



Foundations and Family Farming:

Exploratory Study on Strategies,
Operational Practices and Learning

Marlèn Arkesteijn
Rosien Herweijer

Photo credits:

Most of the photographs used throughout this publication have been provided by the foundations or their partners, and are labelled with the contributing organisation's name. Photos without labels were sourced from an online photolibrary (www.shutterstock.com).

On the cover (small pictures from left to right):

1. Tea-picking in Tanzania (Gatsby and the Wood Family Trust). 2. Cera, BRS & Trias support family farmers in Honduras. 3. Family Farmers in Benin – (Fondation de France, 2012). 4. Children learning about beekeeping in Eastern Tyrol (Forum Synergies & FPH).

Back cover (small pictures from left to right):

1. Preparing cotton for delivery to a ginnery in Tanzania (Gatsby Charitable Foundation). 2. Family Farming in Lesachtal (Forum Synergies & FPH). 3. Farmer's solidarity group in Uganda receiving financial training (BRS & Cera). 4. Algaculture in the Philippines (Fondation de France).



This publication was made possible with generous support from Cera, Compagnia di San Paolo, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme, Fondation de France, and Fondazione Cariplo.

Copyright © European Foundation Centre (EFC) 2014.

All rights reserved. Reproduction by any means mechanical or electronic is prohibited without express written consent of the publisher. Quotation from this publication is authorised subject to full identification of source. Every effort has been made to ensure the quality of information in this document. However, the EFC cannot guarantee the accuracy and completeness of information published in this document. The EFC is not responsible for consequences resulting from use of information provided in this document. The EFC expressly disclaims all liability for, damages of any kind arising out of use of, reference to, reliance on, or performance of the information given in this document.

For additional copies of this publication and further information on the EFC and its activities, please contact: efc@efc.be

Foundations and Family Farming:

Exploratory Study on Strategies, Operational Practices and Learning

Marlèn Arkesteijn
Rosien Herweijer



Contents

Preface..... 3

Acknowledgements..... 4

Key findings 5

PART I: INTRODUCTION AND EXPLORATION OF THE FIELD

I Introduction..... 7

2 Exploring the field: Family farming and the crisis of the current agricultural production and consumption system..... 9

PART II: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3 Foundations, the agricultural crisis and family farming..... 12

4 Data on foundation activities in support of family farming..... 15

5 Mapping foundation interventions and approaches 18

6 Innovations and added value of foundations 25

7 Collaboration and networking among foundations..... 29

PART III: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8 Conclusions and recommendations..... 36

ANNEX

Foundations' Approaches to Family Farming:	Fondazione Cariplo.....	52
Short Profiles..... 39	The Gatsby Charitable Foundation.....	53
AgroEcology Fund..... 40	Obra Social “la Caixa”.....	55
Aydin Doğan Foundation..... 41	Plunkett Foundation.....	56
Carnegie UK Trust..... 43	Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau-SÖL.....	58
Cera..... 44	Terre de Liens.....	59
Compagnia di San Paolo..... 45	TrustAfrica.....	60
Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso..... 47	Vignette: Fondazioni4Africa.....	62
Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme..... 48	Bibliography and reference list.....	64
Fondation de France..... 49	Foundations covered in the study.....	70
Fondation Nicolas Hulot pour la Nature et l’Homme..... 51		

Preface

It is always fascinating to see how a seemingly clear topic can mask a multitude of issues that impact everyday life. Family farming is one such topic.

Inspired by the 2014 International Year on Family Farming, we set out on a journey to learn how we as foundations approach and support family farming, and to explore ideas and opportunities for knowledge sharing and practical collaboration in this area, within both European and global contexts.

What brought us together is shared interest in sustainable agricultural production and food systems and a recognition that family farming is a critical player in this field: From the production, supply and consumption of sustainable food in communities and across borders, through to the operation of finance and markets in terms of access and policy. Even the smallest ecosystem around food in the community has a link to wider supply chains, which often have a correlation with poverty, disadvantage, and well-being in the communities. In order to achieve impact, we have to work through this lens.

The idea to undertake a study on the topic appeared to be a logical first step in building a strong common base from which more concrete cooperation ideas could emanate, thus forming the basis of a roadmap for joint action.

We are pleased to present the report of the enquiry we undertook. We hope that this initial analysis of the state of the field, foundation practice and opportunities for working together towards promoting systemic change in agriculture and food systems will encourage other foundations to engage, learn and collaborate in this field.

The Steering Committee of European Foundations for Family Farming:

Benjamin Bellegy, Fondation de France (Chair)

Lieven Vandeputte, Cera

Marzia Sica, Compagnia di San Paolo

Novella Pellegrini, Enel Cuore Onlus

Matthieu Calame, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme

Cristina Toscano, Fondazione Cariplo

David Edwards, The Prince’s Charities International Sustainability Unit

Acknowledgements

Family farming and the transformation of the food production and consumption system are topics that are close to our heads, hearts and hands. We are therefore grateful for this opportunity to be part of the European Foundations for Family Farming (E4F) initiative and to conduct the study into *Foundations and Family Farming: Exploratory Study on Strategies, Operational Practices and Learning*.

For their trust and support, thanks goes to the European Foundation Centre (EFC) and the E4F Steering Committee - Cera, Compagnia di San Paolo, Enel Cuore Onlus, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme, Fondation de France, Fondazione Cariplo and The Prince's Charities International Sustainability Unit.

Last but not least, we would like to thank all participating foundations and their representatives who took time and effort, to share stories and experiences with us.

We hope this study helps those foundations involved in the E4F initiative, and indeed others, to engage in a well-considered and inspiring dialogue on family farming and the necessary transformation of the food production and consumption system.

Marlèn Arkesteijn
Rosien Herweijer
September 2014

Key findings

ON FAMILY FARMING

- ◆ A very diverse group of European foundations is engaged in issues of food and agriculture and they apply different approaches, instruments and resources. All share common concerns that link poverty and food (in)security with the sustainability of our planet.
- ◆ Few foundations focus explicitly on family farming or feel the need to do so. Most foundations featured in the study looked at work in the broader field of agriculture and food. Some of these seek specifically to promote agro-ecology while others do not; some regard smallholder farmers instrumental to sustainable agriculture and others do not.
- ◆ Attempts to estimate the financial dimensions of foundation engagement were hindered by the fact that family farming is not often used as a category to describe a programme or grant priority by foundations. The foundations involved in this study and/or our quick scan spend approximately €30 million annually on activities that can be labelled in broad terms as supporting family or smallholder farming.
- ◆ Most of the foundations that took part in the quick scan invest in Skills, Knowledge and Practice building as one of their priorities. This emphasis suggests that they work from the

assumption that these are critical ingredients for the field of family farming. As a model for change, however, this approach has limitations as will be discussed in chapter 5.

- ◆ Foundation spending on agriculture and food is stable or increasing when comparing expenditures in 2006 and 2007 with those in recent years.

ON MAPPING INTERVENTIONS

- ◆ The mapping of a small sample of foundations' interventions for this study shows that foundations engage with a wide range of issues in food and sustainable agriculture and in very different ways. Some foundations support specialised interventions while others work across a whole spectrum of issues from producers via distribution to consumers.
- ◆ To identify more precisely what foundations do, a refined taxonomy can be helpful, preferably one that departs from the entire process of food production, storage and consumption. Such taxonomy can identify clearly and consistently what foundations do.
- ◆ The study also recommends distinguishing between different approaches towards change. For this, it builds on existing research on agricultural innovation systems.

ON COLLABORATION

◆ Almost all foundations that took part in this study are already involved in collaborative initiatives around food and agriculture. A new collaborative initiative can add value either through furthering collaborative learning among diverse foundations or through enabling more joint actions and funding. The latter would need a group of strategically aligned actors; this study seeks to contribute to encouraging such collaboration.

◆ The E4F chose to use three themes as a broad framing for this study and for the exchange and networking activities facilitated through the initiative. The themes are: feeding the cities, supporting farmers and farmers' organisations, and agro-ecology and sustainable farming practices. However, to go beyond an exchange of practices and experiences, more narrowly defined topics must be identified. A stronger strategic alignment and shared understanding of approach to change may also be required. The two mapping tools suggested in this study could be helpful for further defining topics and strategic alliances.

◆ There is scope and appetite for collaboration. The mapping reveals many opportunities for exchanging experiences, shared learning and action. Specific issues mentioned by foundations included:

- ◆ Working with farmers' organisations;
- ◆ Issues related to rural credit;
- ◆ Promoting rural/agricultural employment;
- ◆ Creating an enabling (policy) environment for agro-ecological approaches; and
- ◆ Connecting cities to their rural environments.

More detail is given in chapter 7. The case descriptions and vignettes may also provide additional entry points for collaboration.

◆ Collaboration is also needed to complement individual intervention. Most foundations are restricted by their financial and human resources. An organisation can undertake focussed action in its key areas of competence, as long as it acknowledges that the ensuing impact may be strongly affected by factors outside the scope of the intervention. To increase its impact an organisation may choose to coordinate or partner with others that are taking for example more systemic approaches that deal with barriers such as market regulations and international policies. Therefore, engaging in open dialogue, knowing what others are doing and what approaches they use, are the essential building blocks for exchange, networking and collaboration. Collaboration and networking strengthen the voice of foundations, their leverage and impact. The mapping tool - How do foundations work on change - could provide useful entry points for complementary action.

◆ Several collaborative ventures are featured in the study and case descriptions. We recommend that foundations explore such ongoing collaborations further, in particular those in the field of EU agricultural policies and in research into sustainable food production, with a view to assessing whether they represent opportunities to get involved.

This study is by no means exhaustive in scoping out opportunities for collaboration but we hope it inspires readers to spot and share opportunities and to build on this initiative.

Chapter 1 Introduction

1

BACKGROUND

2014 is the International Year of Family Farming (IYFF). The celebration of the IYFF gave impetus to a group of foundations - Cera, Compagnia di San Paolo, Enel Cuore Onlus, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme, Fondation de France, Fondazione Cariplo and The Prince's Charities International Sustainability Unit - to launch the **European Foundations for Family Farming (E4F) initiative**, with the support of the European Foundation Centre (EFC). This initiative seeks to raise the visibility of the family farming agenda among foundations, increase awareness of the role and contribution of foundations and their partners in this area, and create opportunities for connecting philanthropic actors with other key stakeholders and international processes on family farming.

Foundations and Family Farming: Exploratory Study on Strategies, Operational Practices and Learning was commissioned to help inform and support these goals.

OBJECTIVES

- ◆ To establish a typology of foundations' methodological approaches;
- ◆ To better understand foundations' agendas when it comes to (operational) choices related to family farming; and

- ◆ To identify synergies or links created by philanthropic actors and possibilities for collaboration.

THEMES

Three themes were selected by the **E4F initiative** to guide the study:

- 1** Feeding the Cities;
- 2** Supporting Farmers and Farmers' Organisations; and
- 3** Agro-ecology and Sustainable Farming Practices.

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on in-depth interviews with foundation representatives, a quick scan of foundations working on family farming and a literature review.

For the in-depth case studies, 14 European foundations, 1 African foundation and 1 American foundation¹ were interviewed on their strategies and operational choices, their perceptions towards and interventions in family farming, the role of foundations in family farming, types of collaboration they engage in and on their work on the three identified themes. Interviewees were also asked for some minimal, quantitative information and additional documents and websites were reviewed.

¹ The AgroEcology Fund (USA), Fondazione Cariplo (IT), Carnegie UK Trust (UK), Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso (FR), Cera (BE), Compagnia di San Paolo (IT), Aydin Doğan Foundation (Turkey), Fondation de France (FR), Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme (FR/Switzerland), The Gatsby Charitable Foundation (UK), Fondation Nicolas Hulot (FR), Obra Social "la Caixa" (ES), Plunkett Foundation (UK), Stiftung Ökologie and Landbau (DE), Terre de Liens (FR), TrustAfrica (Senegal).



Separately, 17 foundations² – among them 8 that were interviewed also for the case studies – provided data on their support to family farming through an online survey conducted by the EFC.

The participating foundations were selected by the E4F steering committee and EFC staff and the list included both EFC members and non-members. The interviews revealed a group of rather like-minded foundations in France in terms of how they look at family farming – Fondation de France, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, Terre de Liens and Fondation Nicolas Hulot – while the other foundations were very diverse in terms of thematic and geographic focus, budgets, modes of operations and level of intervention (local, national and international).

READING GUIDE FOR THIS STUDY

Part I includes an introduction to the study and a brief exploration of key issues in the field of family farming and agricultural production and consumption.

Part II comprises several chapters as follows: chapter 3 looks at foundation perceptions of the agricultural crisis and family farming; chapter 4 presents basic operational data; chapter 5 discusses two mapping tools, one for what foundations do and one for how they approach change; and chapter 6 explores questions of advancing innovation and the added value of foundations.

Part III presents conclusions and recommendations.

The Annex includes short profiles of the foundations interviewed for the study.

A list of useful resources and organisations is provided at the end of the publication.

² Wageningen University Fund, la Caixa Foundation, Calouste Gulbenkian, Fondation Ensemble, Fondation pour l'agriculture et la ruralité dans le monde, Fondation de France, Carnegie UK Trust, Compagnia Di San Paolo, The Gatsby Charitable Foundation, Cera, Siemens Stiftung, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme, enel cuore onlus, Jacobs Foundation, Un monde par tous, Fondation Enthic and Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso.

Chapter 2 Exploring the field: Family farming and the crisis of the current agricultural production and consumption system

2

AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION AT A CROSSROADS

Over the last six-eight years, several leading analyses on agricultural production and consumption have been published. All arrive at a similar conclusion: the current agricultural production and consumption system needs to urgently change (IAASTD, 2009; UNCTAD 2013; De Schutter, 2014; FAO, 2006³).

Despite the boost in agricultural production over the past decades, there is still hunger. In 2012–2013, according to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, 842 million people suffered chronic under-nourishment⁴ and short-term or partial under-nourishment, with 2 billion people lacking vitamins and minerals due to lack of nutritious food.

The production and consumption system has caused many environmental problems such as soil erosion, pollution, an increase of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and loss of (agro) biodiversity. By way of example, 30–32% of man-made GHG is caused by crop production, transportation and

conservation (HLPE, 2012⁵), and at least 18% of man-made GHG is caused by livestock and meat consumption (FAO 2006) although other, more inclusive estimates, go as far as 51% (De Schutter, 2014). There are also unfavourable national and international financial and trade policies that result in overproduction in developed countries, on the one hand, and in a retreat from farming or a return to subsistence farming in developing countries due to highly subsidised imports, on the other. In both developed and developing countries, large numbers of predominantly young people migrate to cities in search of income, food, and education where they often face unemployment, social unrest and instability. This trend is leaving the countryside deprived of a young generation and social cohesion.

The demand for nutritious food is increasing due to changes in consumption patterns and world population growth⁶. However, the current industrial mode of production is highly dependent on fossil fuel: 70% of energy contained in one grain of maize produced by high-input agriculture comes from fossil fuels (Pimental and Giampietro, 1994⁷). It is said that producing food for 9

³ IAASTD (2009) *Agriculture at a Crossroads*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

UNCTAD (2013) *Wake up before it is too late. Make agriculture truly sustainable now for food security in a changing climate*. Trade and Environment Review 2013. NY, United Nations

De Schutter, O (2014). *Final report: The transformative potential of the right to food*. NY, United Nations A/HRC/25/57

FAO (2006). *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options*. Rome, FAO.

⁴ FAO, IFAD and WFP (2013) *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013: The Multiple dimensions of Food Security*. Rome.

⁵ FAO HLPE (2012) *Food Security and Climate Change*. HLPE report no. 3. FAO/Rome.

⁶ The demand for bio-fuel is another factor that influences food prices and production.

⁷ Pimentel, David and Giampietro, Mario (1994) *Food, Land, Population and the U.S. Economy*. Carrying Capacity Network.



Traditional haymaking in Romania (Forum Synergies & FPH)

billion people in 2050 through industrial agriculture will exhaust the global oil reserves in about 12 years (Tittonell, 2013⁸).

In general, there seems to be a broad agreement on the diagnosis of the current production and consumption system and the main paths for change needed: more sustainable production and consumption as well as poverty reduction. While few can disagree with broad lines and analyses, disagreements emerge when it comes to what sustainable production and consumption exactly means, what pathways could lead to sustainable production and consumption, who is

going to deal with the consequences and whose vested interests carry most weight.

