instance go beyond talk of achieving such a vision and concentrate on implementation strategies. They must also develop spokespersons among their farmer and fisherfolk members so that they can tell their own success stories. Media coverage is invaluable to this process.

7. Sec. Lorenzo ended his presentation by quoting Steve Farrar, who said that what matters is not how one starts the journey but how she/he finishes. To finish strong, however, one needs to have “a clear vision of what is important”. It cannot be done by simply taking life as it comes. Sec. Lorenzo said he was optimistic that given the optimism of the participants, the partnership built around SARD “would be buoyed by the situation in Asia towards a strong finish”.

For the text of Sec. Lorenzo’s Prepared Keynote Address, please see Annex C.

OPEN FORUM

8. Sec. Lorenzo’s keynote address was followed by a short open forum, where the following main points were tackled:

Urban bias among national development planners. Sec. Lorenzo said that there will always be a migration from the rural to urban sector because of the rush by Asian leaders to adopt the Western model without going through a process. As DA Secretary, he had tried to encourage people to stay and be productive in the rural areas, but that converting the millions of people who work on the land has not happened quickly enough. The future, he added, is in the local government units (LGUs), especially the progressive ones, which can be used as models for future development.

Building leadership with a value orientation. Given Sec. Lorenzo’s emphasis on building leaders with a value orientation, a participant wanted to know



how such leaders can be developed. Sec. Lorenzo said that there are many potential leaders on the ground but that these need to be inspired to take up a leadership role. Continuity is likewise invaluable in developing such leaders because it takes time to change or mold people’s mindset to an appropriate level.

Mainstreaming SARD. Sec. Lorenzo acknowledged that the government has done little to mainstream SARD other than talk about it, and that it is up to NGOs and the private sector to inculcate the value of SARD among a wider constituency. When asked about how long it would take to mainstream SARD, Sec. Lorenzo said that the answer would depend on how quickly a society adopts SARD into its way of life. In any case, he said, “[mainstreaming SARD] is a continuing commitment from now to forever”.

Factors in the successful implementation of SARD. Asked to name three key factors to successful SARD implementation, Sec. Lorenzo named the following: (1) a clear vision; (2) focus; and (3) action and implementation.

SARD-FSE PROJECT OVERVIEW

9. Dr. Marcelino Avila, FAO Project Coordinator, provided an overview of the SARD-FSE Project. He cited a number of global events and factors which had led to the thinking behind the SARD-FSE Project. He then explained the objectives of the Project which are to enhance the capacity of governmental and non-governmental institutions to plan, implement and evaluate SARD policies and strategies, and to develop the essential capacities to actively participate in the processes of decision-making. Furthermore, the project aims to promote a favorable environment for open

policy dialogue among all stakeholders and to ensure that the necessary conditions are in place to foster such dynamic processes.

10. The expected outputs of the Project include: the case study analysis to understand their driving forces and the various social, environmental, economic and institutional constraints and obstacles for achieving SARD; relevant and flexible policy guidelines and institutional strategies for SARD based on the real-life experiences, lessons learned and future expectations of stakeholders; and user-friendly and cost-effective decision-support tools for promoting and working towards SARD, adapted to the specific needs of each stakeholder and decision-maker's category.

11. The stakeholders involved in the different phases of the Project include government agencies (e.g. ministries of agriculture, rural development, environment, planning), NGOs/ CBOs (e.g. community based organizations, peasant community and farmer organizations), private sector enterprise (e.g. input supply, processing, product marketing), agricultural education and extension institutions, agricultural research centers, and external cooperation and donor agencies.

12. Dr. Avila also explained the project management structure, criteria for selecting farming systems and countries (i.e. Philippines, Honduras and Mali), the conceptual framework and methodological steps, an analysis of past trends and future scenarios, a matrix for analyzing recommendations coming out of the Project's implementation, and an analysis of the preliminary lessons learned.

For the text of Dr. Avila's presentation, please see Annex D.



Methodology and Content

13. Dr. Danilo S. Vargas, Research Team Leader for the SARD-FSE Project, gave a presentation on the methodology and content behind the SARD-FSE Project undertaken in Guimba and Talugtug municipalities in Nueva Ecija, Philippines, from January to April 2004. The Project involved field secondary data gathering, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), including local consultations.

14. Dr. Vargas initially described the Project management structure and the rationale for the research study. The research problem or the main question with which the research was concerned was, "Is rainfed lowland rice-based farming sustainable?"

15. This particular farming system was selected as the focus of the study because the majority of the Philippines' rice areas are rainfed and because poverty is highest in this farming system. Meanwhile, the province of Nueva Ecija was considered as ideal because it is the largest rice producer in the country, accounting for 20% of the Philippines' rice production. Forty percent of its agricultural land is planted to rainfed rice, and it has been a recipient of many government rice programs, as well as being host to strong research and development (R&D) institutions and NGOs. On the other hand, the municipalities of Guimba and Talugtug were chosen because rice is their primary crop—particularly rainfed, lowland rice.

16. The study was undertaken from April 2003 to May 2004 and involved field secondary data gathering, Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), including local consultations.

17. Dr. Vargas' presentation also included a description of the rainfed rice-based farming system in Nueva Ecija based on current trends. Among others, the study showed a steady deterioration of soil condition, loss of field organisms, dropping groundwater levels, and increased land conversion, especially the illegal kind. Land is being fragmented due to population pressure, thus causing a decline in farm sizes and ultimately putting into doubt the economic viability of farming as an enterprise. The mechanization of farmwork has caused the virtual disappearance of the carabao on the farm, reduced labor demand, and increased the costs of land preparation, among others. High-yielding rice varieties predominate, fertilizers

used are almost invariably synthetic, and weed control is dependent on chemicals. Farmers have also expressed a number of concerns about the delivery of technology based services. Among these are the high financial requirements of using hybrid and high value crops; limited training programs in the use of technology; delays in the delivery of inputs; and limited irrigation coverage, among others. Rural to urban migration, another notable trend in this farming system, has had a number of social and cultural impacts, like the aging of farmers, as more and more of the rural youth abandon farming to work in the cities; and familial strain as women, who are the traditional caretakers of the family, are forced to leave the home to work elsewhere. Meanwhile, institutional trends include the decline in the number of cooperatives; and the insufficient budget of local government units (LGUs) to implement agricultural development programs.

18. Dr. Vargas then presented two scenarios: an anticipatory one, based on current trends, and an exploratory, or improved scenario. The anticipatory scenario projects a continued increase in farm inputs; reconsolidation of lands by the rich; receding water levels; and deforestation. The exploratory scenario, which forecasts reduced production costs, a halt to or reversal of rural outmigration, better extension services, and improved market integration for farmers, among others, is contingent, however, on the restoration of watershed systems; the implementation of a comprehensive organic farming program; adequate provision of technology, irrigation services, and pre- and post-harvest facilities; a moratorium on land conversion; an enhanced role for women in farm production; and better services from government agencies.

19. Finally, Dr. Vargas gave five recommendations—in order of importance—to achieve implement SARD:

(1) Increase agricultural productivity by means of continuous discovery of high yielding varieties, explore other sources of irrigation water, generate more technology on water management and alternative cultural practices to improve soil fertility; strictly implement land conversion laws; and implement an alternative livelihood system for farmers and diversify the farming systems in rainfed areas.

(2) Increase investment in agriculture in order to enhance the development of infrastructure for agri-

culture such as irrigation, farm-to-market roads, post-harvest facilities as well as information and communication technology, and adopt a sustainable market-oriented approach to research, development and extension.

