Family farming under pressure: Reassessing options for liveability and permanence

Convenors
C. Macombe, S. Madelrieux, B. Dedieu, H. Langeveld

Scope of the workshop

- Sustainability of agriculture includes the social pillar!
  \(\rightarrow\) farmers / workers liveability
  \(\rightarrow\) permanence of family farming: adaptive capacities, changes and transitions, transmission

- as specific themes of investigation
- As themes connected to what is in debate in the other pillars
  - pressures and uncertainties that affect the economic and environmental pillars (CC, prices volatility, local development schemes)
  - Need for plasticity in innovations

Adaptive farming systems
Contents of the WS

- Methods to analyse FS liveability and dynamics (LT, transitions) from the farmers points of vue
- Case studies, surveys: results / observations
- Ways of improvement
- New advisory and R&E methodologies

Basics of IFSA

• Pluridisciplinary approaches
• Research and extension contribute to the debates
• Open space for discussion (presentations, posters, field experience)
5 sessions

• Social impacts of shifts in land use management S 1 (Hans)

• When the farming system evolves S2 (Catherine), S3 (Hans)

• From job and working conditions to permanence S4 (Catherine), S5 (Sophie)
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Session 2

Second session « When the farming system evolves »

The 5 presented papers set:
5 different contexts whose common feature is:
« the farming system evolves »

What are the lessons learnt about liveability and permanence from these papers?
- At macro level
- At micro level
Contexts

1) Magalhaes, Drouvat, Perluss Families of small-farmers living in semi-arid region of Brazil
2) Wellbrock, Antunovic, Oosting, Bock Pig farmers in Croatia
3) Hellec, Blouet Dairy breeders in the Vosges mountains (East of France)
4) Madelrieux, Nettier, Dobremez Livestock farms in the French Alps
5) Rodriguez, Ivanov, Vasov, Schwarz Rural municipalities in South-Eastern Serbia

What about the shifts?

1) Families of small-farmers living in semi-arid region of Brazil → implementation of the Brazilian National Biofuels Program
2) Pig farmers in Croatia → Croatian agriculture move towards the agricultural European standards
3) Dairy breeders in Vosges (East of France) → Conversion to organic farming
4) Livestock farms in the French Alps → General changes in society (family) and agriculture
5) Rural municipalities in South-Eastern Serbia → Serbian agriculture move towards the agricultural European standards
Let us discover (a part of) the lessons!

- At macro level
- At micro level

Lessons

- Underpin the role of institutions to facilitate or to hamper the local adaptation to shifts
- Provide some options for liveability and permanence
The dominant role of institutions

1) The success depends on the Petrobas willingness to favor peasant farmers.

2) Difficulties stem from the Croatian « Pig Production Development Programme »

3) Agro-food companies dominating the market (California)/Mutual funding (2006)/ Nestlé Waters (Vittel)

4) Complexity of « family careers » types is an echo (recall) from multiple changes in the institution « family »

5) The success of the agricultural transition depends on State (Agricultural Ministry), Private investors, NGO…

Options for liveability and permanence

1) Developing a range of activities (co-products and by-products) around main crop

2) Organic agriculture, agro-tourism, Nature and landscape management, local food production and direct sales.

3) Organic farming

4) Suckling instead of dairy herds, diversification, horses…

5) Local products (milk, meat, wool)
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Session 5
« From job and working conditions to permanence »

Problems to be solved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>People investigated</th>
<th>Social issues dealing with work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Australian dairy industry actors</td>
<td>Labour supply issue. How to improve on-farm employment relations ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiorelli</td>
<td>French multiple-job-holders sheep farmers</td>
<td>How to take into account (characterise) the subjective dimension of work ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt</td>
<td>Women farmers in Bavaria</td>
<td>How did farming women cope with 30 years of agricultural restructuring ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petit</td>
<td>Farmers with Short Supply Chains in 2 French regions</td>
<td>What are the effects of SSC on the farm management and liveability ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cournut</td>
<td>Livestock French farmers</td>
<td>How to qualify the liveability of livestock farms from the work viewpoint ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us discover solutions…

Options for liveability and permanence -1

Robotic milking
Once-a-day
Simplified management
Capacity building of dairy farmers

IFSA 2010
Options for liveability and permanence -2

In livestock farming, each production system carries its own work organisation stemming from: different technical contents technical and economic or socio-cultural models, associated with these sectors and likely subjective dimension of work (2)

With the multiple job-holders sheep farmers (2) highlights that introducing more global approaches linking technical and human aspects is worthwhile, if dealing with work organisation.

For Short Supply Chains farmers, (4) systems are lasting when:
- Introducing more productions (crops or varieties) on the farm
- Maybe? Introducing various market outlets (several SCC forms: internet, boxes…)
- Giving up the "urban markets" outlet, because of heavy workload.

Each SCC form carries its own work organisation

To conclude about liveability

Each Production system carries its own liveability conditions:

- Technical constraints - physical limits
- Economical constraints - socio-cultural constraints
- Subjective dimension of work

liveability

people
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