One school of thought is that agricultural production and consumption need to ‘extensify’ in the North, ‘ecologically’ intensify in the South and ‘detoxify’ in North and South (Tittonell, 2013). Others believe that the problems of conventional and more industrial ways of production can be fixed through technological solutions that lead to sustainable production and consumption. Although some positions are supported only by partial evidence, others are more tenuous.

DEFINING FAMILY FARMING

Organisations and associations including the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), Genetic Resources Action International (GRAIN), Via Campesina, the World Rural Forum and 360 civil society and farmers organisations, as well as academics (Van der Ploeg, 2008⁹), see family farms as one of the potential driving forces behind a sustainable transformation of world agriculture. Family farms are said to generate welfare (food, employment, social cohesion within communities), to contribute to poverty alleviation and to the protection of (agro-)biodiversity. Estimates suggest that, worldwide, there are 500 million family farms¹⁰ that produce 70% of the world’s food.¹¹

The International Year of Family Farming (IYFF) activities aim to raise awareness of the impor-

BOX 1

THE 10 QUALITIES OF FAMILY FARMING
Jan-Douwe van der Ploeg analyses what Family Farming could be: He mentions ten characteristics ranging from control over main resources to make a living; delivering labour force; provides income and food; place of production and home; linking past, present and future; accumulates experiences; nexus of family and farm; place of culture; part of rural economy; part of rural landscape.

Ploeg, Jan Douwe van der (2013) Theme Overview: Ten qualities of family farming. In www.agriculturesnetwork.org/magazines/east-africa/69/theme-overview

tance of family farming among the general public, policy makers and civil society organisations. They also aim to promote policies that favour family farms, strengthen farmers’ organisations, defend an international economy of food products that fosters development and food security, and raise funds for research.

There is no universally agreed definition of family farming. Some refer to the size of the holding and focus on smallholders or peasants, while others refer to farms with either small or large holdings where the family owns the farm, and provide most of the labour (see FAO, 2014).

The general understanding is that family farming is “a means of organising agricultural, forestry, fisheries, pastoral and aquaculture production, which is managed and operated by a family and predominantly reliant on non-wage family labour, including both women’s and men’s. The family and the farm are linked, co-evolve and combine

economic, environmental, reproductive, social and cultural functions. Family farming includes men and women farmers, artisan fishers, pastoralists, gatherers and landless peasants, as well as indigenous people” (see World Rural Forum, <http://familyfarmingcampaign.net>).

The E4F Steering Committee agreed on the following definition of family farming for the purpose of this study:

“Family farming includes small-scale and family-based agricultural activities, with limited penetration of industrial farming techniques and equipment. Family farming is a means of organising agricultural, forestry, fisheries, pastoral and aquaculture production, which is managed and operated by a family and predominantly reliant on family labour, including both women’s and men’s, with the general perspective of supporting rural development. Both in developing and developed countries, family farming is the predominant form of agriculture in the food production sector”. (Terms of reference for the study)

The following chapters present how foundations view family farming; the crisis of the conventional agricultural production and consumption system; operational data; and two mapping tools for collaboration and networking.

Preparing cotton for delivery to a ginnery in Tanzania (Gatsby Charitable Foundation)



8 Tittonell, Prof. Dr.Ir Pablo A (2013) *Farming Systems Ecology. Towards ecological intensification of world agriculture*. Wageningen University.

9 Van der Ploeg, JD (2008) *The new peasantries. Struggles for autonomy and sustainability in an era of empire and globalization*. Earthscan, UK.

10 Lowder, S.K., Skoet, J. and Singh, S. (2014) *What do we really know about the number and distribution of farms and family farms in the world?* Background paper for The State of Food and Agriculture 2014. FAO, Rome.

11 (WRF <http://www.familyfarmingcampaign.net/en/home>)

Chapter 3
Foundations, the agricultural crisis
and family farming

3

FOUNDATIONS AND THE
AGRICULTURAL CRISIS

Our research shows that foundations agree on the problem diagnosis of the current agricultural and production system, as detailed in chapter 2. Some foundations explicitly mentioned the current agricultural crisis during the interview, or refer to it in their documents or on their website e.g. Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso, Fondation Nicolas Hulot, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau, Terre de Liens, and Fondation de France. All foundations design their strategies on the basis of an explicit or implicit analysis of the food system crisis, although in many cases analyses are only partially complete.

None of the participating foundations have claimed to offer ready-made solutions but when looking at the types of intervention and strategies, several clusters of strategies emerge (see matrix 1). For instance, one group of foundations/programmes focus explicitly on agro-ecology or organic production while others may engage in this area only occasionally. Some foundations/programmes work specifically and intentionally with smallholders or peasants while others work with broader groups of farmers. Some of the larger foundations apply different approaches to different areas of work and programmes.

Matrix 1¹²: Foundations' strategies and interventions to deal with the current crisis

	Agro-ecology and organic production are the entry point or at least a fundamental consideration	Organic or agro-ecological production are not essential, but long-term environmental sustainability is a concern
Smallholder farms are part of the strategy	Fondation de France, AgroEcology Fund, Aydin Doğan Foundation, Terre de Liens, Fondation Nicolas Hulot, Fondazioni4Africa/Senegal (Compagnia di San Paolo leading) Fondazioniforafrica/Burkina Faso (Fondazione Cariplo leading)	TrustAfrica, Fondazioni4Africa/Uganda (Fondazione Cariplo leading) , Obra Social "la Caixa", Carnegie UK Trust and Plunkett Foundation,
Strategies aim at broader range of farmers	Fondazione Cariplo/Environmental action in Lombardy Region, Compagnia di San Paolo /Slow Food, Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer	Cera, Gatsby Foundation, Fondazione Cariplo/Research, Fondation Daniel & Nina Carasso

12 Note that the borders between the groups are blurred. E.g. Gatsby also focuses on conservation agriculture and targets a broad range of stakeholders. In practice, it mainly works with smallholders



Finding affordable land is a challenge for small farmers in rural Lithuania (Viva Sol & FPH)

FOUNDATIONS AND FAMILY
FARMING

We deliberately avoid using the term 'family farming' in Matrix 1. It was clear from the outset of study that different actors perceive and engage on family farming differently. This is reflected also in the definition of family farming provided in the terms of reference for the study. Indeed, the study reveals that most foundations do not frame their strategies or interventions as 'supporting family farming'¹³. Those that do - Fondation de France, the AgroEcology Fund, Aydin Doğan Foundation, Cera and Compagnia di San Paolo - interpret the concept differently. For example, Aydin Doğan Foundation, Compagnia di San Paolo and Fondation de France refer to smallholders in general; the AgroEcology Fund refers to smallholders in developing countries only; Cera uses a broad concept of family farming with the family as the central unit of production irrespective of size of holding and business model; and Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau focuses on all ecological farmers, either family-based or large collectives (see box 2).

13 Although some, for instance, Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, Cariplo, could have activities that are connected to the International Year of Family Farming.

BOX 2

STIFTUNG ÖKOLOGIE UND LANDBAU SÖL aims to contribute to the further development of ecological agriculture in Germany. The foundation works with all types of farms as long as they work in an ecological and animal-friendly way. If it were to focus on smallholders only, SÖL would have to leave out a significant percentage of farms in eastern Germany. In the east of Germany, landholdings range from 200-3000 hectares that are owned by a group of families but are overseen by a manager.

BOX 3

THE 10 QUALITIES OF FAMILY FARMING REVISITED
Jan-Douwe van der Ploeg mentions ten qualities of family farming (see box 1). The EFC study shows some important additional 'community-level' qualities of smallholders: creating employment within the community (due to knowledge and labour-intensive production) and thus contributing to social cohesion and viable communities and possibly contributing to (agro) biodiversity and environment.

We recognise that E4F saw an opportunity in the IYFF to initiate an exploration of foundation experiences in the field of family farming, engage with key other stakeholders and explore possibilities for increasing collaboration. However, the question arises whether 'family farming', as a category, offers clear grounds for the identi-

fication and development of strategic areas for knowledge sharing and practical collaboration. We propose to work instead with the distinction that foundations make in practice: that between **smallholders** (small-scale farmers, peasants) and **farmers in general**.

All foundations involved in the study seek, in one or another way, to change the agricultural production and consumption system. Some see smallholders as instrumental to healthy, stable

and resilient communities and regions for their ability to provide employment and food as well as preserving biodiversity and the environment (see also box 3) while others works with all types of farmers.

In the remainder of the report we will use ‘support to family farming’ when referring to the broad range of activities foundations embark on, either ultimately geared at smallholders or farmers in general.

Microinsurance in the north of Togo to help vulnerable groups become more resilient (BRS & Cera)



Chapter 4

Data on foundation activities in support of family farming

4

FOUNDATIONS' THEMATIC FOCUS

Our quick scan reveals that the majority of foundations focus their support in the field of ‘family farming’ on what is labelled **Skills, Knowledge and Practice issues**. This emphasis could indicate that the majority of foundations work from the assumption that skills and knowledge are critical ingredients to ensuring economic prosperity and stability. As a model for change, this approach has its limitations, which will be discussed in chapter 5.

Thematically, 13 of the foundations that participated in the quick scan focus on issues related to **Agro-ecology** (biodiversity, organic farming, forest preservation); 12 – on **Agricultural Technologies**; 11 support **Market Issues** (access, price stability, fair trade) and **Farmers' Organisations**. Only a limited number address **Legal, Governance and Policy** issues or **Land issues** (ownership, sharing) even though the majority of interviewees consider these of critical importance. Several interviewees indicated that they pursue holistic or programmatic approaches addressing a range of issues in an integrated way.

FOUNDATIONS' EXPENDITURE ON SMALLHOLDERS AND OTHER FARMERS

Due to the limited scope of the study and the quick scan covering in total 24 foundations, it is not possible to provide a full picture of the amount of funding available for family farming. Furthermore, the interviewees indicated that it is

very hard to extract expenditure and investment statistics on family farming from their general financial data as for most of them family farming does not constitute an explicitly defined priority or programme area. Based on the data provided (2013 or most recent available), it appears that, collectively, foundations invest currently approximately €30 million annually in support of family farming. Those interviewed were also asked to provide information on expenditure in 2006 and 2007 in order to compare with that of 2013 or most recent available. The results show that spending on agriculture and food is stable or has been increasing compared to 2006 and 2007.

Detailed data on 15 of the 17 foundations that took part in the interviews highlighted that 14 of them distinguish expenditure targeting specifically farmers (either smallholders or other farmers).



Rokia Degbevi from Benin poses proudly with her casava field. (BRS & Cera)

Three of the fifteen foundations are, in financial terms, 'single issue organisations', with over 90% of their grant/programme expenditure dedicated to farming and agriculture. One of them has a budget of €4 million, the highest in this group.

Family farming is 'a core area of work' for one foundation (accounts for between 15% and 50% of overall expenditure); 'an important area of work' for six foundations (accounts for between 5% and 15% of overall expenditure); and 'a secondary area of work' for five foundations (accounts for less than 5% of overall expenditure)¹⁴. The foundation for which family farming is 'a core area of work' has an annual budget of €2.7 million. The highest annual expenditure within the group of foundations with family farming as 'an important area of work' is nearly €6 million.

The distribution across the three broad thematic areas that are guiding the E4F's work is roughly as follows: about half of the expenditure goes towards supporting 'farmers and farmers' organisations', a third is dedicated to 'agro-ecology and sustainable farming practices', and 'feeding the cities' areas receives the smallest share of about twenty per cent of the total reported.

Table 1: Spending patterns: The relative importance of expenditure on smallholders and other farmers

Expenditure on 'family farming'/FF as a % of overall expenditure (2013/14)	Number of foundations (N=15)	Relative importance category
FF Expenditure >90%	3	single issue
50%> FF Expenditure <90%	0	highly specialised
15%> FF Expenditure <50%	1	core area of work
5%> FF Expenditure <15%	6	important area of work
FF Expenditure <5%	5	secondary area of work

14 Some foundations are mixed operational and grantmaking. Our analysis includes both direct expenditures and expenditures through grants.

INSTRUMENTS AND PARTNERS

Our scan revealed that, in terms of 'type of support', the instrument of choice is grants and scholarships. Thirteen out of the seventeen foundations provide grants or scholarships, and seven use these instruments exclusively. Six foundations run self-operated programmes and for two of them, this is the only way of working. Only two foundations use loans and/or equity as funding instruments. Similarly, only two provide advice and or coaching services.

Cera and Gatsby reported that they moved deliberately from grantmaking to self-operated programmes, in some cases in partnership with others. They felt this approach allowed them to operate more strategically and that it positioned them better to learn more and steer the programme. Some foundations are constrained by their mandates in their choice of instruments and partners: Italian foundations work through Italian development NGOs for example. The emphasis on grants, as compared to loans and equity, even in a productive sector like farming, seems to reflect the more traditional way in which foundations support public benefit work.

The quick scan offers also some information on the type of actors foundations support and on who they involve when it comes to family farming. The pattern shows a clear emphasis on international or local NGOs and on farmers - either directly or through farmers 'organisations'. One participant of the scan highlighted that women are their target group. Interestingly, few link up directly with entrepreneurs. The quick scan seems to indicate that the interaction with government is mostly left to partners. For details, see table 2.


GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS

15 of the 17 foundations included in the quick scan (online questionnaire) provided information on their geographic priorities. The majority appear to focus on Africa; Europe and Latin America follow. It is interesting to note, for example, that five foundations are active in Burkina Faso but have not had prior contacts to explore synergies or some form of cooperation; the same could be said for several other countries, including

Table 2: Foundations' partners

To whom do foundations provide support? Who is involved?	
Local or international NGOs	11
Farmer(s)/ Farmers' organisations	8
Universities and (local) research(ers) institutions	4
Coordinate with or involve the government	2
Work with cooperatives	1
Work with coalitions of local actors	1
Support entrepreneurs and their associations	1
Special focus on women	1

Colombia, Mozambique and Uganda. While the sample is very limited and not representative for the wider sector, the data already highlights several opportunities for working together based on a common geographic interest. Finally, it should be noted that only very few of the foundations in our sample are working in Asia and none in Eastern Europe.



Chapter 5

Mapping foundation interventions and approaches

5

One of the key objectives of this study is to explore and map foundation interventions and approaches to family farming, in particular their activities related to the three themes E4F chose to focus on: *feeding the cities; farmers and farmers’ organisations; and agro-ecology and sustainable farming practices*.

As broad spheres of interest, the themes provide interesting entry points to examine diverse set of issues related to family farming but are difficult to use a framework to analyse specific ventures and undertakings. Many activities supported by the foundations in the study pertain to more than one theme, or cannot be classified easily under any of the three areas. For example, the work of Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso on feeding the planet cuts across all three. Obra Social “la Caixa”, Cera and the Carnegie UK Trust work with smallholders and other farmers but do not necessarily invest in agro-ecological approaches. Some activities related to community-supported agriculture are classified as agro-ecology while others are about feeding the cities. And the topic of slow-food involves working with producers (farmers’ organisations), traders as well as consumers.

Drawing on conversations with the participating foundations and the EFC, we believe we can contribute towards developing additional alternative taxonomies of foundations’ (methodological) approaches related to smallholders and other

farmers: one for mapping what foundations actually do and another for mapping how foundations approach change in practice.

A taxonomy on what foundations do would help improve the exchange of information and knowledge, while a taxonomy on how foundations approach change acts as a starting point for reflection on collective, complementary action and for collaborative learning around systems change.

MAPPING INTERVENTIONS: WHAT DO FOUNDATIONS DO?

Inspired by the food systems matrix developed by Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso, we present a **topic matrix** (see Matrix 2, opposite and over-leaf), which illustrates different quadrants of the food system where foundations can act.

This taxonomy serves to clearly classify what foundations do rather than what they seek to achieve. The matrix does not illustrate how foundations approach change, which is another important source of diversity that will be tackled in the second mapping tool (on approaches).

The classification matrix works at the programme level and links topics to actors. The idea is to add a relevant tag, or tags, to programmes or interventions and use the matrix to explore which foundations work on similar topics. For example, if a foundation were supporting productivity at the local or

national level, it would be important to know which foundations address the issue at the global level (see box 4). For mapping, learning and connecting, adding a primary and secondary tag is critical¹⁵.