(3) For the government to review policies on trade and market linkages, specifically product standards and rationalization of transport policies, including policy that will provide credit support for organic rice and vegetable cultivation, and the improvement of access to price information.

(4) Strengthen people's organizations' capability and capacity to undertake their own development and to serve as conduits of government programs and projects by improving local governance through enhanced program planning, monitoring and evaluation of agricultural/development programs/projects; build the capacity of extension agents in tandem with farmer volunteers/leaders and other instrumentalities as well as promote integration and complementation of government agricultural programs at the local level.

(5) Implement a farmer extension/education program by developing the capability of farmer volunteers or farmer scientists as extension/change agents for effective technology dissemination; conduct farmers training through the Participatory Technology Development process; develop suitable extension materials for farmers; and establish community/farmers information and technology services.

For the text of Dr. Vargas' presentation, please see Annex E.

Stakeholders' Perspective on the Study

20. Dr. Miguel L. Aragon, director of the Agribusiness Program of the Central Luzon State University (CLSU), provided the stakeholders' perspective on the study by giving comments on the latter's organizational and management structure; the study's importance; its sections on characterization, diagnosis, and factors influencing evolution; and its recommendations.

21. Organizational and management structure. Dr. Aragon thought that the composition of the team and the inclusion of all stakeholders in the rainfed-lowland rice-based farming system met the requirement of a supra-disciplinary approach. He added that

the way the project was managed reinforced the participatory method and thus virtually guarantees its success.

22. The importance of the study. The study's objectives coincide with the Millennium Development Goals, making the study worthwhile and timely.

23. Characterization and diagnosis. Dr. Aragon commended the "characterization" for establishing a comprehensive data bank which can be used for complete analysis and diagnosis of the stakeholders, particularly the target beneficiaries. The "diagnosis" was considered complete and fully elucidated.

24. Factors influencing evolution. Dr. Aragon thought that the "driving forces" were fully accounted for but that further analysis and a more complete integration of the recommendations are necessary so that the ultimate objective of SARD could be accomplished. He likewise proposed that the study shifts its focus from equitability—which Dr. Aragon said is "difficult to meet"—towards equilibrium of the farming system—which would provide for present needs of the family without damaging the resource base.

25. Recommendations. Dr. Aragon regarded the recommendations set out in the study as valid and attainable, except for the widespread adoption of organic farming practices, which he thought might compromise the goals of achieving food security and increasing yield.

For the text of Dr. Aragon's presentation, please see Annex F.

OPEN FORUM

26. The following major issues were tackled at the Open Forum following Dr. Aragon's presentation:



27. Use of the term "territory". Participants took issue with the use of the word "territory" to refer to geographic regions where the selected countries for SARD-FSE implementation are found. Dr. William Dar suggested that a neutral, more sensitive term be used in its stead because the word "territory" has connotations which are incongruous with the participatory nature of the project, besides being anachronistic to present-day realities. Dr. Avila replied that the word "territory" is used in the same context as the Europeans use it, that is, to mean an geographical or administrative unit. Nonetheless, he agreed that a more politically correct term can be found to replace it.

28. Unaccounted for elements/components of the selected farming system. Dr. Dar wanted to know if the study took account of other income sources, for example, from crop diversification, etc. Dr. Arnulfo Garcia, member of the research team, replied that their analysis was focused on rice but that they also looked into the presence of livestock and other crops and found that there were no other crops apart from lowland rice that were suitable in that farming system. There were also few carabaos—a result of increasing farm mechanization—but the number of cattle was rising. He added that the presence of other components can be assumed because in rainfed areas most of the family's income derives from nonfarm sources.

29. Synthesizing the outputs and recommendations from all the case studies. Dr. Julian Gonsalves wanted to know how the "Integrated Synthesis" mentioned in Dr. Avila's presentation and which is expected to happen towards the end of the SARD-FSE Project, would actually be conducted. Dr. Gonsalves expressed his reservation that if the synthesis focused only on

recommendations arising from the case studies, then it would be little more than an inventory. Dr. Avila said that the synthesis can take the form of a “plan of action” and that the recommendations could be used to organize the plan according to medium- and long-term goals. The synthesis may consist of guidelines, steps or indicators for evaluating SARD, or it could be done by region, by farming system, or in response to the requirements of particular stakeholders.

30. **Outmigration of the rural youth.** Mr. Jose Osaba, consultant for the World Rural Forum, inquired about how the rural youth were faring in the Philippine project site. Dr. Vargas said that a few sons and daughters could still be found helping out in the farm, but that in general, the youth are leaving the farms. Hence, one of his team’s recommendations is to set up rural enterprises designed to benefit the rural youth and women.

Issues and Challenges Confronting SARD in Asia

The Future of SARD in Asia

31. Dr. William D. Dar, Director-General of the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), spoke on behalf of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and its perspective of SARD. CGIAR puts a lot of emphasis on rainfed agriculture because, while yields from the latter are low, it still accounts for as much as 65% of cultivated land in Asia and contributes 60% to 70% of the world’s grain supply. Hence, CGIAR considers it as imperative to develop sustainable rainfed farming systems through integrated natural resource management (INRM).

32. Meanwhile NRM research at ICRISAT has been broadened into integrated genetic and natural resource management (IGNRM), whose goal is to enhance the livelihood of the poor in semi-arid farming systems. More specifically, ICRISAT is working to: (1) develop diversified income-generating options for managing soil, water and agro-biodiversity in the dry tropics; (2) seek input-efficient, practical, integrated genetic and natural resource management solutions, which include (a) drought tolerance, water and nutrient use

efficiency, including targeting of fertilizer, manure and/or residue; (b) integrated pest management; (c) low-cost water catchments and conservation systems; (d) managing agro-biodiversity for ecosystem sustainability; and (e) institutional and policy reforms for water usage.

33. Dr. Dar then cited examples of ICRISAT’s work in community-scale watershed management, legume diversification, integrated pest management, building drought tolerance, and integrated nutrient management. Dr. Dar ended his presentation by reiterating the guiding principle for ICRISAT’s work: “Science with a Human Face,” or harnessing science as a means to serve the poor, and not as an end in itself.

For the text of Dr. Dar’s presentation, please see Annex G.

FAO’s Regional Programme and Initiative on SARD

34. Mr. Wim Polman, Rural Development Officer of the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (FAO-RAP), described FAO’s rural development strategy to meet the challenges involved in working towards the Millennium Development Goals. This strategy comprises two strategic approaches: (1) Empowerment of the rural poor through rural small and medium enterprises (SMEs); and (2) Capacity-building for pro-poor and responsive local governance.

35. As far as empowering the rural poor through SME development, RAP’s interventions have covered a wide variation of village, family and group/community level enterprises, but with a particular focus on agricultural cooperative enterprise development (ACED). This strategic approach has three priority





areas: (1) development of awareness among national policy-makers regarding the importance of rural SMEs in the effective eradication of hunger and poverty; (2) development of innovative approaches and capacity building programs, including training materials on the promotion of rural SMEs; and (3) regional networking and coalition-building at local and national levels in support of rural SMEs.

36. The second strategic approach, or capacity-building for pro-poor, responsive local governance, entails regional networking by RAPS with national and regional development agencies in order to enhance the capacities of local government officials in pro-poor participatory planning for the sustainable use of local financial and natural resources. This strategic approach is also designed to support gender sensitive Participatory, Equitable Local Development (PELD), and Mr. Polman cited a number of RAP initiatives in this regard. Mr. Polman ended his presentation by mentioning the main strategic regional partners of RAPS.