The limited scope of this study and variations in information provided prevented a full mapping exercise using this taxonomy. It is included as an illustration of the classification of some of the main activities of the foundations interviewed.

Matrix 2: Topic matrix: What foundations do?

	Fondation Nicolas Hulot
	Plunkett Foundation
	Aydin Doğan Foundation
	Carnegie UK Trust
	Cera
	Fondazione Cariplo
	Fondation de France
	Compagnia di San Paolo
	Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme
	AgroEcology Fund
	Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau
	Obra Social ‘la Caixa’
	Terre de Liens
	Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso
	Gatsby
	TrustAfrica

PRODUCTION & PRODUCERS


Environmental and Biodiversity Aspects

Awareness	Biodiversity
	GHG emissions
	Landscape
Water use	Animal welfare
Soil	Policies and laws
	

Socio-Economic Aspects

Productivity						
Produce prices						
Access to land						
Access to water						
Access to seeds & inputs (incl. energy)						
Access to info and knowledge						
Access to credit						
Access to credit						
Gender						
Organisations						
Community cohesion						
Employment						
Policies and laws						

Health & Nutritional Aspects

Nutritional values	Safety
	

15 For statistical purposes one would have to qualify for each intervention one tag as the primary tag, to avoid double counting.

STORAGE, PROCESSING, DISTRIBUTION

Environmental and Biodiversity Aspects

Water use
Waste
GHG emissions
Policies and laws

Socio-Economic Aspects

Employment
Gender
Safety
Productivity



Access to markets



Access to credit
Access to information and knowledge



Access to energy
Storage and processing costs
Organisations



Community cohesion
Policies and laws



CONSUMPTION & CONSUMERS

Environmental and Biodiversity Aspects

Awareness around environment and biodiversity



Waste



Socio-Economic Aspects

Consumer organisations
Access to land



Cultural dimensions and awareness



Markets, economic choices & affordability
Community cohesion



Access to food
Policies and law

Health & Nutritional Aspects

Nutritional values of (processed) food
Safety

Health & Nutritional Aspects

Awareness of health
and nutritional aspects
Under-nutrition
Obesity and diet related
chronic diseases



MAPPING APPROACHES: HOW DO FOUNDATIONS WORK ON CHANGE?

Whichever aspects they tackle, strategies they take and farming concepts they endorse, foundations' approaches to change vary substantially according to our findings. Based on research on agricultural innovation systems (Klerkx, Schut, Leeuwis and Kilelu, 2012; Schut, Rodenburg, Klerkx, van Ast and Bastiaans, 2014¹⁶), we distinguish four different approaches towards change:

1 The technology, knowledge and best practices approach that is geared at improving production practices (improving productivity and/or biodiversity) at the farm level. Technologies and best practices are traditionally developed by researchers and disseminated by extensionists, while farmers are seen as end-users. There is limited or no attention to the context where adoption takes place and to technical and institutional barriers.

2 The collaborative approach for developing technology and best practices that focuses on context-specific social, cultural, economic and agro-ecological drivers. This approach influences productivity at the level of the individual field, the farm, or a collection of farms. Research and actions are based on working together with farmers and on the problems they face in their field and/or at the farm level. It could include some value-chain actors, e.g. input suppliers and credit facilities, but attention is geared towards the farmers and the barriers to production. Examples include the Farmer Field Schools, supported by Fondazioni4Africa, and the farmer-led

agro-ecology of Groundswell International, supported by the AgroEcology Fund.


3 The value chain approaches that aim to build local capacities and to empower farmers. This approach, which is based on Agricultural Knowledge and Innovation Systems (AKIS), tries to integrate different types of knowledge for sustainable development from various actors in the value chain and takes the local context (value chain) into consideration. It seeks to foster shared learning between researchers, extension personnel, farmers and other value chain actors as a basis for sustainable agricultural development. We have seen two different sub-approaches within this group: foundations trying to strengthen a current value chain (improving the value chain) and foundations trying to change the value chain itself (resetting the value chain). An example of the first is Gatsby trying to involve and strengthen actors in the cotton sector. The latter is seen in the work of Terre de Liens which tries to shorten the value chain by connecting producers and consumers directly, and Fondazione Cariplo, which supports Community Supported Agriculture (CSA).

4 The system change approach puts more emphasis on the institutional and political dimensions of change processes than the other approaches. It pays attention to the various dimensions of the problem (social, economic, environmental) at the different levels (local, national and international) and how they influence each other. The approach is based on the Agricultural Innovation System. Innovation is considered as a

¹⁶ Laurens Klerkx, Marc Schut, Cees Leeuwis and Catherine Kilelu (2012) Advances in Knowledge Brokering in the Agricultural Sector: Towards Innovation System Facilitation. IDS Bulletin Volume 43 Number 5 September 2012.

Marc Schut, Jonne Rodenburg, Laurens Klerkx, Aad van Ast and Lammert Bastiaans (2014) Systems approaches to innovation in crop protection. A systematic literature review. Crop Protection 56 (2014) 98-108 pp.

Picture 1: Four approaches towards change (adapted from presentation from M. Schüt, WUR, 2014)



process that is shaped by interactions between actors and institutions inside and outside the agricultural sector. Examples include the work of ARC2020 (see chapter 7) supported by Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, and the work of the International Agriculture and Trade Policy and Grassroots International on expanding the global agro-ecology movement, supported by the AgroEcology Fund.

The sequence of the approaches, visualised on picture 1, shows the increasing importance of the broader socio-economic and political context of farmers.

Although very different, these approaches exist simultaneously, even within one organisation. Over the last decades, various studies have shown that the first approach does not yield sustainable long-term results. This has been the

experience also of some of the foundations interviewed for the study. Gatsby, for example, has made a shift from supporting research and extension work in East Africa to working on a sector value chain approach. Further examples of how foundations use these approaches are provided in matrix 3.

Some foundations concentrate on a single approach, as in the case of Obra Social “la Caixa” or Gatsby; others embark on a range of approaches – the AgroEcology Fund, for example, looks at farmer-led agro-ecology practices and also works on system change.

Exchanging experience on collaborative approaches is quite different from exchanging experience and lessons on trying to change the system even though the approaches are complementary. Changing the system (or the game)

Matrix 3: Four approaches taken by foundations¹⁷

1 Externally-led dissemination of technology and best practices Fondazione Caripio	2 Collaborative approach for technology and best practices Agro-ecological: AgroEcology Fund Compagnia di San Palo Fondazione Caripio Aydin Doğan Foundation Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau Terre de Liens Fondation de France Non agro-ecological: The Plunkett Foundation Carnegie UK Trust
4 System change At international level: AgroEcology Fund, Terre de Liens Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso Fondation Nicolas Hulot Fondation de France At international level: AgroEcology Fund, Terre de Liens Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau TrustAfrica, Carnegie UK Trust At local level: AgroEcology Fund Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau Carnegie UK Trust	3 Value chain approaches Improving current value chain: Gatsby Cera Obra Social “la Caixa” Compagnia di San Palo Fondation de France Resetting the value chain: Carnegie UK Trust The Plunkett Foundation Terre de Liens Fondation Nicolas Hulot Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer Cera

cannot happen without sufficient work on the ground – on value chains (changing the rules), technologies and best practices (improving your work). Equally, collaborative approaches for technology development may not lead to sustainable change if no work is done on the value chain and/or at system level.

During the interviews we came across several examples that underline the importance of these complementary approaches. Carnegie UK Trust observes that there are training opportunities for new horticulturists and farmers, but limited support is available for people to start a small-scale business. Land is not affordable and

¹⁷ Filling in the quadrant is still rather tentative and may need refinement by the foundations. Conversations around the classifications of certain activities can help foster mutual understanding

BOX 4

EXAMPLE OF TRADE POLICIES AFFECTING LOCAL PRODUCTION

‘Tomato production in Ghana, especially in the upper eastern region, had been thriving until a privatization programme resulted in the selling off or closure of tomato-canning factories, while import tariffs were reduced. This enabled the heavily subsidized EU tomato industry to penetrate Ghana, displacing the livelihoods of tomato farmers and industry employees. Tomato paste imported by Ghana rose from 3,200 tons in 1994 to 24,077 tons in 2002. Local tomato production has stagnated since 1995. Meanwhile, tomato-based products from Europe have made inroads into African markets. In 2004, EU aid for processed tomato products was €298 million, and there were many more millions in indirect aid.’

Khor, M. (2008). *The impact of trade liberalization on agriculture in developing countries: The case of Ghana*. Penang, Third World Network

obtaining credit is difficult, so work must be done at the value chain and at system level to change policies. The Plunkett Foundation funds community supported agriculture but sees that land prices are high. Meanwhile, market mechanisms are destroying small producers, so work needs to be done to change these market mechanisms, i.e. resetting value chains and system change. Compagnia di San Paolo focuses on increasing productivity but sees that access to credit is a barrier and decides to invest in linking farmers’

organisations with credit providers and/or in converting the former into the latter.

Gatsby has scale and clout in the cotton sector in Tanzania and might be able to influence the institutional context while the Fondazioni4Africa partners, who are seeking to improve productivity of small holders in Burkina Faso, may have to join up with other players to influence the institutional context as the national and international financial and trade policies are not protecting these small-holders from cheap imports.

Foundations do not need to work on all approaches themselves. Most are restricted by financial and human resources and choose to focus on certain specific topics and approaches. More importantly most prefer – and sometimes are limited by design – to fund technical, capacity-building approaches or awareness raising and behavioural change, compared to engaging in influencing policy agendas or international trade negotiations.

Backed by a comprehensive analysis, an organisation can undertake targeted practical action in areas best suited to its purpose and expertise, as long as it acknowledges that the wider context may affect the impact of the investment. To increase its impact, it can coordinate or partner with others that are seeking to address systemic issues, such as changing market regulations and international policies.

Therefore having an open dialogue, knowing what others are doing and what approaches they use, are the essential building blocks for exchange, networking and collaboration. Collaboration and networking strengthens the voice of foundations, their leverage and impact.

Chapter 6
Innovations and added value of foundations

6

INNOVATIONS

One of the objectives of the study was to look at foundations’ experiences in supporting innovation and the value added they bring. We found during the interviews that foundations support various types of innovations across the value chain; several examples are discussed briefly in this section.

Innovatiesteunpunt (Innovation Support Center for Agricultural and Rural Development) is a partnership between Boerenbond (the Flemish Farmers’ Union), Cera and KBC, a commercial bank in which the foundation has a

share. Funding comes from the partners, government programmes (including the European Commission) and service fees. The *Innovatiesteunpunt* provides services to support technical-environmental innovations, including energy, agro-ecological solutions etc. Innovations do not have to be low-tech; what counts is the end-result, i.e. greater environmental sustainability. Another stream of work relates to business management, including shortening of the value chains but also personnel management and the development of new services etc. Finally, the *Innovatiesteunpunt* provides support and advice to help connect farmers and civil society

BOX 6

INVESTING IN COOPERATIVE INITIATIVES IN BELGIUM AND ABROAD

The cooperative tradition in Belgium is strong, and Cera sees the cooperative model as an important solution to today’s agricultural challenges. Coopburo initially only worked in Belgium but now intends to provide services in other European countries and in the global south. For example, Cera is currently exploring the possibility of providing services to organisations that support small-scale farmers in South Africa.

In Belgium, there are many new initiatives involving people working together to undertake activities and connecting directly with others in their neighbourhood and local community. For example,

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) enables a young, entrepreneurial ecological farmer to acquire land and begin farming with the involvement of people from the community as shareholders, counting often also on their participation in harvesting. At least ten such farms are currently operating in Flanders (see www.bioforumvlaanderen.be/nieuws/CSA). These CSAs are often organised as cooperatives and are mostly found around the larger cities and towns. There are also experimental initiatives that seek to develop cooperative agricultural activities in cities with rooftop gardening (*dakmoestuinen*).

actors. Examples include the collaboration between farmers and (urban) organisations working on social inclusion. It started ten years ago as *Steunpunt Groene Zorg*: farmers who work with organisations that have a role in care and social protection.

Growing Livelihoods is a programme supported by the Carnegie UK Trust and Plunkett Foundation that takes a model that was successful 50 years ago and tailors it to the realities and needs of today, seeking to provide young people with a livelihood in horticulture.

BOX 7

CONTRACT FARMING

In the Tanzanian cotton sector, the key challenge is to secure sustainable mechanisms for farmer investment in inputs, coupled with agronomic advice. Weakly governed public sector input procurement systems have failed on quality control, transparency and debt collection. However, private investment has not filled the gap, as high levels of competition in buying undermine incentives for the primary processors - ginners - to invest in pre-harvest services to farmers.

In 2007 Gatsby and the Tanzania Cotton Board (TCB) began assessing different options, eventually embarking on pilots with contract farming, where ginners become the critical investors in farmers with their investments protected through contracts and licensing; only those that have invested are licensed to buy.

In 2011/2012 the whole industry was switched over to a limited form of contract farming. Over 290,000 farmers received inputs on credit and that contributed to a record harvest.

However, that success was in part due to the cost of the inputs supplied being split between ginners and a subsidised industry

trust fund, with initial credit coming from input suppliers, not ginners. Even this limited requirement for ginners to take on more of the risk met resistance. Many smaller ginners have a trader's approach to cotton, taking each season as a new opportunity depending on price, rather than investing in the long-term. Many of these were happy with the status quo and unable or unwilling to take on further risk. They lobbied against contract farming. The hard decision of refusing licenses to such ginners was not taken - instead political support for contract farming faltered and it was abandoned in the next season. A 40% drop in output followed.

Gatsby learned a lot, including that political will to challenge vested interests, is paramount. Furthermore, deep levels of trust and understanding are required in such systems, and these - plus the necessary institutional structures - are only built up over time. Gatsby and the TCB are now working to build up support for contract farming again while also exploring other options, should it prove politically unfeasible, especially in some areas where regulated contracts will continue to be difficult to enforce.

Fondazione Cariplo is working closely with the public sector, municipalities in particular, to develop sustainable urban food policies.

Gatsby and Aydin Doğan Foundation have been experimenting with contract farming, enabling farmers to access credit for the purchase of good seeds and other inputs. Aydin Doğan Foundation linked small organic farmers to an Aydin Doğan company for organic products to enable them to purchase raw materials and ensure the sale of their produce after harvest. The profits for the company are still limited due to the fluctuations in market prices. Profit is not, however, the main objective; the sustainable development of the region is. The foundation and its partners are still working on the development of a good model that can be used by other foundations, public or private investors in other regions in Turkey.

Terre de Liens has created an interesting organisational model that combines a foundation with a social enterprise that owns and leases out land. Innovation thus addresses not only what you do and how you do it but also organisational structure.

Harvey Koh¹⁸ argues that people at grassroots level, civil society organisations and the NGOs close to them are closer to the problems and the solutions. In his view, most innovations stem from trying to deal with concrete problems. This highlights the importance of partnerships among foundations and between foundations and other actors who are close to on-the-ground realities.

Furthermore, foundations should invest systematically in activities and processes that seek to

Farmer in Benin (Fondation de France)



capitalise on individual experiences and project outcomes and stimulate the generation of new ideas, solutions and a better understanding of opportunities for change, taking the wider agriculture and food systems into account. More specifically, foundations should ensure, as part of their programmes, support for activities such as joint learning and reflection involving researchers, experts and farmers; for analysis of project outcomes, identification of transferrable practices and their dissemination; and for feasibility studies on scalability of specific approaches.

Fondation de France systematically combines targeted project support with support for capitalisation activities, as one of the key objectives underpinning its funding strategy is to generate actions beyond the immediate results of a project.

18 Harvey Koh (2012) From Blueprint to Scale: <http://www.mim.monitor.com/blueprinttoscale.html>

THE ADDED VALUE OF FOUNDATIONS' SUPPORT FOR FAMILY FARMING

The foundations that took part in the study are very diverse in what they support, how they do it and in how they approach change. The specific added value of their support for family farming would also differ from one case to another, from one context to another. This said, we were able to distil from the interviews several characteristics and opportunities: flexibility and ability to respond to emerging issues; ability to take risk (from supporting new/unproven ideas/solutions through to investing in initiatives aimed at system change); and ability to bring together diverse stakeholders around an issue of common interest and creating dialogue between farmers, on the one hand, and researchers, markets, public institutions, civil society and citizens, on the other.

Most foundations referred also to the ability to collaborate and form a counterforce to conventional industrial agriculture. Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, Terre de Liens, Fondation Nicolas Hulot, Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau underlined the need

to show the benefits of smallholder farming/family farming and convince politicians, consumers and others that small-scale farming is a valuable and viable alternative to industrial farming. Furthermore, foundations put a lot of emphasis on skills, knowledge and practices, as discussed in chapter 4 but seem to be less inclined to address, as individual foundations or collaboratively, more systemic issues or support incentives for behaviour change across the value chain.

This conclusion deserves deeper consideration in the future work of E4F as it represents an area where foundations, due to their independence and wide networks, could add particular value in tackling tough systemic issues of the agriculture and food agenda. The collaboration potential, particularly around advocacy agendas, has yet to be fully explored.

The next chapter takes a closer look at the issue of collaboration and networking among foundations in the area of family farming, food and agriculture, and distils key ingredients and conditions for making collaboration work.

Wheat selection process in Lot et Garonne, France (Réseau Semences Paysannes & FPH)



Chapter 7
Collaboration and networking among foundations

7


Networking and collaboration for learning and action can be done in different ways. When describing collaboration among foundations, one can distinguish different ways in which knowledge and financial resources are used and managed, in terms of decision-making and administration. Examples are:

- 1 Open, virtual communities of practice where knowledge resources are exchanged freely. An example is Fiery Spirits a community of rural activists and practitioners moderated by the Plunkett Foundation (<https://www.facebook.com/fieryspirits1>);
- 2 Close collaboration for exchange of knowledge and systematisation of experiences, like the European Network of Civic Initiatives on Access to Land, or the Agricultures Network (<http://www.agriculturesnetwork.org/about-us>).
- 3 Aligned funding and collaborative advocacy. This involves a certain degree of shared decision-making on the use of financial and non-financial resources while all or some of the administration of funds remains with the individual funders. Examples include collaborations between Agropolis and Fondazione Cariplo; Gatsby and The Wood Foundation; and Fondazioni4Africa (see Annex for further details). In ARC2020, a pan-European

collaborative around the Common Agricultural Policy, foundations and CSOs align funding and pool knowledge, resources and advocacy capacities (see further below).

- 4 Joint or pooled funding. Funding is awarded based on joint decision-making and administered collectively or by an independent body. The AgroEcology Fund, the European Climate Foundation, Ocean5 and many others are examples of pooled funds established by foundations.

More general information and guidance on collaboration between foundations in Europe can be found in the GrantCraft guide: European Foundations Working Together¹⁹.



19 GrantCraft guide: European Foundations Working Together, <http://www.grantcraft.org/>.

Almost all networking and collaboration involves the exchange of knowledge and learning. Learning is often distinguished in three forms: single-loop learning i.e. undertaking action and improving on it; double-loop learning i.e. involving collective reflection leading to different approaches; and triple-loop learning, which involves a collective reflection challenging the underlying assumptions that determine the strategy of the action. Some also call the first *'following the rules'*, the second *'changing the rules'* and the third *'changing the game'*. With more loops, actual learning processes are increasingly 'unsafe'. When engaging in learning in networks it is important to be on the same page as to what kind of learning you seek.

A narrow focus on **how to do things better** is practical when partners in learning do rather similar things – for example, providing credit to smallholder farmers, supporting start-up organic horticulturalists – and are open to at least **changing the rules**. In the learning process all the different approaches are examined in great detail, evidence is assessed and evaluated to isolate the best solutions and their adaptations in different geographies. A safe learning space where partners respect and trust each other is critical to be able to expose both weaknesses and strengths in different approaches. If not it will be a 'show-and-tell' among very similar partners.

The topic matrix and the collaborations from the approaches matrix are examples of areas where foundations can learn together **to do things better**. And it seems that both **improving** and **changing the rules** are applicable to the value chain approaches.

In complex systems, the effectiveness of any good solution can be systematically eroded. This requires **changing the game (or system change)**, challenging some underlying assumptions and seeking synergies among different operational practices and approaches. Learners would need a common long-term goal in a common language but are ideally very diverse with different strategies and interventions. This learning maps interventions and approaches, not to judge which is best, but to see how these different interventions and approaches are influenced and interfere (complement and hinder each other), and to see where gaps exist. Unless there is a real openness to actually change the game, such learning may remain noncommittal because of the diversity of approaches.

Any of the above types of learning can be a basis for **joint action or joint funding**, for example to scale-up or replicate effective solutions, to generate 'mass' or to leverage complementary capacities for action. All joint action requires fully shared short- and medium-term goals.²⁰

SOME EXAMPLES OF COLLABORATIVE (LEARNING) EXPERIENCES

The foundations that took part in the study are engaged in different types of collaborations, both among themselves and with other stakeholders active in the field of family farming. Some examples are shown below. More details can be found in the short profiles in the annex.

Fondation de France, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer and the Fonds Dotation Germes funded the creation of the **European Network of Civic Initiatives on Access to Land**, which was ini-



Algaculture in the Philippines (Fondation de France)

tiated and is coordinated by Terre de Liens. The network brings together 12 civic organisations from 8 EU countries (United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, France, Catalonia/ Spain, Italy, Romania and Lithuania) that are working to promote access to land for local food production and sustainable farming, and the preservation of agricultural land. The network identifies, documents and disseminates good practice and tools and facilitates the sharing of experiences on how to assist farmers in accessing land and in good land stewardship with a view to improving the practice (collaborative approach, single-loop learning); it helps raise awareness of land issues in Europe and, last but not least, organises petitions and advocacy actions at EU level (triple-loop: trying to influence the game/change the system).

Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau collaborates with other actors in the organic agriculture community in Germany on documenting and disseminating good practices, on research projects and on advocacy initiatives aimed at influencing policies related to agriculture and food systems. In their experience, in order to succeed in bringing different parties together to develop

a common agenda, a long term commitment to the process is needed and an acceptance of the driver of the process.

Fondazioni4Africa started as a collaboration of four Italian foundations and is currently evolving under the aegis of the Italian Association of Banking Foundations. Funding is only partially pooled but all foundations involved feel that their interventions are much more effective because of the coordination and collective learning. As a group, they have also been able to involve new actors in Italy in their work in Africa. In Fondazioni4Africa, the learning focuses on improving and resetting (shortening) value chains. Fondazioni4Africa started out as a venture to do things better mostly following the rules, but the way it has evolved and the fact that it is now replicated, may very well reflect that it has actually changed the rules.

Group CAP 2013 was established in 2008-2009 in anticipation of the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy 2013-2020. A group of 15 French agricultural organisations in the field of international solidarity, sustainable development, and environmental protection organised them-

²⁰ For some resources on collaboration see FSG (2011) Multiplying Impact through Philanthropic Collaboration http://www.fsg.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/PDF/multiplying_impact.pdf and GrantCraft (2012) European Foundations Working Together <http://www.grantcraft.org/guides/foundations-in-europe-working-together>



Seed bank in Kpayeroun, Benin (Réseau semences paysannes & FPH)

selves to make proposals for major reforms of the CAP 2013-2020. The Fondation Nicolas Hulot is co-funding the initiative. The Group CAP 2013 had a high-level coordinator that guided shared vision-building and had contact with EU commissioners and other people. Building a shared vision was central to the group's success. Nevertheless it was quite a challenge to keep all members heading in the same direction. Achieving success in greening the CAP2013-2020 saw serious constraints. Group CAP 2013 probably involved triple-loop learning in the process of vision-building and it reflected on elements of system innovation. The example illustrates some of the challenges in the dynamics of such learning processes.

The Agricultural and Rural Convention (ARC2020) is a European alliance supported by Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, OAK Foun-


dation and MAVA Foundation. ARC2020 is a multi-stakeholder platform of 150 organisations from 22 EU Member States, working together to influence the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The platform was set up in 2010, ahead of the latest reform of the CAP 2014-2020. ARC2020 is calling for a paradigm shift in agriculture and a rural renaissance. They call for a progressive shift from industrialised agriculture towards sustainable farming, which builds on the regional and local diversity of farming and economies, makes intelligent use of non-renewable resources, respects animal welfare, puts good agronomic sense and agro-ecological innovation at the heart of farming decisions, and achieves positive environmental, social and economic outcomes.

The AgroEcology Fund is an example of multi-donor collaboration. From the start, the founding donors aimed for an independently and impartially managed fund. The donors did not have the capacity to manage the fund themselves, and they wanted to prevent the fund's association with any of the founding donors so as not to deter new donors. Considerable attention was given to make the strategic and decision processes genuinely collaborative. An advisory board advises on the selection of grantees, while the group of contributing donors makes the ultimate decisions. Among lessons learned, the Fund found that setting up a multi-donor fund is time-consuming and requires long-term commitment. In the eyes of the funders, it makes very good (economic) sense to pool funding instead of taking independent action. An advisory board is said to be a very good instrument to foster harmonious and collaborative decision-making.

There are also collaborations where the main focus is on joint funding or joint complementary operations. **Gatsby** has (in its view) a relatively small budget for its Africa programmes (£4-5

million/year), but partners with other foundations like **The Wood Foundation** and bilateral donors. Gatsby sees co-funding as vital for leverage and increasing impact. It is also looking to test and refine its model of development: a holistic approach aimed at improving the value chain, supportive markets and the policy environment for specific sectors, such as the Rwandan tea sector. Working with others increases the number of programmes that Gatsby can be involved in and thus the opportunities to learn what is needed to make a sector approach work in different contexts.

Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso created in 2014 the International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems (IPES-Food). IPES-FOOD will analyse and synthesise evidence in the field of sustainable food systems and diets; identify knowledge gaps and priority fields of research; encourage and guide research on sustainable food systems and diets; develop tools for decision makers in order to determine national guidelines on sustainable diets; influence stakeholders (policy makers, scientific communities, food chain actors, civil society, media, public at large); and support concrete food policy transitions. IPES-Food has joined forc-



Family farmers, Benin (Fondation de France)



Members of a farmers' cooperative in Rwanda take the greatest care of their vegetables.. (BRS & Cera)

es with EAT – Stockholm Food Forum, an initiative of **Stordalen Foundation** to advance this agenda; EAT will play a key role in linking the scientific community with civil society, policy makers and business. This collaboration represents an example of alignment and complementarity on common agenda, without necessarily involving joint funding.

The Global Alliance for the Future of Food is an alliance of foundations committed to leveraging resources to help shift food and agriculture systems towards greater sustainability, security, and equity. The Global Alliance, created in 2013, brings together more than 30 foundations from 10 countries with diverse interests and expertise, spanning health, agriculture, food, conservation, cultural diversity and community well-being. The Global Alliance seeks to foster knowledge on and

catalyse collaboration aimed at advancing sustainable food systems.

Many European foundations collaborate under the umbrella of the **Network of European Foundations (NEF)**. NEF provides an operational platform for developing collaborative initiatives among foundations and between foundations and other private and public actors on European or international issues of common interest. NEF is currently supporting a Joint Fund for Tunisia – FIKRA, which invests, among others, in small-scale economic and agricultural projects in northwest Tunisia.

Last but not least, we must mention the source of this study, the European Foundations for Family Farming (E4F) initiative. E4F involves a group of foundations – Cera, Compagnia di San Paolo, Enel Cuore Onlus, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme, Fondation de France, Fondazione Cariplo and The Prince's Charities International Sustainability Unit, with coordination provided by the European Foundation Centre. This network aims to: build a better understanding of foundation investments in family/smallholder farming, identify good practices, as well as gaps and needs; enable learning and identification of shared interests to foster concrete collaboration in the future; raise the profile and visibility of foundation support for and experiences in advancing the family farming agenda. Under this initiative three working groups involving some twenty foundations have been established to examine specific opportunities for joint learning and practical collaboration in the three themes discussed also in the study: feeding the cities; supporting farmers and farmers' organisations; and advancing agro-ecology. The analysis and proposals from the working groups provide the basis for a roadmap to guide the future development of the network.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION

During the interviews a series of opportunities for collaboration were mentioned. Joint funding and action was of interest but learning more so.

Several foundations work with farmers' organisations in developing countries. This is an opportunity to learn, adjust or synchronise the rules without immediately challenging the game: how do you foster links between farmers' organisations and credit providers? What are good practices supporting farmers' organisations in their governance and management? Among the interviewees, there is a lot of experience, and a frequently expressed need for more knowledge regarding work on rural credit. Such a learning network on supporting farmers' organisations could also make an inventory of good gender practices.

The experience of TrustAfrica and other foundations working with **farmers' organisations to influence national policies** to benefit smallholders could be of interest for other foundations; an exchange can foster learning for systemic change, since TrustAfrica's work is oriented towards national policies. This could be combined with learning around the nexus between **local agricultural development and national and international food markets**; such learning will

be more complex as it questions the actual approach of improving value chains.

Several foundations invest in **agricultural and rural cooperatives**. There may be a space to exchange experience in concrete service provision for cooperatives. Many actors indicate cooperatives represent one of many options. A learning process in a broader group could explore different possibilities to help smallholder farmers collaborate and innovate to generate economies of scale and foster economic viability of smallholder farming in Europe.

Several communities of practice and networks are active around the agro-ecology theme; the challenge is how to connect what is learnt at technical levels with socio-economic and political processes. This requires sharing practice among those who strictly adhere to agro-ecological approaches and explore where and how such connections have been successfully made.

Feeding the cities and advancing agro-ecology lend themselves well for a joint reflection among funders with diverse interests, such as generating employment, rural innovation, slowing urbanisation, biodiversity preservation and municipal food planning, on how foundation interventions fit into or contribute to broader systemic change.

Chapter 8

Conclusions and recommendations

8

A very diverse group of European foundations – see also the case descriptions in the annexes – is engaged with issues of food and agriculture, applying different approaches, instruments and resources. All share common concerns that link poverty and food (in)security with the sustainability of our planet.

Aside from this current initiative on foundations active in family farming, almost all of the participants in study are already involved in collaborative initiatives around food and agriculture. In this rich context a new collaborative initiative can add value either through collaborative learning – which is feasible also in larger groups of diverse actors – and through joint ac-

tion and funding. The latter would need a group of strategically aligned actors. This study seeks to support foundations on their journey to such collaboration.

ON FOUNDATIONS AND FAMILY FARMING

Few foundations explicitly focus on family farming or feel the need to do so. Most foundations work in the broader field of agriculture and food. Among them, one can differentiate between those who explicitly seek to promote agro-ecology (and those who do not) and between those who explicitly regard smallholder farmers as instrumental to sustainable agriculture (as opposed to those who do not).

Attempts to estimate the financial dimensions of foundation engagement were hindered by the fact that family farming is not often used as a category by foundations. The foundations that participated in the study or the quick scan reported altogether a total annual expenditure of approximately €30 million on activities that can be labelled in broad terms as family farming/agriculture. The bulk of support goes to farmers and farmers' organisations and agro-ecology and sustainable agricultural practices.

ON MAPPING INTERVENTIONS

When attempting to map a relatively small sample of interventions of foundations as a starting point for learning and collaboration, it turns out that foundations engage with a wide range of issues in food and sustainable agriculture and in very different ways. Foundations are different both as to what they support as well as how they approach change.

To identify more exactly what foundations do, a refined taxonomy can be helpful, preferably one that departs from the entire process of food production, storage and consumption. We recommend a taxonomy based on a matrix that distinguishes 'Production and Producers' as one label, 'Storage, Processing and Distribution' as a second, and 'Consumption and Consumers' as a third label on one axis.

A matrix emerges when on the other axis, interventions are categorised in terms of 'Environment and Biodiversity', 'Socio-Economic Issues', and 'Health and Nutrition'. Such taxonomy can identify very clearly and consistently what foundations do. Some interventions may be very specific and others may cover a broad range of issues. The study finds that some foundations support specialised interventions while others

address all issues across the spectrum, from producers, via distribution to consumers.

We also recommend to consider the differences in the approaches towards change. For this we use an approach that builds on research on agricultural innovation systems and that distinguishes:

- 1 The technology, knowledge and best practices approach
- 2 The collaborative approaches for developing technology and best practices
- 3 The Value Chain approaches based on Agricultural Knowledge and Information Systems (AKIS)
- 4 The System Change approach based on the Agricultural Innovation System (AIS).