For the text of Mr. Polman's presentation, please see Annex H.

NGO/CSO Perspective of SARD at Regional Level

37. Mr. Roel R. Ravanera, project coordinator of the Asia-Japan Partnership Network (AJPN), defined SA from the NGO/CSO perspective. In particular, NGOs/CSOs view SA using ecology and equity criteria. For instance, SA is considered to have been achieved, from the ecological point of view, where pesticide use has been reduced; water and soils are being sustainably managed; and biodiversity has increased. In the meantime, SA must respond to equity

concerns, like reducing rural poverty, equalizing agricultural trade in favor of poor countries, and addressing issues emerging from the privatization of agriculture. Mr. Ravanera cited AJPN's main program interventions on SA, namely: (1) campaigning for food sovereignty and farmers' rights; (2) institutionalizing SA; and (3) engaging the market.

For the text of Mr. Ravanera's presentation, please see Annex I.

NGO/CSO Perspective of SARD at Community Level

38. Dr. Justo Canare Jr., assistant professor at CLSU, identified the current issues and challenges to SARD as seen by NGOs/CSOs at the community level. Productive resources like land, capital and credit, and water are scarcer than ever. Support services are either inadequate or inappropriate. The market is neither free nor fair, and government policy is biased in favor of intensive chemically dependent monoculture and large private agribusiness. Educational institutions have few programs on sustainable agriculture. Local politics are inhospitable to development activities. NGOs can cover only a few communities, and thus leaves out both the very rich and the very poor farmers. They are also hampered by their lack of expertise in marketing and by their weak linkages with local government units and other government institutions. The inadequate interaction among NGOs and POs poses an obstacle to the fruitful sharing of knowledge, skills, experiences and manpower.

For the text of Dr. Canare's presentation, please see Annex J.

OPEN FORUM

39. The following major points were covered in the Open Forum:

40. **Weak NGO-GO linkages.** Some participants wanted to clarify the assertion in Dr. Canare's presentation that NGOs' weak linkages with government have been a stumbling block to SARD in the Philippines since Philippine NGOs are known to be well in advance of their counter-





parts in other countries in this department. Dr. Canare said that local government officials seldom take the initiative to work with NGOs, and hence, the latter have taken on this responsibility. Mr. Cezar Belangel, PhilDHRRA National Coordinator, added that while there are collaborative initiatives between government and NGOs, these are not yet the norm. Local government officials still need to be trained to relate with NGOs, for one thing. Frequent changes in local government leadership also derail the process of building the relationship. However, where such collaboration has been institutionalized, the partnership between government and NGOs with regard to SARD can be expected to be sustained. Fr. Lucas offered a different perspective on the relationship between NGOs and government. He said that NGOs that relate with the government for what they can get out of it would not be respected by government. Nor will NGOs that cannot offer a viable alternative to what the government is doing. NGOs that refuse to work with government have the option to support candidates for office, but in doing so risk losing their “spirit”. Corruption is not a monopoly of government, said Fr. Lucas. NGOs are not immune, and so have networks to keep their activities and motives in check.

41. **Focus on internal vs. external aspects.** Mr. Elmo Angeles, representing OISCA, said that the foregoing discussion had focused on externals and non-personal issues/concerns, and that not enough attention had been given to the valuing of the self or valuing of the land. Mr. Polman replied that such concerns, particularly the valuing of the self, were implicit in the discussion. Fr. Lucas said that there is a personal dimension to SA, where it is concerned with the sacred-

ness of food: which goes beyond logic and materialism and which penetrates the heart and the being.

Inputs on the International Year of the Rice and Other Initiatives on Rice

42. On December 16, 2002 the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) declared 2004 the International Year of Rice (IYR). This declaration aimed to focus the world’s attention on the role that rice can play in providing food security and alleviating poverty. The IYR implementation strategy is to engage the entire community in initiating combined and mutually beneficial actions to face the challenges associated with a sustainable increase in rice production.

Presentation from IRRI

43. Ms. Charina Ocampo, community relations manager at the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), ran through the mission statement, theme, objectives, guiding principles, and platform for the international celebration of the International Year of the Rice (IYR), including slated activities for its observance worldwide.

For the text of Ms. Ocampo’s presentation, please see Annex K.

Presentation from PhilRice

44. Dr. Madonna C. Casimero, chief science research specialist at the Philippine Rice Research Institute (PhilRice), gave details of the Philippine IYR celebration, starting with the enabling law (*i.e.*, Presidential Proclamation 524), which also made November of every year National Rice Awareness Month. Besides affirming the importance of rice to the Filipinos, the Philippine IYR celebration aims to engage the entire community of stakeholders, from farmers to scientific institutions, in dis-



cussions and efforts to increase rice production for self-sufficiency. The Department of Agriculture is the lead agency in the Philippine observance of IYR. PhilRice is the national IYR Secretariat. Dr. Casimero then ran through the yearlong calendar of activities for the IYR celebration in the country.

For the text of Dr. Casimero's presentation, please see Annex L.



Presentation from VASI

45. Mr. Ha Dinh Tuan, agricultural scientist representing the Vietnam Agricultural Science Institute (VASI), traced the traditional/historical importance accorded to the rice crop in Vietnam, including recent government policies designed to boost rice production in the country. Coinciding with the observance of the IYR, the government of Vietnam has instituted Program 135 to support rice farmers in the river deltas, especially the Mekong Delta, as well as farmers in the midlands and highlands. Such support has included infrastructure improvements; technical assistance, specifically the provision of new high-yielding, and pest- and disease-resistant rice varieties; conversion of less-productive rice lands for aquaculture production; and price support for rice. The Vietnamese government is likewise spearheading initiatives to explore, collect and conserve rice genetic resources.

For the text of Mr. Ha Dinh Tuan's presentation, please see Annex M.

Presentation from SEARICE

46. Ms. Wilhelmina Pelegrina, executive director of the Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Commu-

nity Empowerment (SEARICE), gave the civil society response to the IYR celebration. She began by recalling the first IYR celebration in 1966, which ushered in the Green Revolution and all its attendant effects, such as genetic uniformity in rice, heavy dependence on chemical inputs, soil degradation and water contamination, among



others. Ms. Pelegrina then expressed civil society reservations that, given present trends (*e.g.*, 56% of patents on rice genes are owned by private entities in developed countries), the current IYR might give rise to a second Green Revolution. In response to such apprehensions, civil society groups have formed an East Asia Rice Working Group (EARWG), with their own alternative calendar of activities to mark the IYR worldwide. Ms. Pelegrina ended her presentation by reminding the participants that the IYR is about farmers and their lives, and hence should be marked by debates and exchanges designed to find ways to move towards SARD.

For the text of Ms. Pelegrina's presentation, please see Annex N.

Presentation from the TWG on Rice

47. Mr. Cezar Belangel, representing the Technical Working Group on Rice (TWG on Rice), traced the development of organic rice farming in the Philippines to the work of MASIPAG, an NGO. More recently, the Philippine Development Assistance Programme (PDAP), in partnership with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), started a project called Promoting Participation through Sustainable Enterprise (PPSE), which aimed, among others, to market organic rice on a large scale. While there is an acknowledged market for organic rice, a number of challenges remain, among them (1) lack of a certification process and farmers' capacity to comply with it; (2) affordability of organic rice, and hence, its accessibility not just to a limited market but also among poor farmers; (3) marketing concerns, like common product brand and packaging, advertising and product promotion, eco-labelling, and consumer

education. Mr. Belangel said that government must be persuaded to create a credit window in support of organic farmers; design and implement a national program that promotes organic production; and provide pre- to post-harvest facilities to maintain product quality and to meet certification standards.