The quick scan – drawing on a group of 18 foundations – also provides some information about the geographic focus of the work of foundations and the kind of support they provide. As to the latter, the scan indicates that traditional instruments (grants, fellowships and self-operated programmes) are dominant.

ON COLLABORATION

The original three themes 'Feeding the Cities', 'Supporting Farmers and Farmers' Organisations' and 'Agro-ecology and Sustainable Farming Practices' seem to work as umbrella terms for further exchange and networking, as is currently taking place within the three thematic working groups of the E4F. However, to go beyond an exchange of practice and experience, more narrowly defined topics have to be defined and a stronger strategic alignment and shared understanding of the approach to change may be required. The two mapping tools suggested in this study could be helpful for further defining topics and strategic alliances.

Support to small farmers and micro business in Honduras (Trias, BRS & Cera)





Farmers' solidarity group in Uganda receiving financial training (BRS & Cera)

There is scope and appetite for collaboration. The mapping tool for 'What foundations do' shows many opportunities for exchanging, joint learning and action. Specific issues that were mentioned by foundations included:

- ◆ Working with farmers organisations
- ◆ Rural credit
- ◆ Promoting rural/agricultural employment
- ◆ Creating an enabling (policy) environment for agro-ecological approaches
- ◆ Connecting cities and their rural environments

Further details can be found in chapter 7. The case descriptions and vignettes may also provide further concrete entry points for collaboration.

Collaboration should also be considered as a way to harness the potential of complementary interventions. Most foundations are restricted in their financial and human resources. To enhance impact, an organisation may choose to coordinate or partner with others that are working comple-

mentarily on other, more systemic approaches that deal with barriers like market regulations and international policies. The mapping tool 'How do foundations work on change' could present useful entry points for complementarity.

Because of the diversity of approaches among foundations, some foundations will have to assume the role of bridge-builders.

Several collaborative ventures are described in the study and the case descriptions. It is recommended that foundations explore further the opportunities presented by such collaborations - either for deepening learning, or as a concrete possibility to leverage their own resources and potentially have a greater impact by getting involved in an existing collaboration.

This study is by no means exhaustive in scoping out opportunities for collaboration, but we hope it inspires readers to spot and share opportunities to go further.

Foundations' Approaches to Family Farming: Short Profiles

AgroEcology Fund

The AgroEcology Fund is a multi-donor fund set up in 2012 by a group of foundations, including the Christensen Fund, New Field Foundation and Swift Foundation. To date, the Fund has involved in total eight donors from the USA and the UK through two grantmaking rounds.

The donors contributing to the Fund view conventional agricultural models as compromising economic well-being, undermining food sovereignty and biodiversity, degrading the environment, and contributing to climate change. They believe agro-ecology provides a more sustainable approach to feeding the world with nourishing food while protecting smallholders' land rights, restoring the environment, and empowering family farmers and peasants to experiment with agro-ecological techniques and measure results. Since many scientists and academics are engaged in agro-ecological research and studies, the Fund seeks to strengthen relationships between farmer organisations and professional researchers, which in many cases are fragmented and under-funded. The donors believe that, if interlinked and amplified, collaborating actors can improve agro-ecological farming practices and create a unified, well-informed, and positive message for advancing agro-ecological solutions.

The Fund supports three types of activities: 1) Research, learning exchanges and knowledge building; 2) Strengthening social movements and awareness efforts; and 3) Collaboration and network building. It has a particular interest in supporting collaborations that link local, national and international initiatives. In 2012, the Fund awarded approximately \$1 million in its first round of grant-making to six partnerships. These grants were given over a two-year grant period to grantees

working in a variety of locations, including Central and South America, West Africa, the United States, Southeast Asia, and South Asia.

	Overall	Family Farming
2012 budget	\$1 million	\$1 million

In 2014, the Fund will award over \$1.2 million in grants for activities in 2014 and 2015. In addition, the Fund seeks to expand participation to other donors interested in collaborating on the scaling up of agro-ecology worldwide, and to encourage exchange and learning among grantees, donors and international development institutions.

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

The AgroEcology Fund highlights the important role played by smallholder farmers, indigenous peoples and peasant communities in feeding the world in sustainable ways, using agro-ecology as a holistic system that is part of family farming in contrast to large-scale industrial agriculture. Agro-ecology comprises food production and local markets but also environmental stewardship, a way of life, and a strategy to keep rural communities resilient and strong. The grants seek to reform the food system through collaborations that promote agro-ecological practices (at local, national and international level), make available productive resources like seeds, and influence international agricultural and trade policies.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND IMPACT

The AgroEcology Fund actively seeks to build and share knowledge on promoting and scaling up agro-ecology and sustainable farming practices. It is an example of multi-donor collaboration. The founding donors aimed for an independently and impartially managed fund that was gen-

uinely collaborative. Because the donors were already occupied with existing grant programs, they contracted a national philanthropic organisation to manage the fund. An advisory board was established to review proposals and advise on the selection of grantee partnerships. The establishment of the multi-donor fund has been time consuming but the contributing foundations have found that they could accomplish certain things together that they could not accomplish alone, for example, funding in new regions of the world and with new constituencies without having to re-fashion their mission or strategic plan. The ability to dive deeply into agro-ecology with other funders and with new partners has contributed to accelerating learning and impact. Even in the relatively short time since the creation of the Fund, trustees and boards of directors of the participating foundations have seen an increase in their organisation's effectiveness through this partnership.

Website: <http://agroecologyfund.org/>

A view from Doğan Organic Farm, Turkey (Aydin Doğan)



Aydin Doğan Foundation



The Aydın Doğan Foundation was established in 1996 by the Turkish businessman and media magnate Aydın Doğan and serves as an instrument to guide the social responsibility projects of the Doğan Group of Companies.

The Aydın Doğan Foundation believes in a democracy that is built on a well-educated and informed society. Therefore it provides opportunities to people to get access to unbiased and correct information, and invests in, organises and supports activities to enhance the level of education in a range of sectors: sports, health, arts, social and cultural sector, and organic farming. The foundation provides prizes, funds and investments to projects that are basically implemented by the foundation or a related Doğan Company.

	Overall	Family Farming
2014 budget	€ 2.7 million	€193,000

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

According to the Aydın Doğan Foundation, family farming is of strategic importance for the economic, social and environmental development of Kelkit, a rather barren area in the Northeast of Turkey and hometown of the founding father Aydın Doğan, where the foundation is focusing its efforts on. The main livelihood of the region is conventional livestock breeding, which until about 10 years ago was carried out with informal

out-of-date methods. Viable farming opportunities can provide an alternative to the community, thus countering migration to the cities and contributing to the long-term sustainable development of the region.

The Organic Farming and Stock Farming Project started in 2003-2004 with the establishment of a vocational school to teach organic farming, among others, and a 'train the trainers' programme in collaboration with the UNDP. A company for organic products had been established two years earlier with the objective to become a hub for organic milk production and livestock breeding. Since the land was hardly used before, the conditions for starting organic farming were considered excellent. Furthermore, in 2002 the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Animal Husbandry designated the Kelkit Basin as a pilot zone in Turkey for organic agriculture, and provided subsidies for initiatives in the region. The promise that the company would purchase their produce helped persuade the farmers to start organic farming. The vocational school programme on organic farming and the 'training of trainers' component are considered by the foundation as critical to the permanence and sustainability of agriculture in the region.

By connecting a commercial enterprise with the local farmers, the foundation wanted to create a model for sustainability. The company provides the farmers with know-how, technology and inputs to improve their production. Purchase prices for raw materials and for produce are agreed upon at the beginning of each season, which ensures access to inputs and a guaranteed sale of produce, with most of the risk borne by the company. The company has not been very profitable yet, but the main priority during the initial phase has been to invest in the development of

the region. The foundation channels all the funding through the company, which acts as an implementing party. The foundation does not plan to extend the programme to other districts or regions. It wants to develop a model that can be replicated in other regions.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND IMPACT

Aydin Doğan Foundation has not worked with other foundations but collaborated with UNDP (training the trainers), with commercial banks (access to favourable loans to farmers), with the local and national government as well the private sector to design and fully embed the programme in the region, and to ensure its sustainability and success. Linking commercial (social) enterprises with family farming is an area of interest for learning and exchange.

Website: <http://www.aydindoganvakfi.org.tr>



Carnegie UK Trust



The Carnegie UK Trust is a long-standing foundation, founded by Andrew Carnegie and based in Scotland. Its mission is to improve well-being in the UK and Ireland. The Trust's main way of working used to be grant making but in 2010 it changed its strategy and it now focuses on Changing Minds (policy) and Changing Lives (practice) in three areas: 1) Enterprise and Society; 2) Knowledge and Culture; and 3) People and Place.

While Carnegie UK Trust continues to fund a broad variety of activities through partnerships with charities and others, it does no longer do open calls. The annual expenditure of the Trust in 2013 was approximately €2 million. Growing Livelihoods, the only current programme related to family farming, has an annual allocation of €63,000 for 2014.

	Overall	Family Farming
2013 budget	€2 million	€0

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

The foundation does not explicitly work with family farmers and does not have an official position on farming or family farming. Rural development has always been an important area of work of the foundation. Carnegie UK Trust is widely known in the UK and Ireland for the rural libraries it established in remote areas.

In 2012, the Trust published a policy paper on Future Directions on Rural Development. The

paper suggests that agricultural production is no longer the primary source of resilience and strength of rural communities. Current work of the foundation in rural areas includes digital inclusion, rural transport and rural energy.

The Growing Livelihoods pilot programme focuses on employment generation through cooperative horticultural activity. It is about (urban) food supply, skills and employment. Some initiatives support the use of organic methods but that is not a requirement. Roundtables around possible employment in horticulture showed that while there is interest and good educational opportunities to engage, there are few possibilities to actually start horticultural production, nor is there adequate support or training on how to manage a horticultural farm. The programme builds on previous investments in the Land Settlement Association that has supported veterans and unemployed people to take-up cooperative growing since the end of the First World War. Carnegie UK Trust joined forces with the Plunkett Foundation, which is experienced in supporting rural cooperatives, and the Land Settlement Association Charitable Trust to launch Growing Livelihoods as an experimental programme that may be scaled up or lead to policy change.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND IMPACT

Carnegie UK Trust is interested in sharing experience around creating employment opportunities in growing food. They are also interested in sharing information around urban agriculture and community food growing groups.

Cera



Cera's mission is to be a steward of its endowment and protect the long term interest of KBC Group N.V., a Belgian bank and insurance group with cooperative roots, and to promote the fundamental values of the cooperative movement and cooperative entrepreneurship. Cera is historically rooted in the Raiffeisen movement of rural self-help based on cooperation. It now counts over 400,000 members.

Initially, Cera pursued its philanthropic mission mainly as a grantmaker. Currently it uses a mixed approach drawing on a variety of instruments. Over time Cera has spun off several now independent organisations. It also leverages funding from third parties, including the government, to scale up and reinforce programmes and initiatives it supports. Cera works with a strong emphasis

on collaboration and networking, trying to connect diverse actors, something they consider independent foundations are particularly well placed to do. Cera invests mostly in capacity strengthening and movement building: to be an effective model, it is critical that cooperatives are democratically governed and well managed.

In 2013, Cera Foundation's philanthropic budget was €4.6 million with €600,000 dedicated to family farming.

	Overall	Family Farming
2013 budget	€4.6 million	€600,000

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

For Cera, family farming includes almost all agricultural production units that are meant to sustain a family even if they draw occasionally on paid labour (particularly in horticulture). Cera finds that low-tech is not an essential consideration; the focus is on sustainability as a goal. Cera has been very active in supporting family farmers to organise themselves in cooperatives to buy inputs and

to commercialise output. Currently it is engaged in three undertakings relevant to family farming: Innovatiesteunpunt/Innovation Support Center, a multi-stakeholder service provider to farmers in Flanders that engages in information and awareness-raising, advisory services towards farmers to further foster sustainable, future-oriented agriculture; Coopburo, a support office operating within Cera, that provides advisory services and implements projects; and BRS-Microcredit and Insurance, a technical assistance service for cooperative initiatives that provides microcredit and insurance in the global South. It should be noted that even though many of its clients are farmers, Coopburo offers support to anyone who wishes to start a cooperative.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND IMPACT

Cera emphasises that it is complex to support farmers' organisations and micro-finance programmes in the global South and is keen to connect and share experiences with other funders; outreach of microfinance institutions to rural areas would be of particular interest. Cera is an active member of the International Raiffeisen Union (IRU), an international network of co-operatives organisations in 36 countries. It is also a founding partner of the Co-operative Europe Development Platform. Cera partners with the Belgian members of AgriCord which is a network of "agri-agencies" from several EU countries, Canada, Senegal and one regional organisation from Asia. AgriCord and its members provide support to farmers' organisations in developing countries, covering both capacity building and concrete operations. Cera is currently developing a network of partners to adapt the Innovation Support Center model to other European countries.

Website: <http://www.cera.be/>

Compagnia di San Paolo



Compagnia di San Paolo was founded in Turin in 1563 as a charitable brotherhood and is one of Europe's most important private foundations. Compagnia di San Paolo pursues goals that are of public interest and social utility, with the aim of advancing civil, cultural, and economic development in the community in which it is active (Turin and surroundings). The foundation works in several areas: scientific, economic and juridical research; education; art; conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage and activities and of heritage sites; health; assistance to the socially vulnerable groups. It pursues its mission through providing grants, through designing and operating own programmes and projects, as well as through a number of operating entities it has created. Most of the support goes to public benefit organisations (NGOs, associations, foundations), municipal organisations and universities in the Piedmont region (75% of the budget is allocated to work in Turin; only 0,7% of the budget goes to international work outside the EU).

Compagnia di San Paolo's 2012 budget was 130 million euro, a little under earlier year budgets because of the financial crisis. Some 40% of grants are between €10,000 and €50,000, 20% are larger than €500,000.

	Overall	Family Farming
2012 budget	€130 million	€735,000



Family business (BRS & Cera)



Mango campaign, Diouloulou, Senegal (Fondazioni4Africa)

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Compagnia di San Paolo became involved with family farming because of the Slow Food movement that emerged in the Piedmont region. Since 2004 every two years the Terra Madre event takes place in Turin. Organised by Slow Food, Terra Madre is about food, agriculture and the protection of biodiversity. Participants are farmers from 180 countries. Acknowledging this movement, in 2006 Compagnia di San Paolo started supporting the ideas behind it and the event itself. The foundation also invests in promoting small (urban) social farming activities, school gardens and the 10,000 Food Gardens project of Slow Food Africa. Fondazioni4Africa, a collaboration of several Italian foundations (see Annex), has a strong focus on family farmers and farmers' organisations. Recently Compagnia di San Paolo launched a new programme 'Turin and the Alps', about the interaction between the city and surrounding (rural) alpine areas where family farming is one area of interest.

According to Compagnia di San Paolo, family farming could provide an answer to the challenge of food security and to fundamental questions raised by the Slow Food movement, such as: why

is food production insufficient; why do we waste incredible quantities of food; and why do we get sick from food? Family farming is undertaken on small-scale holdings, involves family members, and protects ancient ways, indigenous seeds and species. Compagnia di San Paolo stresses that it is people that people make change happen: a cultural change among consumers and producers/agriculturalists can spark a change in the way we produce, distribute and consume food and thus benefit our long-term interests.

One of the key challenges for family farming and the Slow Food movement is that people think that sustainable agriculture is too small to address the big issues regarding agriculture and food the world faces. At a practical level, access to credit as well as to marketing and distribution channels represents a problem for small-scale farmers. Family farmers should also get more support to connect with researchers, and to access innovation and information technologies.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

In the past, collaboration with others has helped Compagnia di San Paolo to innovate (see for example Fondazioni4Africa). Collaboration is important for learning, visibility and having a stronger voice and impact, Compagnia di San Paolo is interested in learning more about working with Farmers Associations in Africa or globally. Some of the issues they are grappling with include: how to achieve scale and better linkages between local and national networks; how to work on the link between credit and farmers' associations; and how to support farmers' associations in developing good governance and management.