For the text of Mr. Belangel's presentation, please see Annex O.

OPEN FORUM

48. The following major points were tackled at the Open Forum:



49. **Need for more private sector-led initiatives to promote organic farming.** Mr. Wim Polman observed that NGOs tend to depend too much on government when private sector-led initiatives (*e.g.*, a collaboration among NGOs, cooperatives and universities) would be more effective in promoting, say, organic farm production. He also commented that NGOs prefer to do things in one go when a step-by-step approach would be more appropriate. Mr. Belangel clarified that the TWG on Rice, for instance, is selective in what it is asking government to do. The certification process, for example, is private-sector led. Marketing is another component that is best handled by the private sector, particularly business. However, Mr. Belangel insisted that the government should at least incorporate organic production in its rice master plan to achieve self-sufficiency in this food crop.

50. **Responsiveness of research institutions.** Ms. Pelegrina expressed her frustration that CSO/NGO dialogues with research institutions like IRRI are not what

they used to be, and that just getting people to sit and talk has become very difficult. Dr. Julian Gonsalves, however, was more optimistic, saying that research institutions have transformed themselves in the same way that the business sector has. In any case, said Dr. Gonsalves, achieving record yields, like 5 tons per hectare, is no longer in dispute. The techniques are straightforward and can be taught quite easily. What is needed, he said, is a campaign directed at the poor and controlled by them. Dr. Casimero added that the government strongly supports PhilRice's Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and that this has made all the difference. She cited the strong political will shown by Indonesia's leadership in banning the use of organophosphates in the country as a similar example of how such initiatives can succeed.

51. In closing the First Day of the Workshop, Dr. Avila outlined four tentative points to focus on on the Second Day, as follows:

- ✍ The methodology in analyzing potential policies and institutional priorities;
- ✍ Policy recommendations that can be brought to bear on SARD (*e.g.*, how to increase productivity of rice);
- ✍ Diversification to strengthen productivity; and
- ✍ Strategies, approaches and mechanisms to disseminate, advocate and increase dialogue among stakeholders.

Panel Presentation on Country Policy Issues and Institutional Strategies for SARD

Indonesia

52. Mr. A. Ghaffar Rahman, representing Bina Desa, gave a background of his organization, including its network affiliations. He added that his NGO is not so optimistic about SARD, particularly in the uplands, because these have been taken over for other purposes. Their experience in relation to SARD includes programs such as leadership training, policy advocacy, a rural information center, sustainable development, and decentralization. He emphasized that

other crops (now rural households eat rice only) should be increased for nutrition objectives, that agricultural land was being rapidly converted to non-agricultural land, and that development of uplands should be a priority.

Cambodia

53. Mr. Hok Bun Thoeun, executive director of the Cambodian NGO Alliance for Cooperation (CNAC), identified four government policies in aid of SARD: (1) cultivation of marketable crops, particularly those that can be processed; (2) use of green manure and traditional pesticides in place of chemicals; (3) development of agricultural cooperatives, especially the revolving fund for members; and (4) encouragement of private sector investments in agriculture. He also listed a number of priority projects for the government in relation to SARD. These are: (1) institutional strengthening and human resource development; (2) infrastructure building; (3) provision of clean drinking water and environmental sanitation; and (4) expansion of small-scale irrigation systems. Meanwhile, he cited a number of roles that NGOs can play to promote SARD, among them, the provision of appropriate agricultural technologies to farmers; establishment of rice banks and farmers unions or associations in communities; propagation of the use of alternatives to agricultural chemicals; and assistance to Village Development Councils in starting sustainable development projects. *(For the full report, see Annex P.)*

Thailand

54. Mr. Somporn Isaranurak, senior expert in cropping systems at the Department of Agriculture (DOA) in Thailand, reported that the government, through the DOA, actively promotes and implements SA. The DOA's eight regional Offices of Agricultural Research



and Development are responsible for various SA-related programs, among them: on-farm soil and water

conservation and management; pest management; plant disease management; recycling of plant residue, and human resource development, including training in SA. The DOA



is also involved in SA initiatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC). The MOAC facilitated, for instance, the formulation of a Sustainable Agriculture Development Action Program, which is designed to involve both government and NGOs in a cooperative effort to promote and provide opportunities for SA development. This program subsumes six main activities: (1) research and development on SA; (2) training of farmers and government personnel; (3) infrastructure development; (4) encouraging farm development plans and adoption of natural farming, organic farming, integrated farming, and agroforestry-oriented production methods; (5) activities to develop methods for processing, packaging, and the adoption of standards for SA products; and (6) assistance in the marketing of SA produce.

Laos

55. Mr. Vandy Phetpaseuth, head of the rice seed multiplication unit of the Department of Agriculture of Laos, focused on two government policies promoting SARD. The first is related to food production which aims to improve the quantity, quality and availability of food through the intensification of production and expansion of cultivable areas, integrated pest management, and extension, among others. The current government projects in this regard are in the areas of rice production, biodiversity protection, integrated pest management, and decentralized, participatory agricultural extension system that benefits men and women equally. In the future, improvement of rice seed varieties, especially high-yielding and disease-resistant ones, would be prioritized. Meanwhile, NGOs are expected to disseminate new technologies to farmers, especially those that promote high yields. The second government policy is concerned with stabilizing the rice processing environment, specifically by reducing slash-and-burn cultivation. About 100,000 families

would be encouraged to take up alternative on- and off-farm activities such as agroforestry, animal husbandry, cash crop cultivation in the mountain plains, etc. Presently, the government has projects/programs promoting agroecology, stabilization in the uplands, and technologies, approaches and methods to improve upland livelihoods. Monitoring land use in each village is a concern for the future. NGOs for their part are expected to support sustainable land use in the uplands and organize training in soil conservation, especially against erosion. (*For the full report, see Annex Q.*)

Vietnam

56. Mr. Ha Dinh Tuan, agricultural scientist at VASI, reported that with regard to agriculture, the Vietnamese government is primarily concerned with ensuring food security, diversifying agricultural production, and market research and development. It has adopted policies directed towards the sustainable development of farming systems, as follows: (1) development of the farm household economy; (2) land allocation for long-term use; (3) land use tax reduction and exemption; (4) credit for farm households; (5) scientific research, technology development and agricultural extension; (6) improvements in the distribution and marketing of agro-products; (7) improvement of agro-product quality; (8) promotion of mountain agriculture and rural development in more sustainable ways; (9) promotion of ecologically oriented production approaches; (10) poverty alleviation and hunger eradication. (*For the full report, see Annex R.*)

India

57. Dr. Bisheshwar Mishra, general secretary of the Association for Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development (AVARD), cited SARD related priority areas in the Indian Government's Tenth Plan (2002-07), as follows: (1) utilization of wastelands; (2) reclamation/development of problem soils; (3) rainwater harvesting and conservation for the development of minor irrigation; (4) conservation and utilization of biological resources; (5) diversification with high value crops; (6) increasing cropping intensity; (7) promotion of a Farming Systems Approach; (8) promotion of organic farming and utilization of organic waste; (9) stabilization of fertilizer prices; (10) promotion of

integrated pest management; etc. The Common Programme of the United Progressive Alliance Government also has pertinent provisions: (a) increased allocation for agricultural research and extension, rural infrastructure and irrigation; (b) a special program for dryland farming in arid and semiarid regions; (c) watershed and wasteland development; (d) full implementation of minimum wage laws for farm labor; (e) safety nets for farmers against cheap imports; and (f) fair prices for agricultural produce. NGOs are expected to take a lead role in programs that promote organic farming; implement watershed conservation and development programs; diversify agricultural production; strengthen local governance; and alleviate poverty, among others. (*For the full report, see Annex S.*)