Website: <http://www.compagniadisanpaolo.it/>

Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso



Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso is a French family foundation, established in 2010. It works in two programme areas: sustainable food systems and diets, and arts in the community. Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso funds in France, Spain and globally. It provides grants to select partners or through calls for proposals, and also designs and implements own initiatives. Scientific evidence is important for the foundation; it invests substantially in research and a respected body of advisors guides its work.

The foundation awards The Daniel Carasso Premio. This is an international prize awarded every two years to a scientist or a research team for outstanding work in the field of 'sustainable food systems and diets for long term health'. In 2013 the foundation spent nearly €6.6 million in grants of which €2.7 million (42%) went to activities in the area of sustainable food systems.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€6 million	€2.7 million

*Sustainable food systems

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Over the past four years, the foundation has supported projects on ecosystems, agriculture and food, social solidarity food stores, sustainable fish and food against exclusion. It also supports French, Spanish and Italian partners in two SUSFOOD research programmes. Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso does not have a specific programme that

targets family farms or small-scale agriculture. It is convinced that because of their complexity, the major problems are not going to be solved by one kind of solution. In other words, agro-ecology on its own is not going to solve problems, neither are GMOs. The foundation wants to ensure that all possible and potentially interesting approaches and solutions to the systemic food and nutrition problems the world faces are being explored. It prioritises activities that bring together diverse stakeholders in the food system that bring different angles to the problems at different levels. According to the foundation, the food system as a whole (including production, transformation, distribution and consumption) has 4 key dimensions and outcomes: nutrition, environment, social and economic. They are closely linked together and should be considered in an integrated perspective. This is the reason why Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso has decided to look at the entire food system, from seed to stomach.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso does not hesitate to engage with the policy dimensions of food and agricultural systems. Earlier this year, the Foundation established an International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food Systems (IPES-Food), co-chaired by Olivier de Schutter and Olivia Yambi, to come up with recommendations for a more sustainable food system. They are partnering with Stordalen Foundation, Norway, and founder of the EAT Stockholm Food Forum. Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso emphasises collaboration with all the food actors, including the private sector, for example through corporate foundations. It is also involved in consortia like the Global Alliance for the Future of Food.

Website: <http://www.fondationcarasso.org>

Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme



Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme (FPH) was established in 1982 by Charles Léopold Mayer. The foundation's financial resources come from the original endowment donated by the founder.

The purpose of the foundation is to contribute to the emergence of a world community. For this to happen, three paths of change are needed in the eyes of the foundation: development and implementation of new regulations and forms of governance; managing the planet and its resources and adopting common ethical principles for this; and developing and promoting a sustainable society. The ultimate goal is systemic change.



Family Farming in Lesachtal (Forum Synergies & FPH)

The foundation provides long-term support (6-10 years) to civil society alliances and networks. It develops and implements tools and methods for these alliances and networks to embark on and walk the path of change and shares and reflects on experiences about the three paths of change. The nature of supported interventions includes capacity strengthening, movement building, training, lobbying, and networking. Projects are usually collectively developed between the foundation and its partners. Partners that receive funding are usually based in Europe and some of them operate globally. In 2014, FPH had around 60 grantees. 154 partners and organisations make up the core of FPH's social capital - the network with which they exchange lessons and interventions.

	Overall	Family Farming
2014 budget	€7.9 million	€620,000

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

FPH does not have a specific family farming programme but does support activities that benefit small-scale farming, including access to commons, access to seeds and EU seed legislation, access to land, agro-ecology in France, Latin America, West and North Africa, transforming urban food systems in Europe, the Balkans and China, the reform of CAP (2013 and 2020), scenarios for the transformation towards an agro-ecological system in Europe, and farmers' organisations in China and Chad. According to the foundation, family farming is important as it contributes to the stability of societies through the creation of employment and linking production and consumption at local levels; and it helps preserve the bio-diversity. Over the last few years the foundation's budget for agriculture has decreased, since its focus is moving towards the broader production and consumption systems of which agriculture is only a part.



Children learning about beekeeping in Eastern Tyrol (Forum Synergies & FPH)

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTEREST

FPH, Oak Foundation and Mava Foundation are supporting ARC2020, which is a multi-stakeholder platform of 150 organisations from 22 EU Member States whose purpose is to monitor and influence the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The platform was set up in 2010, ahead of the latest CAP 2014-2020 reform. ARC2020 is calling for a paradigm shift in agriculture and a rural renaissance: from industrialised agriculture towards sustainable farming. It argues that general subsidies, unrelated to sustainable farming systems or public goods, cannot be politically justified. Support should reward sustainable farming practice, environmental stewardship and should target small and family farms, particularly those in difficult areas, thus enhancing the diversification of farm and rural economies. The 'Greening the CAP' efforts have not been very successful yet; FPH is interested in continuing to explore these issues with other funders and discuss funding strategies.

Website: <http://www.fph.ch/>

Fondation de France



Fondation de France is a private foundation founded in 1969. Fondation de France seeks to supports concrete and innovative projects that meet the needs of people facing the challenges posed by a rapidly changing society. Its key action areas are: support to vulnerable people; knowledge and skills; the environment; and the development of philanthropy.

Fondation de France raises and manages funds: it receives support from a large base of private individual donors (435,000 in 2013). It also helps others to create funds and manage funds: currently, it hosts 744 private funds and foundations under its aegis. The foundation further plays an important role in the promotion and development of philanthropy at national and international level. Grantmaking is Fondation de France's main modality and grantees are selected by selection committees. The foundation also supports the exchange and scaling-up of experiences, and gives awards and prizes. Grant recipients are usually NGOs and research institutes. The grants are mainly distributed in France but many recipients work also abroad. The foundation also manages a number of international solidarity programmes. The total



Market in Senegal, 2013 (Fondation de France)

budget of Fondation de France in 2013 was €128 million for 8,600 grants, which includes both Fondation de France’s programmes and projects of the foundations under its aegis, (€83 million for 6,800 grants in 2008).

	Overall	Family Farming
2013 budget	€128 million	€6.1m (est)

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Fondation de France is one of the foundations that pay specific attention to family farming since 2009, under its International Solidarity Programme. It perceives family farms as smallholder community-connected farms that manage the land in an intergenerational perspective using their household labour, own resources and their own capital. It considers family farming important for the protection and safeguarding of the environment and natural resources, for ensuring access to land and food security, notably in rapidly-growing urban centres, and for employment and resilience in rural areas. Food security and employment are key to stability. For the survival of family farming in developing countries, Fondation de France thinks farmers need specific protective and supportive measures in order to become truly competitive at national and regional level. Collecting solid and credible data on the productivity and the potential of family farming, and the dissemination of good practices are essential. Fondation de France itself does not advocate policy shifts. It supports movements/organisations that represent the interests of vulnerable groups or communities in their advocacy efforts, as it considers this the most legitimate way of advocating the foundation’s own cause and solutions.

Fondation de France’s family farming programme is focused on West Africa. Through this

programme, Fondation de France has supported more than 80 innovative and concrete projects since 2009. Its priorities in the region include also: reinforcing farmers’ organisations knowledge development and capitalisation capacities, and promoting peasant-based support services to small farmers.

Fondation de France further provides support to organisations in France that are working on agro-ecology (€2.5 million euros in 2013 for over 25 projects). As part of its post-emergency programmes, the foundation invests in building up agricultural resilience: €5.5 million in Haiti, and €1 million in the Philippines. The post-emergency investments are not part of the family farming programme. Besides Fondation de France’s own programmes, many among the 744 foundations and funds under its aegis also support family farming-related projects in France and abroad.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTEREST

Fondation de France supports several collaborative initiatives on access to land and on the reform of the EU Common Agricultural Policy, notably the European platform Forum Synergies. It has a keen interest in exchanging and collaborating with other foundations around different aspects of their work on family farming. Fondation de France is the chair of a European funding collaborative, Fikra, which is a joint fund to support social and economic development projects in Tunisia.

Website: <http://www.fondationdefrance.org/>

Fondation Nicolas Hulot pour la Nature et l’Homme



Founded in 1990, Fondation Nicolas Hulot strives for an equitable and inclusive world that respects nature and the well-being of human beings. The foundation tries to change individual and collective behaviour in France and abroad and encourages people to contribute to an ecological transition. It aspires to be as much a “do-tank” as a “think-tank.

Fondation Nicolas Hulot works on ecological transition, particularly: responsible food, biodiversity, climate and energy, democracy, and economy. It undertakes three types of interventions: education and awareness programmes in France; policy development and advocacy for policy changes; and grants for capacity development projects in France and in some developing countries in Africa and South America. 90% of the foundation’s budget is allocated to initiatives in France and the rest of Europe; 10% goes to international projects. The largest share of the 2013 budget, approximately 70%, came from corporate responsibility programmes of (French) enterprises, 8% from subsidies and 16% from the public. Over the last few years the budget has decreased because of the financial crisis. The foundation does grantmaking (15%) and programme implementation (85%). The total budget for 2012 was €4.5 million.

	Overall	Family Farming
2012 budget	€4.5 million	€250,000

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Fondation Nicolas Hulot’s approach to the agricultural field is through agro-ecology. It focuses on small-holders in order to contribute to generating employment and building resilient communities. The foundation sees food as the common denominator for all living beings and at the heart of sustainable development issues. It seeks to respond to the problems of the current food production and consumption system that degrade ecosystems, emit GHG, and make farmers more dependent. Fondation Nicolas Hulot develops – with other actors – proposals to promote and support agricultural production methods that are respectful of ecosystems and people. It is also investing in initiatives aimed at ‘greening’ the EU Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) as it greatly influences the production systems in France, Europe and worldwide.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

Fondation Nicolas Hulot was closely involved in bringing together Group CAP 2013 in anticipation of the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy 2013-2020. Following the publication of the CAP assessment in 2008, which showed a bleak picture of EU’s agriculture and rural development, a group of 15 (later 25) French organisations, active in the field of agriculture, international solidarity, sustainable development, and environmental protection, formed a coalition to make proposals for major reforms of the CAP 2014-2020. The foundation continues its involvement in the group and is also involved in the pan-European network, ARC2020, which is supported by several European foundations, including Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme, Oak Foundation and Mava Foundation.

Website: <http://www.fondation-nicolas-hulot.org/>

Fondazione Cariplo



Fondazione Cariplo, founded in 1991, is based in Milan and is one of the largest foundations of banking origin in Italy. The foundation's mission is to support social, cultural, and economic development of the Lombardy community, including the provinces of Verbano-Cusio-Ossola and Novara in Piedmont, by being a resource that helps civil society organisations better serve their own community. It is governed by a broad representation of diverse stakeholders in the region it is expected to serve. The foundation funds innovation and promotes participatory projects. It also devises and implements its own projects and acts as a convenor and catalyst in the community.

Fondazione Cariplo is active in four areas: environment, arts and culture, social services and scientific research. Its work in development cooperation is part of the social services area.



The foundation maintains an online database of its grants, searchable by thematic areas and a set of subtopics.

Drawing on the proceeds from its assets and other resources, Fondazione Cariplo's expenditure in 2013 amounted to €140 million, of which 2% or €3 million were broadly related to family farming.

	Overall	Family Farming
2013 budget	€140 million	€3.036 million

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

For Fondazione Cariplo, family farming means farming on relatively small holdings, using mostly family labour, often - but not exclusively - connected to local food markets. Family farmers are seen as potential protectors of biodiversity. Family farming is addressed in three of the foundation's core areas of work. Within the research area, Fondazione Cariplo collaborates with Fondation Agropolis to promote agro-ecology and sustainable farming practices in the cereal field, funding research projects with the potential to benefit smallholder farmers. Within the environment area, the key challenge for the foundation is to contain the process of urbanisation and to promote more sustainable food production and consumption in the Lombardy region.

Fondazione Cariplo is working with Parco Agricolo Sud Milano on developing a set of indicators to monitor the environmental impact of (smallholder) agriculture. It also provides support to municipalities to develop sustainable food plans. Further, the foundation funds educational and awareness activities that target different segments of the population,

including schoolchildren, and supports services for Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) development in peri-urban areas. A new project in the mountainous parts of Lombardy and Piedmont, which is jointly funded by the research and environment areas, is starting to bring back agricultural activities on abandoned farmland, with specific attention to youth employment and land care to address hydrological issues. Fondazione Cariplo is part of Fondazioni4Africa, which is a collaboration of several Italian foundations (see Annex). This initiatives falls under the foundation's social area.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

Fondazione Cariplo has a strong commitment to collaboration - locally, nationally and internationally. Staff involved in the foundation's research, environmental and social services/development cooperation areas worked together to provide input to the study. Fondazione Cariplo was one of the initiators of Fondazioni4Africa. It is interested in exchanging experiences with others around the world working with smallholder, family farmers.

Fondazione Cariplo leads the committee organising the EFC Annual General Assembly and Conference in Milan in 2015. The foundation is a member of several funders' networks that interface with the themes of agriculture and farming - the EFC Research Forum, the Global Alliance for the Future of Food, and the EFC Environmental Funders Network.

Website: <http://www.fondazionecariplo.it/>

The Gatsby Charitable Foundation



The Gatsby Charitable Foundation (Gatsby) was founded in 1967 by David Sainsbury - UK Minister of Science and Innovation from 1998-2006. Currently the foundation focuses on six areas: Plant Science, Neuroscience, Science and Engineering Education, Public Policy, Arts, and Economic Development in Africa. Gatsby's expenditure for the budget year 2013/2014 was £63.4 million. The foundation provides long-term support through grants and investments and has set up a number of independent entities. The budget for its Africa programmes in 2014 is about £4.5 million.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€80 million	€5.8 million

* Africa Programme

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Gatsby began working in Africa in 1985 with the overall goal of creating jobs and improving incomes for poor people. It is currently focusing on achieving this by financing and implementing programmes in East Africa that seek to transform entire sectors: cotton and textiles in Tanzania, tea in Rwanda and Tanzania, and forestry in Tanzania (with a programme under development in Kenya). It also has a portfolio of social investments, mainly in two private equity funds that invest in small and medium agricultural enterprises in East Africa.

Until 2007, Gatsby was providing primarily grant finance to agricultural research and dissemination projects in Africa. The foundation's ambitions grew when David Sainsbury left the UK government and reengaged with the organisation. He met with Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete and talked about priority sectors that needed support to enable the structural transformation of Tanzania's economy. Gatsby started shifting its strategy for the cotton and textiles industry to a sector approach, which involves identifying and addressing constraints along the whole value chain, across supportive markets and within the surrounding policy environment.

This sector approach means that Gatsby intervenes through a range of measures including research, lobbying, capacity strengthening of farmer organisations and crop boards, technology transfer, training and investment. It works with stakeholders including farmers, processors, research institutions, input providers, extension services, financial institutions and policymakers. The complexities of such a sector approach mean that Gatsby's role has evolved from being a grantmaker into an organisation that designs and implements its own programmes.

Gatsby does not focus exclusively on family farming but looks to improve incomes for poor people by

supporting mutually beneficial relationships in sectors. As a result, cash crops figure heavily in its portfolio. For example, Gatsby invests in strengthening relationships between growers and processors; it considers these as essential in ensuring long-term sustainable investment in smallholder farmers.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

Gatsby has developed a joint funding partnership with The Wood Foundation to support the tea sectors in Rwanda and Tanzania. The partnership is working with government, factories and farmers to bolster the sector's competitiveness and ensure that smallholders benefit from its growth. Gatsby also co-finances several programmes in East Africa with bilateral donors. The foundation has a relatively small budget for the Africa programmes; co-funding provides an opportunity to leverage its resources and increase the impact of the interventions. Gatsby is interested in building, testing and refining models so they can be applied successfully elsewhere by others, and the partnership with The Wood Foundation allows them to learn more about sector approaches and what is needed to make them work.

Website: <http://www.gatsby.org.uk/>

Workers at the Tree Biotechnology Programme Trust in Kenya (Gatsby Charitable Foundation)



Obra Social "la Caixa"



Obra Social "la Caixa" is a Spanish foundation and majority owner of a bank. Besides shares in the bank, its portfolio also includes other assets. The foundation runs an independent philanthropic programme with a budget of €500 million annually. At the same time the bank also has a Corporate Social Responsibility programme, and employees are involved in some of the (international) work of the Obra Social "la Caixa".

Obra Social "la Caixa" envisions being an international point of reference, committed to human rights, peace, justice and people's dignity. Its mission is to contribute to the advancement of people and society, with particular emphasis on the most vulnerable groups, whether through its own programs, strategic alliances or collaboration with third parties. It is important that results can be evaluated and are transferred to other entities. The foundation's 2012 budget was distributed as follows: social programmes (60 %), international programmes (3%), environment and science (13%), cultural (13%), education (7%). Smallholder farming is part of the international programme, which has an annual budget of about €10 million. Besides a socio-economic component, the international programme also includes components related to emergencies and to health and awareness and educational activities.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€500 million	€4.5 million

* vulnerable families

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Obra Social "la Caixa" does not have a specific focus on family farming. Their target group are vulnerable families. The foundation found that these are often involved in small-scale farming to sustain the family and generate income. Obra Social "la Caixa" makes grants for capacity strengthening and investment in (small) infrastructure. The priority areas within the international socio-economic development programme include: micro-credit/rotating funds, training and advice; policy influencing; infrastructure; and promotion and development of/access to marketing networks. In Latin America, Africa and Asia, its portfolio includes grants to the most vulnerable (rural) communities for activities such as the development and increase of the productivity of cooperative or small agricultural units to combat poverty and promote community resilience; the development of cooperatives or small agricultural units that process agricultural produce and assistance to improve their insertion in sectoral or territorial value chains; and support to innovative employment generation.

The foundation puts a strong emphasis on results. In its work with cooperatives and farmers' organisations it seeks to obtain concrete improvements for families in terms of increased income and food, for example. The funding provided by the foundation is complemented, where relevant, with in-kind support for skills development provided by employees of the bank as part of its corporate social responsibility commitment.

The environmental dimension of the programme seeks to ensure that programmes do not have any negative environmental impacts (deforestation, contamination). The environmental dimension of projects, for example, the preservation

of local seed varieties, is valued positively in the selection process. Obra Social “la Caixa” also supports public awareness activities on food and agriculture issues, such as the Food Justice Sowing Hope photo exhibition and a series of related school workshops and documentaries.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

Obra Social “La Caixa” Foundation is interested in sharing experience in working with farmers’ organisations, particularly on rural enterprises and rural credit.

Website: <http://obrasocial.lacaixa.es/>

Irrigation project in India (Obra Social “la Caixa”)



Plunkett Foundation



The Plunkett Foundation is a company limited by guarantee and a registered charity based in the UK. Originally founded by Horace Plunkett in the early 1900-ies, it has limited assets and leverages funds to undertake projects. It also has (paying) members to which it provides services. The foundation’s mission is to help rural communities to take control of the issues affecting them through co-operatives and community ownership. For example, the foundation can help a community to ‘pause’ the sale of buildings or land to get time to develop a bid themselves. The services provided by Plunkett help communities to set-up cooperatives, manage community shops and in other similar activities. The ‘Making Local Food Work’ programme is supported with funding from the Big Lottery Fund, as is the ‘Power to Change’ initiative aimed at growing community enterprises, including in horticulture.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€1,575,000	n/a

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

The Plunkett Foundation’s engagement is with rural communities. Inspired by the experience of its founder, the foundation has been working with farmer cooperatives ever since its establishment. To achieve its goals, the foundation engages with a broad array of rural actors to promote community ownership and the up-take of the cooperative models. One of the preferred groups are small size farmers – they



Organic Farming Students during internship at Doğan Organic Farm (Aydin Doğan)

provide employment, play an important role in their community and help preserve relevant agricultural skills.

The ‘Making Local Food Work’ programme focussed on community food retail and engaged with 1,900 businesses in six years, among them community-owned stores (on average 25% locally sourced), farmers markets (promoting collaboration) and several Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) activities. The programme also catered to community enterprises and organic farms. The new programme, Growing Livelihoods, builds on the successful experience of the Land Settlement Association to create employment through (cooperative) horticulture. The programme seeks to set up shared services and provide (technical) support. It has a strong focus on connections with (short) retail chains. Making that part work can be complicated because of the way the food market works and also because the alternatives, for example direct supply agreements, also have downsides. The foundation sees a number of challenges in the UK context: there is food policy that promotes and helps local food; land prices are high; and, on the retail end, there are some very dominant

market players that overpower small producers and retailers.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

The Plunkett Foundation always works in partnerships. Sir Horace Plunkett was a founding trustee of the Carnegie UK Trust that predates the Plunkett Foundation. According to the Plunkett Foundation, in collaborative ventures the key thing is to find common ground and be explicit about the goals. Grantee-funder relationships can be different from programme partnerships: the Plunkett Foundation and Carnegie UK Trust have shared objectives, while in the relationship with the Big Lottery Fund is different: the Fund sets the objectives and the Plunkett Foundation bids for calls that suit them. Only few organisations in the UK have a similar mission and approach to the Plunkett Foundation; internationally, the foundation works with the Food and Agriculture Organisation and with the international cooperative movement (Cooperatives Europe). The foundation is interested in connecting with other foundations that working on policy issues, such as the EU Common Agricultural Policy.

Website: <http://www.plunkett.co.uk/>

Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau-SÖL



Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau - SÖL (Foundation Ecology & Agriculture) is an independent foundation that aims to contribute to the further development of organic agriculture in Germany and, to a very limited extent, in other German speaking countries. The foundation was established in 1961 by Karl Werner Kieffer and Dagi Kieffer and started off as a grant-making foundation. For the last 15-20 years, however, it has implemented mainly its own projects. The foundation does not provide grants to other organisations. The main activities include documenting and disseminating best practices and knowledge about organic agriculture; researching organic agriculture; educating young consumers, teachers and decision makers; and convening and connecting the various players in the field of organic agriculture (academic world, consumers, advisors, farmers, business and policy makers). The foundation seeks to improve knowledge on organic farming and influence behaviour and policies; however, it does not work directly on changing the market and the market share of organic produce.

In the 90s, SÖL was catalytic in influencing policy making on organic farming. Nowadays this influence has diminished since the political world has set up its own organic farming umbrella organisation, of which SÖL is a member.

The annual budget of the foundation for 2013 was €400,000. 95% of it comes from the in-

come from the endowment; the remaining 5% - from other sources.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€400,000	€400,000

* agro-ecology

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

SÖL invests its entire budget in activities aimed at promoting and supporting agro-ecology/ sustainable agricultural practices. It does not have a specific programme on family farming. The foundation focuses on organic farmers, many of whom are small (family) farmers, but the point of entry is organic production and not the nature or size of the farm. This is partially due to the specific situation in Germany: the farms in eastern Germany are 'collective farms', ranging between 200 and 3,000 hectares. They are owned by a large number of families but are managed by a managing farmer/team of farmers. These are organic farms but certainly not family farms.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE AND INTERESTS

SÖL collaborates with other actors active in organic agriculture - mainly on research, lobbying and the dissemination of best practices. In their experience, collaboration requires a long-term commitment to the process of bringing different actors together, respect for the driver of the initiative and building trust, and modesty in recognising that success is a shared achievement.

Website: <http://www.soel.de/>

Terre de Liens



Terre de Liens (2003) is a French alliance of citizens and farmers operating through 19 regional associations and one national body. Terre de Liens promotes access to agricultural land for (new) organic farmers. Terre de Liens works along three main lines: raising awareness about land issues and mobilising citizens to support organic farmers through educational programmes; mobilising resources to acquire land and buildings that are then rented out to organic farmers, and setting up and supporting multi-stakeholder activities that strengthen local and organic farming.

Terre de Liens has established two entities to pursue its activities:

1 The Foncière is a social enterprise. Its capital comes primarily from savings and private investors; they are also its shareholders. It buys land and farms to stem the loss of farmland, improve access to agricultural land for farmers, and ensure responsible and sustainable management of these resources. The governance comprises a management team (consisting of representatives of the La Nef Bank and Terre de Liens), a supervisory board, and the general assembly. This separation of ownership and management is done to protect their objective of securing farmland for future generations. La Foncière was founded in 2006.

2 The Fondation. Terre de Liens set up a fund in 2009 to help build its assets (financial and in-kind, such as land and buildings). In 2013 it ac-

quired the status of a public foundation, thus providing an adequate institutional vehicle to pursue its purpose to preserve agricultural land for future generations.

All land acquired is given to new and established organic farmers for long-term tenancy with binding environmental clauses. Since the establishment of Terre de Liens movement in 2003, it has acquired 100 farms with over 2,300 hectares dedicated to organic and peasant farming, with 118 farmers and more than 10,000 active citizens supporting the farmers and Terre de Liens. Terre de Liens is also supported Fondation de France, the Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l'Homme and Fonds GERMES d'Économie Fraternelle support this initiative.

	Fondation*	Fonciere*
2014 budget	€700,000	€4-€5 million

* all Family Farming

Goats on an agro-ecological farm in France (Terre de Liens)



ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE,
FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

Terre de Liens dedicates all its energy and money to the issue of land access for sustainable farming in France. It operates from the vision that the current agricultural food and production system needs change, and strives for integrated rural development where the production of healthy and nutritious food is linked to local communities and consumers and done in an environmentally responsible way. Terre de Liens focuses specifically on organic smallholder or peasant farming. All funds are spent on supporting farmers and their organisations and on agro-ecology and sustainable practices.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE
AND INTERESTS

Terre de Liens is a member of the CAP2013 and ARC2020, the French and European citizens' action networks that seek to influence the EU Common Agricultural Policy.

Terre de Liens initiated the creation of the European Network of Civic Initiatives on Access to Land together with 12 other civic organisations from 8 EU countries (United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, France, Catalonia/ Spain, Italy, Romania and Lithuania). The network facilitates the sharing of knowledge and good practice on: assisting farmers in accessing land and in good land stewardship;; raising awareness of land issues; and advocacy at national and EU levels. The network also seeks to influence EU policies on agriculture and access to farmland, and is advocating for for action at EU level to promote sustainable and fair governance of farmland.

Website: <http://www.terredeliens.org/>

TrustAfrica



TrustAfrica was founded formally in 2006 and seeks to strengthen African initiatives that address the most difficult challenges confronting the continent. As a catalyst and convener, TrustAfrica is committed to generating and testing new ideas. The foundation focuses on: securing the conditions for democracy; fostering African enterprise and achieving broadly shared prosperity; cultivating African resources for democracy and development; and strengthening African philanthropy. TrustAfrica's theory of change holds that greater citizen engagement in political and economic governance enables societies to become more stable, more prosperous and more equitable.

It works in partnership with CSOs, universities, INGOs, intermediaries and international foundations. It makes grants, acts as a convener and undertakes activities geared towards learning, sharing and dissemination. TrustAfrica supports a variety of approaches to social change, including advocacy, networking, research and capacity strengthening, as well as pilots and experiments. In 2013 TrustAfrica spent \$2.6 million in grants, \$400,000 on various convening activities across the continent, and approximately \$400,000 on technical assistance. TrustAfrica is funded by foundations operating globally like the Ford Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, among others.

	Overall	Family Farming*
2013 budget	€3.4 million	€400,000

* small holder farming

ENGAGEMENT WITH AGRICULTURE,
FOOD AND FAMILY FARMING

TrustAfrica's work on agricultural development started in 2010. In 2013 grants were made in five countries to support advocacy activities and the organisational development of (national) organisations of smallholder farmers. When the food crisis of 2008-2009 triggered riots, governments across Africa acknowledged that markets were not going to resolve the food problems on their own. The awareness of Africa's increased dependence on food imports has led to important (international) policy commitments at the level of the African Union. However, these commitments have to be translated into national commitments and concrete policies. Smallholder farmers usually have no voice in African policy processes. TrustAfrica supports national and regional organisations in their efforts to monitor and influence national agricultural policies and protect the rights and interests of smallholder

farmers in Malawi, Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria and Ghana. TrustAfrica observes that increasingly farmers speak out and question the role of donors. Media in Africa are very politician-driven and TrustAfrica wants to engage with them to become more issue driven. TrustAfrica also observes that women are taking up more leadership positions and speak out for example on land inheritance issues. Another challenge is the role of traditional authorities that have been co-opted, which has led to underground movements.

COLLABORATION EXPERIENCE
AND INTERESTS

TrustAfrica collaborates with several internationally operating foundations and its experience working with organisations of smallholders to influence national policies could be relevant to other foundations.

Website: <http://trustafrica.org/>

Harvest festival in Tabi, Togo (Réseau Semences Paysannes & FPH)



VIGNETTE:**Fondazioni4Africa**

Fondazioni4Africa started in 2008, five Italian foundations: Compagnia di San Paolo, Fondazione Cariparma, Fondazione Cariplo and the Fondazione Monte dei Paschi di Siena, and Fondazione UMA-NO PROGRESSO. Compagnia di San Paolo took the role of liaison of the initiative Fondazioni4Africa in Senegal, while Fondazione Cariplo played the same leading role in the Northern Ugandan project. Fondazioni4Africa has exited from Senegal and Northern Uganda after a massive five years intervention in the two countries. While the programmes in the two countries were quite different, smallholder farming was at the centre of the interventions.

In Uganda, the main purpose of the programme was to support internally displaced persons (IDPs) to return to their land of origin (Northern Uganda, District of Pader, Agago, Amuru, Gulu) in a holistic manner. The interventions of Fondazioni4Africa thus comprised physical, economic and social livelihood recovery, with an important focus on the role of smallholder farming as key to restore the livelihood assets of local communities. In Senegal, the programme sought to promote specific agriculture value chains (fruits, milk and other locally transformed products), to support rural microfinance and invest in the development of sustainable tourism. Currently, a new joint international programme is being developed in Burkina Faso, modelled on the experiences in Uganda and Senegal. The programme will again have a major focus on smallholders, family farming and linkages with Italy. This collaborative is coordinated by the Italian Association of Banking Foundations (ACRI);

the four initial partners in Fondazioni4Africa are all members of ACRI.

Working with family farmers, the approach of Fondazioni4Africa shows a strong emphasis on reinforcing the entire value chain - from farmer to market - and building the capacities of farmers' organisations, both at institutional and management level. Programme activities also include actions to promote seed diversity protection, rural credit and marketing strategies. Technical and management assistance to farmers is delivered through several methodologies, including farmer's field schools, participatory platforms and family farming networks. Family farmers are assisted to elaborate business plans to be used as economic and financial management tools while running for-profit food processing and marketing units like micro-dairies, fruit processing units, etc.

The programme in Burkina Faso will target several agriculture value chains - rice, soy and horticulture - as well as forestry chains: honey, edible fruits and leaves. The Burkina Faso programme will explicitly incorporate agro-ecological approaches and connect with the global and Italian Slow Food movement. As in earlier interventions, the programme will also establish links with Italians and migrants in Italy originating from Burkina Faso and their organisations. Assessments vary for the different chains, but some of the common weaknesses of family farming, identified by identified by local stakeholders, and which the programme will seek to address include: a lack of (improved) seeds and technical

means, lack of access to credit, soil degradation, absence of marketing channels and 'disorganised and disrupted' agricultural value chains as well as weak producer organisations.

WORKING WITH FARMERS' ORGANISATIONS

The partners in Fondazioni4Africa learned that foundations can (help) provide visibility to farmers' associations and to the key role played by these organisations in sustainable local development mechanisms. Foundations can invest in strengthening their governance and management; in building their capacity to advocate for their members and interests, and in linking them to other stakeholders, for example local authorities and ministries. Another key area where foundations can play a role is in bridging the gap between local small/family farmers' organisations and second/national farmers' organisations and networks.

BROAD-BASED PARTNERSHIP

Fondazioni4Africa involves Italian and local partners. Partners include: Italian farmers' associations, Italian universities and the Italian co-op movement. For example, Senegalese mango produced by family farmers organisation in Casamance has been marketed in Italy through the large distribution chain of Italian co-operatives. Foundations also promoted the exchange and transfer of experience between Senegalese farmers' associations and their homologue institutions in Italy and in other Western African countries (for example in Burkina Faso,

Representatives of farmers' selling their processed products at a national fair, Dakar, Senegal (Fondazioni4Africa)



Mali, and Guinea). Fondazioni4Africa partnered with Turin University to provide support to the Senegalese association of cattle breeders, and with Parma University - on food processing and hygiene dimensions of the programme.