China

58. Mr. Haoming Huang, executive director of China Association for NGO Cooperation (CANGO), identified five government policies promoting SARD in China. The first—comprehensive management for sustainable development—is concerned with addressing the problem of decreasing per capita availability of land. NGOs' role in this area is focused on advocacy. The second government policy is enhancing food security and building early warning systems, and involves the pilot testing of systems to save water or use it more efficiently, especially in agriculture. NGOs contribute by sharing best practice. The third, adjusting the structure of agriculture and optimizing the combination of resources and production factors, is targeted at increasing agricultural productivity and requires the mainstreaming of eco-friendly agriculture. NGOs pro-





vide the model for SARD. The fourth policy aims to improve comprehensive productivity, and develop the scientific basis for SA. NGOs complement this effort by educating the general public. Lastly, the policy promoting the sustainable use of agricultural resources and environmental protection seeks to address the increasing pollution of the agricultural environment. NGOs play a part in information sharing. (*For the full report, see Annex T.*)

Philippines

59. Mr. Cezar Belangel, PhilDHRA national coordinator, focused on four government policies supportive of SARD. Achieving self-sufficiency in rice by 2010 is a major policy currently being pursued by the promotion of hybrid rice technology, expansion of irrigated lands, allowing farmers to import rice, providing credit support, and the eventual lifting of quantitative restrictions on rice imports. Future efforts should focus on building the case for organic rice farming through model implementation and research. The second policy is concerned with increasing the role of local governments, with the participation of civil society groups, in planning, implementing and evaluation of development initiatives required by communities. This currently requires enhancing the capability of local governments to engage with civil society, among others, and in future will call for a greater facilitating role for NGOs, localized agricultural planning, and strengthened capacity among local governments for agri-extension work. The development of rural small and medium enterprises (SMEs), as well as linking the major agri-products to processing and marketing channels, is the third government policy

cited. While this is already a major thrust of the Department of Agriculture and some support is being given to small and medium-scale enterprises, there is a need to build linkages with the business sector and to organize small producers to play a major role in production, processing and marketing of agri-products; this is where NGOs can play a part. (*For the full report, see Annex U.*)

Nepal

60. Mr. Shanta Lall Mulmi, general secretary of the NGO Federation of Nepal (NFN), explained the government's SARD policies as directed towards: (1) enhancing food security; (2) enhancing the productivity of agricultural and rural enterprises; (3) increasing rural employment through the development of agro-based rural enterprises; (4) diversifying agricultural and rural enterprises and thus increasing household income; and (5) promoting environment friendly agriculture. The Government's Agriculture Perspective Plan (APP) provides for programs in the categories of prioritized production and service (*e.g.*, crop intensification and productivity enhancement, production and development of high value agriculture, livestock and poultry production, agri-business promotion, etc.); priority production input mobilization; other sectoral programs (*e.g.*, seed multiplication, plant protection, land productivity enhancement, etc.); capacity building; research and technology development; etc. (*For the full report, see Annex V.*)

Sri Lanka

61. Mr. Cyril Ekanayake, vice president of SARVODAYA, listed the government's interventions in support of the development of agriculture as a means of providing sustainable livelihoods to the majority of the population. They are as follows: (1) provision of irrigation facilities; (2) establishment of colonies in newly irrigated areas; (3) restoration and maintenance of small tanks and irrigation channels; (4) transfer of land ownership to the colonists; (5) supply of fertilizers at subsidized rates; (6) guaranteed price for paddy; (7) easy-term loans for farmers; (8) reduction of duties on farm machinery. All these programs and interventions are designed to work towards self-sufficiency in food, making agriculture a viable economic pursuit, and preventing rural outmigration. The insti-

tutions involved, however, are mostly government agencies. (For the full report, see Annex W.)

Pakistan

62. Mr. Khurram Riaz, executive director of Rural Development Foundation of Pakistan (RDF), identified the following future government interventions: (1) timely sowing with proper technique; (2) use of quality seeds and optimal plan for pipeline levels; (3) judicious and efficient use of inputs; (4) effective pest management; (5) market incentives and favorable prices; (6) larger space for the private sector; (7) share of bank credit to be increased from 65-100 billion rupees; (8) mega project of 86000 water courses, lining and revamping. Meanwhile, NGOs are particularly helpful in providing micro-credit in support of SARD, community mobilizing, facilitating the introduction of new crops, and strengthening communities to manage local resources in lieu of the private sector.

WORKSHOP SESSION 1: Strengthening the Methodology, Recommendations and Strategies of the SARD-FSE Project

Process

63. By asking the participants to count off from one to four, four workshop groups were formed to tackle the following major topics:

- ✍ Review of SARD-FSE methodological procedures/elements;
- ✍ Review of pro-SARD recommendations and interventions;
- ✍ Strategic objectives and interventions for diversifying rainfed rice based farming system toward SARD;
- ✍ Strategy for communicating with relevant key stakeholders for SARD advocacy and collaboration.

Plenary Discussion

Workshop Group I

64. Workshop Group I focused on four specific



methodological procedures or elements of SARD-FSE, namely: (1) participation of different institutional stakeholders, (2) participation of local stakeholders in analyzing future scenarios and policy recommendations; (3) the production /farming system; and (4) the meaning of SARD. While the group commended the manner in which the project was carried out, they proposed that a more flexible approach be adopted to take into account the peculiarities of Philippine culture; that bottom-up assessments be worked into the initial stages of the Project, that rice research institutions be more actively involved; and that the role of women and the youth be highlighted, among others. They then provided corresponding comments on how each was done right and how it can be improved.

For the full report of Group 1, please see Annex AA.

Workshop Group II

65. Workshop Group II tackled five pro-SARD recommendations, as follows: (1) increasing agricultural productivity; (2) increasing investment in agriculture; (3) trade and market linkages; (4) institutional strengthening of people's organizations; and (5) farmer extension/education. The group argued that agricultural productivity would be improved by adopting mixed cropping and organic farming methods, boosting crop improvement efforts, developing seeds at community level, setting up irrigation facilities and finding alternative water sources, among others. The group emphasized the need to increase investments in agriculture, develop efficient market linkages, set up local enterprises, strengthen people's organizations, as well as link farmer extension with local government

plans and programs. The group then gave suggestions on how these recommendations can be improved on as well as identified opportunities for their implementation.

For the full report of Group II, please see Annex AB.

Workshop Group III

66. Workshop Group III worked on three strategic objectives and interventions for diversifying the rainfed rice-based farming system towards SARD, namely, (1) add value to rice products for the benefit of small farmers; (2) improve integrated natural resource management of the system; and (3) reduce the vulnerability of the system to climatic factors. The group proposed to add value to rice products by providing/improving storage and processing facilities, and giving credit support for organic farming. INRM should focus on the management of rainwater and community based watershed systems, and addressing problems of soil depletion and crop infestation. Meanwhile, the farming system can be protected from untimely events by growing drought tolerant crop varieties, legumes, fruit trees, etc.

For the full report of Group III, please see Annex AC.