KEY LESSONS

- ◆ Ensure a strong link between financial products and agricultural production for agricultural production to be financially sustainable.
- ◆ In working with farmers' organisations, focus on strengthening the chain approach from basic level association to second and national level.
- ◆ Maintain a strong focus on women and reinforce their role also in the governance of family farmers' associations.
- ◆ Invest in empowering and strengthening the governance of associations, as well as reinforcing their management and technical skills.
- ◆ Pay even more attention to the marketing phases, working on market aggregators and joint solutions enabling several farmers' organisations to enter new markets at local and national level.
- ◆ Involving farmer's organisations from the north can be helpful - the issues farmers in the south and in the north are dealing with are sometimes strikingly similar - but the exchange process needs to be carefully managed.

CHALLENGES THAT STILL NEED SOLUTIONS

- ◆ How to provide access to credit to smallholder farmers through support to microfinance institutions given the fragile trade-off between access to credit and long term sustainability of micro finance institutions operating in rural areas?
- ◆ How can links between local family farmers' organisations and second/national level organisations be strengthened?

Website: <http://www.fondazioni4africa.org>

Bibliography and reference list

FAMILY FARMING

Documents

Agropolis international (2014) *Family Farming. Les dossiers de Agropolis International. Expertise of the scientific community in the Languedoc-Roussillon region (France). Number 19.* Montpellier, France. Retrieved on 2 June 2014, from <http://www.agropolis.org/pdf/publications/family-farming-thematic-file-agropolis-international.pdf>

Choplin, G (2013) 2014, *international year of family farming: Is it all put on or a true opportunity?* Via Campesina. Retrieved 2 June 2014 from <http://www.viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/sustainable-peasants-agriculture-mainmenu-42/1542-2014-international-year-of-family-farming-is-it-all-put-on-or-a-true-opportunity>

FAO HLPE (2013) *Investing in smallholder agriculture for food security. HLPE report 6.* Retrieved on 2 June 2014 from <http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe/reports/en/>

IFAD (2014) *Investing in smallholder family agriculture for global food security and nutrition. IFAD POST-2015 POLICY BRIEF 3.* IFAD, Rome, Italy. Retrieved 2 June from <http://www.ifad.org/pub/post2015/english/3.pdf>

Lowder, S.K., Skoet, J. and Singh, S. (2014) *What do we really know about the number and distribution of farms and family farms*

worldwide? Background paper for The State of Food and Agriculture 2014. ESA Working Paper No. 14-02. FAO, Rome, Italy.

Ploeg, Jan Douwe van der (2013) Theme Overview: Ten qualities of family farming. In www.agriculturesnetwork.org/magazines/east-africa/69/theme-overview retrieved from same at 2 June 2014 <http://www.agriculturesnetwork.org/magazines/east-africa/69/theme-overview>.

Ploeg, Jan-Douwe van der (2008) *The new peasantries. Struggles for autonomy and sustainability in an era of empire and globalization.* Earthscan, UK.

Organisations and websites

AGRICULTURES NETWORK
<http://www.agriculturesnetwork.org/about-us>
The AgriCultures Network builds and shares knowledge on small scale family farming and agroecology and has members in Brazil, China, India, the Netherlands, Peru and Senegal.

UNITED NATIONS FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION (FAO)
<http://www.fao.org/family-farming-2014/en/>

WORLD RURAL FORUM
<http://www.familyfarmingcampaign.net/en/home>
Civil society's website for the International Year of Family Farming 2014, with latest news from the IYFF-2014 National Committees.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION SYSTEM

Documents

FAO (2006) *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options.* FAO, Rome, Italy.

IAASTD (2009) *Agriculture at a Crossroads.* Washington, DC, Island Press.

Interagency Report to the Mexican G20 Presidency (2012) *Sustainable agricultural productivity growth and bridging the gap for small-family farms.* With contributions by Bioversity, CGIAR Consortium, FAO, IFAD, IFPRI, IICA, OECD, UNCTAD, Coordination team of UN High Level Task Force on the Food Security Crisis, WFP, World Bank, and WTO. Retrieved on 2 June 2014 from http://library.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10947/2702/Sustainable_Agricultural_Productivity_Growth_and_Bridging_the_Gap_for_Small-Family_Farms.pdf?sequence=1

Lim Li Ching, Third World Network, and Martin Khor, South Centre (2013) The importance of international trade, trade rules and market structures. In: UNCTAD (2013). *Wake up before it is too late. Make agriculture truly sustainable now for food security in a changing climate. Trade and environment review 2013*, pg. 252-265, UNCTAD.

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2011) *African Agriculture: From meeting needs to creating wealth. Revised Edition.* Ibrahim Forum 2011.

Montpellier Panel, The (2013) *Sustainable Intensification: A New Paradigm for African Agriculture.* London. Retrieved on 2 June 2014 from <https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/>

africanagriculturaldevelopment/Public/Montpellier Panel Report 2013 - Sustainable Intensification - A New Paradigm for African Agriculture.pdf

Paarlberg, Robert (2009) *Starved for Science. How Biotechnology Is Being Kept Out of Africa.* Harvard University Press, Harvard.

Schutter, Olivier de (2014) Final report: *The transformative potential of the right to food (summary). Report to Human Rights Council. A/HRC/25/27* UN General Assembly.

Tittonell, Prof.Dr.Ir. Pablo (2013) *Farming Systems Ecology. Towards ecological intensification of world agriculture.* Inaugural lecture upon taking up the position of Chair in Farming Systems Ecology at Wageningen University on 16 May 2013. Wageningen University.

UNCTAD (2013). *Wake up before it is too late. Make agriculture truly sustainable now for food security in a changing climate. Trade and environment review 2013.* UNCTAD.

Organisations and websites

FONDATION DANIEL ET NINA CARASSO
<http://www.fondationcarasso.org/en/definition>
The Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso is a large family foundation in France, established in 2010, working in two programme areas: sustainable food systems and diets, and arts in the community.

GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE OF OUR FOOD
<http://www.futureoffood.org/about-us/>
The Global Alliance represents more than 30 foundations from 10 countries. At the core of the Global Alliance is a shared belief in

the urgency of advancing sustainable global agriculture and food systems, and in the power of working together and with others to effect positive change.

NEXUS FOUNDATION

<http://www.nexus-foundation.net/>

Nexus Foundation is a foundation challenging the WTO, World Bank and structural adjustment policies by the IMF.

THE SOUTH CENTRE

<http://www.southcentre.int/>

The South Centre is the intergovernmental organization of developing countries that helps developing countries to combine their efforts and expertise to promote their common interests in the international arena. The South Centre works on a wide range of issues such as development policies, sustainable development, climate change, global governance, economic and social development, South-South cooperation, global economic conditions, intellectual property, technology transfer, access to knowledge, health, trade agreements and food security.

THIRD WORLD NETWORK

<http://www.twinside.org.sg/>

Third World Network (TWN) is an independent non-profit international network of organisations and individuals involved in issues relating to development, developing countries and North-South affairs. Its mission is to bring about a greater articulation of the needs and rights of peoples in the South, a fair distribution of world resources, and forms of development that are ecologically sustainable and fulfil human needs.

FEEDING THE CITIES

Documents

FAO (2012) *Food, Agriculture and Cities. Challenges of food and nutrition security, agriculture and ecosystem management in an urbanizing world*.
FAO Food for the Cities multi-disciplinary initiative position paper 2012. Rome, Italy.

Teng, Paul, M. Escaler and Mely Caballero-Anthony (2011) Urban food security: Feeding tomorrow's cities. In: *Significance Special Issue: Megacities. Volume 8, Issue 2*, pages 57-60, June 2011

Zeeuw, H. de, R. van Veenhuizen and M. Dubbeling (2011) The role of urban agriculture in building resilient cities in developing countries. In: *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 149, pp 153-163. doi:10.1017/S0021859610001279.

Organisations and websites

FAO FOOD FOR THE CITIES WEBSITE

<http://www.fao.org/>

FAO's website for Food for the cities. Since 2007 the world's population is predominantly urban. FAO has been following with attention the acceleration of urbanisation over the last 20 years and its implications for the Organisation.

FARMING THE CITY

<http://farmingthecity.net/>

Farming the City is a project devised and developed by CITIES Foundation, an independent research organisation focusing on urban development issues.

IUFN- THE INTERNATIONAL URBAN FOOD NETWORK

<http://www.iufn.org/>

IUFN - the International Urban Food Network - is an international hub promoting sustainable food systems for cities. Their work consists in

facilitating access of local authorities and decision-makers to the results of international research on this topic.

Launched in 2012 as a non-governmental body, IUFN campaigns for city-region food systems as a relevant driver for the construction of resilient territories.

RUAF FOUNDATION - RESOURCE CENTRES ON URBAN AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY

<http://www.ruaf.org/>

The RUAF Foundation is a global network with member organisations in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Europe together constituting a leading centre of expertise in the field of (intra- and peri-) Urban Agriculture and City Region Food Strategies.

SUPPORTING FARMERS AND FARMERS' ORGANISATIONS

Documents

AgriCord (2010) *Farmers fighting poverty. Strengthening farmers' organisations in developing countries*. AgriCord publication.

Wennink, B., S. Nederlof and W. Heemskerk (2007) *Improving support to producers' organizations: Lessons learned from experiences by AgriCord members and donors for the Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme*. KIT/DEV, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Organisations and websites

AGRICORD [HTTPS://WWW.AGRICORD.ORG/ABOUT](https://www.agricord.org/about)

AgriCord is the network of 'agri-agencies', non-governmental organisations for development cooperation with structural links to the farmers' and rural members' organisations in their home

countries (8 EU Member states, Canada, Senegal and Asia). AgriCord and agri-agencies provide support to farmers' organisations in developing countries, covering both capacity building and concrete operations.

AGRI-PROFOCUS

<http://www.agri-profococus.nl/> Agri-ProFocus (APF)

is a partnership with Dutch roots that promotes farmer entrepreneurship in developing countries. The Agri-ProFocus network members are organisations and companies that gather, train, connect and provide inputs and credit to farmer entrepreneurs and producer organisations.

AGRITERRA

<https://www.agriterra.org/en> Agriterra supports farmers' organisations in fighting poverty, with advice from experts from the Dutch agricultural sector and with finance from the Dutch government. Their opinion is that strong farmers' organisations lead to more democracy, economic growth and a better distribution of income.

CERA

<http://www.cera.be/nl/> Cera/KBC Bank is historically rooted in the Raiffeisen movement of rural 'self-help' based on cooperation. Cera is a cooperative in itself with over 400,000 members and its mission is two-fold: Cera is to be a steward of its endowment and protect the long term interest of KBC Group N.V., and on the other hand Cera is to promote the fundamental values of cooperative entrepreneurship.

COOPSEUROPE/ COOPERATIVES IN DEVELOPMENT

<https://coopseurope.coop/development/welcome-cooperatives-international-development>

'Cooperatives in Development' is an initiative that aims to foster exchanges and collaboration for an impact-driven cooperative development

approach. The project is led by Cooperatives Europe and builds upon the activities of the Cooperatives Europe Development Platform (CEDP), which is a European network of cooperative organisations active in international cooperation.

COPA-COGECA

<http://www.copa-cogeca.be/Menu.aspx>

Copa-Cogeca is the united voice of farmers and their co-operatives in the European Union.

GRAIN

<http://www.grain.org/>

GRAIN is a small international non-profit organisation that works to support small farmers and social movements in their struggles for community-controlled and biodiversity-based food systems.

LA VIA CAMPESINA

<http://viacampesina.org/>

La Via Campesina comprises about 164 local and national organizations in 73 countries from Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas. Altogether, it represents about 200 million farmers. It is an autonomous, pluralist and multicultural movement, independent from any political, economic or other type of affiliation. It defends small-scale sustainable agriculture as a way to promote social justice and dignity.

WFO - THE WORLD FARMERS ORGANISATION

<http://www.wfo-oma.com/about-wfo.html>

WFO is an International Organisation of Farmers for Farmers, which aims to bring together all the national producer and farm cooperative organisations with the objective of developing policies that favour and support farmers' causes in developed and developing countries around the world.

AGRO-ECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE FARMING PRACTICES

Documents

Altieri, M.A, F.R. Funes-Monzote & Paulo Petersen (2012) Agroecologically efficient agricultural systems for smallholder farmers: contributions to food sovereignty. In: *Agronomic Sustainable Development*. (2012) 32:1-13. Springer.

IAASTD (2009) *Agriculture at a Crossroads*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

Schutter, Olivier de (2014) *Final report: The transformative potential of the right to food (summary)*. Report to Human Rights Council. A/HRC/25/27 UN General Assembly.

Schutter, Olivier de and Gaetan Vanloqueren (2011) The new green revolution: How twenty-first century science can feed the world. In: *Solutions for a sustainable and desirable future, volume 2: Issue 4*.

Tittonell, Prof.Dr.Ir. Pablo (2013) *Farming Systems Ecology. Towards ecological intensification of world agriculture*. Inaugural lecture upon taking up the position of Chair in Farming Systems Ecology at Wageningen University on 16 May 2013. Wageningen University.

UNCTAD (2013). *Wake up before it is too late. Make agriculture truly sustainable now for food security in a changing climate. Trade and environment review 2013*.

Organisations and websites

AGRO-ECOLOGY IN ACTION

<http://nature.berkeley.edu/~miguel-alt/index.html>

Research group Berkeley, USA.

AGRO-ECOLOGICAL INNOVATION

<http://agro-ecoinnovation.eu/>

A network for academics and practitioners in the agro-ecological field. They collect examples of innovative and successful agro-ecological practices.

AGROECOLOGY FUND

<http://www.agroecologyfund.org/>

The AgroEcology Fund is a multi-donor fund set up in 2012 by a group of donors. The Fund seeks to increase the volume, collaboration and effectiveness of research, advocacy and movement building for agro-ecological, sustainable food systems and climate change policies.

CENTER FOR AGROECOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS

<http://casfs.ucsc.edu/>

The Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems is a research, education, and public service program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, dedicated to increasing ecological sustainability and social justice in the food and agriculture system.

COMMUNITY AGROECOLOGY NETWORK

<http://www.canunite.org/>

Community Agroecology Network (CAN) is an international organisation actively working in eight regions of Mexico and Central America. They confront social, economic, and environmental injustice through research, education, and action. CAN partners with community-based organizations, farmers' cooperatives, non-profits, and universities to generate local approaches to sustainable development.

IFOAM

<http://www.ifoam.org/>

International federation of organic agriculture movements (IFOAM) seeks to lead, unite and assist stakeholders from every facet of the organic movement.

OTHERWISE

<http://www.st-otherwise.org/>

OtherWise is a non-profit organisation linked to Wageningen University and Research Centre (Wageningen UR). They organise public activities and facilitate a Research mediation programme, and focus on three themes: 'Food sovereignty and Agro ecology', 'Democratising Research' and 'Right to exist'.

STIFTUNG ÖKOLOGIE UND LANDBAU

<http://www.soel.de/>

The Foundation Ecology and Agriculture (SÖL) founded in 1961 is a German Foundation that promotes the progress and dissemination of Organic Agriculture in Germany and German speaking countries.

**FOUNDATIONS COVERED
IN THE STUDY**

AgroEcology Fund
Aydin Doğan Foundation
Carnegie UK Trust
Cera
Compagnia di San Paolo
Enel Cuore Onlus
Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer pour le Progrès de l’Homme
Fondation Daniel et Nina Carasso
Fondation de France
Fondation Ensemble
Fondation Enthic
Fondation Nicolas Hulot
Fondation pour l’agriculture et la ruralité dans le monde
Fondazione Cariplo
Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian
Gatsby Charitable Foundation
Jacobs Foundation
Obra Social “la Caixa”
Siemens Stiftung
Stiftung Ökologie und Landbau
Terre de Liens
The Plunkett Foundation
TrustAfrica
Un monde par tous
Wageningen University Fund



About the EFC

The EFC, founded in 1989, is an international membership association representing public-benefit foundations and corporate funders active in philanthropy in Europe, and beyond. The Centre develops and pursues activities in line with its four key objectives: creating an enabling legal and fiscal environment; documenting the foundation landscape; building the capacity of foundation professionals; and promoting collaboration, both among foundations and between foundations and other actors. Emphasising transparency and best practice, all members sign up to and uphold the EFC Principles of Good Practice.



European Foundation Centre AISBL | Philanthropy House
rue Royale 94 | 1000 Brussels | Belgium | tel.: +32.2.512.8938 | e-mail: efc@efc.be | www.efc.be