Workshop Group IV

67. Workshop Group IV considered five key stakeholder groups (*i.e.*, policy makers; local government units; women and youth farmers or producers; academic and research institutions; and training centers), and determined the priorities for mobilizing each group and how best to get their attention. Policymakers are best approached through dialogue, SARD workshops, farmer-led lobbies, and global advocacy networks. Local government units respond well to demonstrations of how SARD benefits local farmers. Women and youth farmers require capacity-building interventions in order to strengthen their organizations, bargaining and negotiating skills, and capacity to run micro-enterprises.

For the full the report of the plenary discussion of Workshop Session 1 Group 4, please see Annex AD.

WORKSHOP SESSION 2: Priority Action/Next Steps

Process

68. Workshop Session 2 focused on themes/topics for regional collaboration for SARD. Pieces of paper were passed around on which each participant was asked to write one important/strategic theme/topic on which to base regional collaboration in the follow-up for SARD. Similar or related suggestions were grouped together, and four major themes/topics emerged.

69. The participants were then asked to sign up for each group according to their interest or inclination, whereupon the following workshop groups were formed:

Group I: Rural Enterprises and Markets

Facilitator: Antonio Quizon

Members:

- ✍ Jerry Pacturan
- ✍ Cyril Ekanayake
- ✍ Hok Bun Thoeun
- ✍ Danilo Vargas
- ✍ Marcelino Avila
- ✍ Wim Polman

Topics identified during plenary:

- ✓ Developing village level/community based enterprises that will help the development of agriculture
- ✓ (Communities) linking/engaging with the market
- ✓ Farmers' bargaining position relative to the market (trader)
- ✓ Opening "SARD-product markets" in support of local producers
- ✓ Incentive system to promote equitability.

Group II: Solidarity Network/Information Exchange

Facilitator: Haoming Huang

Members:

- ✍ Michio Ito
- ✍ Nhek Sarin
- ✍ Srun Sokhom
- ✍ Jose Osaba

- ✍ Saman Amarasinghe
- ✍ Maria Teresa Agarrado
- ✍ Somporn Isaranurak
- ✍ Vandy Phetpaseuth

Topics identified during plenary:

- ✓ Set up a mechanism on regional network movement and exchange information on SARD
- ✓ Share experiences and exchange information on a regular basis
- ✓ SARD Regional Monitoring Committee
- ✓ Regional collaboration in watershed-SARD management in Mekong River and local institutions
- ✓ Sharing data about crucial issues related to SARD
- ✓ Communication and exchange among research institutions on results (e.g. new varieties of certain crops) at regional level
- ✓ Make understanding and promotion of SARD for all concerned parties
- ✓ Develop information sharing network in the region
- ✓ Exchange of success stories among networks in countries
- ✓ Farmer to farmer knowledge sharing

Group III: Resource Rights/Land Reform

Facilitator: P.V. Rajagopal

Members:

- ✍ Murli Manohar Mathur
- ✍ Shanta Lall Mulmi
- ✍ Elmo Angeles
- ✍ A. Ghaffar Rahman
- ✍ Yosef Arihadi



Topics identified during plenary:

- ✓ Enhancing access to land, common property resources and related services
- ✓ Land reform for SARD
- ✓ Agrarian reform

Group IV: Capacity Building/Good Agricultural Practices

Facilitator: Rohini Reddy

Members:

- ✍ Sandhya Kumar
- ✍ Suhas P. Wani
- ✍ Arnulfo Garcia
- ✍ Vu Thi Quynh Hoa
- ✍ Khurram Riaz
- ✍ Justo Canare
- ✍ Bisheshwar Mishra

Topics identified during plenary:

- ✓ Capacity Building of rural grassroots (farmers) organizations
- ✓ Sensitization and training about participatory watershed management
- ✓ The Sustainable Agriculture “Farmer” (as a person)
- ✓ Capacity building for the academe (it does instruction, research, extension and production)
- ✓ Methodology on Policy Intervention
- ✓ Methodology for Decision Support Systems
- ✓ Development through grassroots for sustainability
- ✓ Curriculum development and training on SARD for trainers and farmers
- ✓ Building Capacity on SARD Strategies
- ✓ Diversification of Rice systems using INRM model
- ✓ Effective Management of Natural Resources
- ✓ Local food systems
- ✓ Guidebook on “SARD implementation and its indicators.

Each workshop group was asked to identify at least three (3) objectives from their assigned theme/topic and to come up with corresponding expected outputs, strategic objectives, and responsible/interested stakeholders. The groups were given until 10 in the morning

of the following day to work on their respective reports.

Synthesis of Day 1 and Day 2: Inputs to the Plenary Discussion

Synthesis of Day 1

70. Day 1's presentations were summarized by Dr. Julian Gonsalves, as follows: The global development community and increasingly the research community are now acutely aware that they have missed out on their commitments to the poor. Poor and less favored areas are now therefore being targeted. A preferential option for the poor is being expressed.

71. *“Dynamic complexity” and “crisis” in many rural areas and rural communities:* Even vibrant and thriving agricultural areas can degrade and decline (and eventually stagnate).

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) seem to offer the potential to galvanize communities of SARD practitioners in an effort to renew their commitment to SARD approaches.

What does being pro-poor imply? Being pro-poor requires that we address livelihoods in its broadest forms, including the need to reduce the vulnerability of the poor. It implies the need to address issues of resource-rights and tenure. It requires new modalities of work. It requires stronger local organizations where the poor have a voice. Technologies are of strategic importance but within a broader livelihoods enhancement and protection framework.

72. *SARD: What does it constitute in today's world?* Is it SA? Is it RD? Or is it SA in RD? Is it Ecology? Is it Equity? Is it Science with a human face? Is it farmers' rights?

This is often determined by the proponent. What is important though is that a set of commonly accepted principles are in place and widely understood. These are subject to revision to meet changing global needs.

There is little room for faddism or fundamentalism if approaches are to be scaled up. But the goal of SARD remains that of healthy families which result from food and nutrition security, eco-friendly agriculture, equitable access to and sustainable management



of land, fisheries and other natural resources and efficient and effective services for SARD.

73. *The value of rights-based approaches:* To succeed in SARD, one has to understand and factor in property rights and tenure security. Land access and tenure remain MAJOR issues even in 2003/04 (landlessness, insecure tenure, land reconsolidation, land conversion, fragmentation).

There are structural inequalities that prevent women from accessing resources, services and benefits.

What can be done to safeguard rights, livelihoods and environments of local resource users affected by rapid and uncertain global changes over which they have little control?

Free trade is possible but only on a fair and level playing ground. There is today an unprecedented concentration of corporate power in the seed, seed-related and the pesticide industry, both at the production and retailing ends.

Farmers and the agroecosystems that they manage are embedded in wider food systems.

74. *SARD: Towards a new understanding of its biophysical and ecological dimensions:*

The challenges to SARD proponents remain even as technological solutions are being generated.

The pro-poor orientation of SARD has drawn attention to the INRM sector. INRM today is more livelihood oriented (e.g., CBNRM) and is being targeted to less favored areas (uplands, mountains, semi-arid, degrading lowlands); building ecosystem resilience to address vulnerability to natural hazards; and addressing the massive degradation of water and land and deforestation.

Integration, however, is needed not just at the farm level but also at the landscape and watershed levels.

75. Some ways in which SARD expresses itself include: value addition through agroprocessing, increased attention to post-harvest dimensions, watershed conservation, medicinal plants, agroforestry, small holder livestock production. Enterprises can be agriculture-related. Capacities need to be built for entrepreneurship. A special concern is being voiced on enhancing the role of women and educated farm youth in SARD.

76. Policy for SARD:

Do we have enabling macroeconomic policies in most SARD areas and is it really an issue of poor implementation and regulation, not a lack of appropriate policy?

77. SARD proponents are on the lookout for new forms of learning, negotiation and effective collective action; farmer-to-farmer approaches, farmer-centered research and extension, farmer field schools, and social learning approaches.

Negotiation and conflict resolution assume new importance. These have implications for capacity development, especially among the poor.

Effective documentation and synthesis of best practice for wider sharing of learning, (*i.e.*, dealing with principles drawn from practice that helps us overcome the local specificity of some SARD work.)

How does one promote the much needed dialogue and exchange on SARD in a donor community that is weary of conferences and workshops and other mega events?

78. Comparative advantages of NGOs as key players of SARD:

NGOs play a critical role in serving remote and marginalized communities or areas (*e.g.*, indigenous people), mobilizing and motivating community based initiatives, helping deliver credit to the poor (micro credit, self help groups), developing linkages between farmers and industry and helping promote and advocate for good SARD practices at all levels.

These require that NGOs learn to develop healthy and constructive relationships with governments in order



to enhance their advocacy efforts, partnership building and pressure exerting roles.

79. Reinvigorating local organizations:

Local organizations are needed to help devolve responsibilities, to monitor, and to transfer control of natural resources to local communities. Local organizations are needed for collective action, to bring in a culture of accountability and to monitor performance. Local organizations are social assets.

What kinds of organizations do we need (now that more than 60% of cooperatives have stopped operating)? Are we putting too much emphasis on form and structure? Are informal groups (*e.g.*, the fast growing Self Help Group movement in South Asia) inadequate? What kind of community organizing do farmers need in this new age; why are we still using the methods generated for a different period of our history, instead of focusing on current needs and realities (negotiation and conflict resolution skills, nurturing market “wise” communities)?

80. SARD can nurture social capital:

Social capital does not necessarily exist in local communities. It could already have degraded.

Social capital can be nurtured via SARD (*e.g.*, successful collaboration or successful collective action).

However, effective local organizations are important in the nurturing process.

81. Governance issues:

Some key constraints to SARD that were identified include instability of government administrations (frequent change of political leaders together with their senior technical managers), rapid decentralization and devolution processes (*i.e.*, disconnect of authority and responsibilities with institutional capacity and resource allocation at the decentralized levels), landlessness and marginalization of large segments of the rural population, vulnerability to natural hazards, and excessive dependence on external donors.

Synthesis of sessions on Day 2

82. Dr. Marcelino Avila provided a synthesis of the sessions on Day 2, as follows:

83. The analysis of the SARD-FSE case study in the Philippines was enriched by the contributions of the national programs and priorities related to SARD. The synthesis of these findings and lessons learned



are summarized under four main topics. Each topic was analyzed in a small working group and subsequently reviewed and improved by the plenary.

84. *SARD methodological procedures*: Among the particular strengths of the SARD methodology, the workshop noted the appropriate range of multidisciplinary capabilities employed in the PSC and in the research team (also a satisfactory gender balance in the latter), the good response from local stakeholders (*i.e.*, municipal and farmer leaders, key informants and the farmers themselves) in the diagnostic and future scenarios analyses, the very good documentation of the production/farming system with comprehensive information dating back several decades, including a good description of gender and youth roles, the management of water and fertilizer resources, and last but not least, the emphasis placed on culture and the common features associated with the meaning of SARD. Some specific recommendations offered to strengthen the methodology are the need to have a more flexible approach to ensure a better fit of the methodology with the local Philippine culture and with bottom-up assessments from the start of the project. Also that there should be more participation of the rice research institute, more holistic descriptions of the farming system/community interactions, a clear focus on enhancing the role of women and in particular how to motivate the youth to return to agriculture. The point was made that SARD goes beyond agriculture and should be defined within the total context of rural development.

85. *Pro-SARD recommendations and interventions*: The workshop indicated that to increase agricultural productivity, it is deemed necessary to focus

on mixed cropping, organic farming, policy gaps, past efforts on crop improvement, community developed seeds, appropriate irrigation facilities and alternative sources of water, and farmers' access to agricultural resources and services (*e.g.* seeds, land and water). The workshop also suggested to explore ways of increasing investment for small farmers and sustainable agriculture, the development of operational and viable marketing systems, village level processing enterprises, professionalization of government in external relations for building effective trade-marketing linkages, strong financial support to local people's organizations, enterprise development and horizontal linkages, as well as linking farmer extension/education with local government planning and programs (*e.g.*, Farm Science Center of India), and with gender-sensitive approaches to encourage and expand livelihood opportunities for women.

86. *Diversification of the rainfed rice-based farming system*: The workshop recommended that to add value to rice and other products from the system for small farmers and families, it is necessary to focus on storage, processing facilities, credit for organic farming, and in this respect, sharing experiences in the region would be extremely valuable. Also it was suggested to improve the integrated natural resource management (INRM) of the system, particularly in terms of the management of rainwater, soil fertility and pests, and community based watershed. To reduce the vulnerability of the farming system, the workshop highlighted the lack of high-yielding/drought-tolerant varieties, the use of legumes, fruit trees, vegetables, livestock (poultry and ducks) and others, and intensified backyard cultivation of vegetables. In all these options, a key objective is the improvement of the nutritional quality of food for the rural family.

87. *Communication strategy for targeting key stakeholders for SARD advocacy and collaboration*: The workshop recommended that for policy makers, including government parliamentarians, it was necessary to focus on the awareness of the important value



of SARD, its tangible benefits for poverty reduction and rural development, concrete proposals for budget allocations. And for policy makers, that the best means for effective communication would be direct dialogue, support of international consultants, information kits, their participation in SARD workshops, farmers working as pressure groups, and global advocacy networks. For the local government units, the key priorities are the ability of LGUs to mobilize and manage resources, enhancing devolution and decentralization with real capacity and authority, and networking. For LGUs, the best means to make them proactive is to demonstrate how SARD can benefit local farmers and for them to witness good SARD practices on the ground. For women and youth farmers, the workshop recommended capacity building and empowerment, focus on farmer's rights, and strengthening them in terms of their organization, bargaining power and micro-business and enterprise skills.

88. Recommendations for academic and research staff include an awareness of SARD, funding for SARD farmer-centered and participatory approaches, their promotion and sustainability issues, for which seminars, training workshops and experience sharing through international or regional cooperation, all of these would be effective means of enlisting their involvement. The workshop indicated that it is important to build SARD awareness in local training centers by including SARD in their curricula, privatization and having more liberty to teach SARD and exposing trainers to more SARD practices.

89. To implement these relevant pro-SARD methods, recommendations and strategies, the workshop recommended that it is essential to develop real partnerships, results-oriented alliances and networking that involves local farmer organizations, local government units, government departments, NGOs, research institutes and the private business sector. Such mechanisms should be driven by the priority objectives and potentials of the small producers and the rural poor and by the basic principles and desirable outcomes of SARD.

Plenary Discussion of Workshop Session 2 Rural Enterprises and Markets

90. Group I put together five recommendations:

The first one, "Promoting better understanding of market opportunities and requirements", calls for building practical skills in dealing with the market, and knowledge of market conditions, requirements and costs; development of marketing networks and viable market linkages for small farmer producers; and lobbying for market policies that favor small farmers. Specifically, meeting this objective would require identifying by-products and services which could be produced from RBFS (fresh, processed and organic); prioritizing products and services that can be marketed; determining market prices, conditionalities and costs; identifying marketing needs and strategy; and capacity-building for small producers.

91. Objective 2, "Establishing links with the market and building the negotiating capacity of small farmers", requires mechanisms at local level to maximize markets; capable institutions that effectively reach-out to small producers and provide services that strengthen their linkages to markets; and strong regional alliances of small producers



and their organizations, engaging in trade. The specific activities this would entail are development of agricultural development investment plans by local government and producers' organizations; helping organizations produce "winning commodities or products"; improving mechanisms and capacities for the appropriate and timely delivery of goods and services; linking producer groups horizontally to maximize market opportunities; and improving rural communities' and local governments' access to government services related to the market.

92. Meanwhile, "Promoting rural enterprises for livelihood diversification" is contingent on the development of the capacities of farmers and NGOs for rural enterprise development; building the entrepreneurial skills of women and other marginal sectors; and the institutionalization of policies supportive of rural producers and enterprises. "Support services and



infrastructure” includes collecting centers for agricultural products; financial support for start-up rural enterprises; and building

forward linkages with markets. “Social marketing of SARD itself for environmental services and building community cultural identity” can be said to have been achieved where SA, and environmental and rural development practices have been adopted; policies supportive of SARD are in place; formal and informal networks of SARD practitioners and producers have been established; the environmental and cultural contributions of SARD are broadly acknowledged; and systems for local certification and branding have been set up, as well as an intellectual property rights regime that is affordable and accessible to small producers and small and medium enterprises.

93. “Fair trade” organizations, consumer groups, regional NGOs, rural producers’ organizations and cooperatives, NGOs involved in enterprise development, business development services (BDS), and the private sector, especially businesses with a social conscience, local governments, and relevant government agencies, and FAO should be asked to participate in these activities.

For the full report of Group I, please see Annex AE.

Solidarity Network and Information Exchange

94. The first objective identified by Group II, “Building up cooperation and partnership among NGOs/GOs/ CSOs/Private sectors and UN/donors and enhancing policy advocacy for SARD”, would lead to the establishment of an information network secretariat, putting together a SARD databank, research and development, and enhanced policy advocacy, and is proposed to be carried out by generating funds from bilateral and multilateral agreements, establishing an e-group and website, survey-mapping and analysis of information technologies, etc. NGOs like ANGOC, AJPN, government agencies, and UN bodies like FAO-

RAP, UNDP, UNEP, WFP, and IFAD, among others, are expected to take part. The second objective—“Strengthening capacity (human and institutional) for SARD”—should result in increased capacity for SARD at regional, institutional and local levels, development of a course curriculum for SARD, and empowerment of women, youth and marginalized and senior farmers. It requires the holding of workshops, training and seminars; research and development activities; preparation of training manuals in local languages; creation of a Monitoring and Evaluation Team (MET); linkages with academic and research institutions; and dialogues with the local community, among others. FAO-RAP, the Academe, National and local governments, the EU, ADB, WB, IFAD, CGIAR institutions, NGOs/CSOs, NGO regional network, INGOS, WRF (World Rural Forum), and farmers groups are important stakeholders in these efforts.

For the full report of Group II, please see Annex AF.



Land Reform and Resource Rights

95. Group III identified a number of Specific Objectives, including making SARD a people-centered process; reducing conflict, and creating an environment in which SARD can succeed; rallying public opinion to the cause of the poor and achieving a more equitable distribution of resources, among others. The group expects to reverse or put a stop to the trend of giving the corporate sector more and more control over land and other resources; make land reform a priority agenda; prevent migration; and enable more landless people to gain access to land and thereby join the SARD process. Towards these ends, the group

plans to promote networking among like-minded groups, lobby at the national and international levels, document successful models for land reform and forest management, support people's movements around land and livelihood resources, develop leaders among marginalized communities who can take up the struggle to regain control of resources, etc.

96. The relevant stakeholders are landless/resource-poor communities, NGOs and MBOs working on land and related activities in the region, some political parties and some government officials, UN agencies, regional networks (e.g., ANGOC), land movements and solidarity groups across the world, human rights organizations, issue-based networks (like those on right to food, right to water, etc.), and intellectuals and research institutes, etc.

For the full report of Group III, please see Annex AG.

Capacity Building/Good Agricultural Practices

97. Group IV recommended "Identification and promotion of good Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) practices for SARD" by first identifying best practice in INRM, as well as SARD models, like diversified and integrated farming systems. "Building and enhancing the capacity of stakeholders to promote SARD" requires appropriate training and training materials as well as judicious use of information and communication technologies (ICTs). "Identifying suitable mechanisms to communicate policy recommendations for SARD" involves strengthening of advocacy groups and development of policy briefs and recommendations.

98. NGOs (e.g., SARRA, AIRD, AVARD, ANGOC, VACVINA, PRRM), Agricultural Universities and Research Institutions, Government Units, and farmers groups are the relevant stakeholders.

For the full report of Group IV, please see Annex AH.

OPEN FORUM

Facilitated by Dr. Patricio Faylon

99. The Open Forum focused on follow up strategies.

100. A specific request of the workshop is for FAO, ANGOC and other collaborating organizations to explore support for follow-up projects and activities in

order to produce concrete field-level outputs from this Workshop. Otherwise, it would be just a "talk-but-no-walk-shop". Hence, it was recommended that feedback be gathered and recommendations analyzed with local stakeholders.

101. Workshop participants (i.e., FAO, ANGOC, PCARRD, SEARCA, CLSU, and others) were requested to explore, promote and negotiate interest, political will, collaboration and resources to implement the workshop recommendations.

102. The FAO team committed to do the following:

- ✓ Insert the workshop proposals into ongoing programs and initiatives;
- ✓ Use the proposals to complement and strengthen project proposals that are being negotiated with potential donors;
- ✓ Develop the recommendations into fully fledged proposals in accordance with the workshop's intentions.

Closing

103. Dr. Avila pointed out that the comments on the youth show that this is a strategic crosscutting concern. He said that young people are important to the future of SARD, and hence, the topics covered in the workshop should be reviewed to see how the participation of the youth can be emphasized. It is important, he said, that agriculture becomes profitable to the youth. If agriculture cannot meet their aspirations for a better life, then agriculture doesn't stand a chance.

104. Fr. Francis thanked all the participants, particularly Sec. Lorenzo, Dr. Dar, Dr. Vargas, Dr. Gonsalves, Mr. Quizon, Dr. Rodolfo Undan, and those that had been engaged in the research, the Philippine Steering Committee, the facilitators, discussants, FAO, the Governments of Japan and France. He recalled ANGOC's pioneering initiatives in SA and assured that the network will likewise follow through on SARD.

Workshop Evaluation

105. The participants were asked to evaluate the workshop by answering two questions: (1) What did you like most about the workshop?, and (2) What changes or improvements would you suggest?

106. The participants commended the quality of the speakers and presentations, the participation of NGOs, the experience gained through the case study, the workshop dynamics, the discussion and sharing of ideas, the focus on SARD issues and challenges, how the workshop was synthesized, and the work of the ANGOC staff.

107. On the other hand, they thought that the workshop would have benefited from better time manage-

ment, especially on the part of the presenters, more panel discussions and open fora, better integration of topics and sessions, greater involvement of grassroots sectors, farmer leaders, senior government officials, and potential donors. They also thought that a visit to the SARD study site would have been highly instructive.



