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Background Information

Since 2010, the Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PAKISAMA), or National Confederation of Small Farmers’ and Fishers’ Organizations, has been involved in building the capacities of agri-based enterprises of their member farmers organizations (FOs). Three (3) key achievements can be noted. First, PAKISAMA now has farmer-owned agri-business cooperative models that provide the full range of production-processing-marketing value-chain intervention. Second, PAKISAMA has contributed towards creating a better enabling environment for agri-based social enterprises of FOs. Third, PAKISAMA members have a sustained presence in key spaces of national and local governance bodies for agri-based enterprises.

The project on Developing Institutional Purchase for Agri-based Social Enterprises in the Philippines, with support from the Collectif Stratégies Alimentaires (CSA) since 2014, is focused on building capacity of rice-based enterprises of PAKISAMA members to engage in the Partnership Against Hunger and Poverty (PAHP), a pilot program of government that promotes institutional food purchase. The project aims to enlarge market access of farmers’ organic rice products and thus help increase farmers’ incomes. Institutional purchase programs such as those provided in Brazil’s Zero Fome model (e.g., Food Acquisition program/PAA and the National School Feeding program/PNAE) will allow farmers to sell their products to government at fair prices. Inside the Zero Hunger program, different forms of assistance are also made available for family farmers to help them get better access to those markets, such as rural credit programs, insurance schemes, and technical assistance which stimulated local food production and increased local food output.
Meanwhile, PAKISAMA participates in a regional project of the Asian Farmers Association (AFA) and with the support CSA entitled *Expanding involvement of Farmers' Organizations in Public Programs Generating Employment and Promoting Sustainable Agriculture*. PAKISAMA is conducting the pilot test in three provinces in Luzon and one in Mindanao on engaging FOs with the government current program on institutional purchase. Their experiences are being documented to see the FOs' involvement in the program, their issues and challenges faced and lessons learnt in engaging the government on food purchase program.

These project experiences have given PAKISAMA more confidence in leading policy dialogues and knowledge-learning sessions not only in asset reform issues but also in agri-business enterprise development.

**Objectives of the Workshop**

This one day workshop to share knowledge on institutional purchases has for its objectives:

i. To share and learn from experiences and initiatives as well as lessons and build on good practice of farmers’ organizations’ (FOs) involvement in institutional food purchase program;

ii. To learn and understand existing government institutional food purchase programs and policies as well as analyze mechanisms on how FOs can effectively engage in the government food purchase program (e.g. Brazil experience);

iii. To learn and understand the institutional set up to make institutional food purchase more effective and responsive to key stakeholders;

iv. To share good experiences of Government actions on legislation; and

v. To identify challenges, opportunities and action points on improving farmers’ engagement in government food purchase programs.

**Workshop Proceedings**

**Opening/Introductory Activities**

The session was formally started at 9:25 a.m. by Ms. Jane Zamar, Business Development Services (BDS) Manager of PAKISAMA, who called the attention of all the participants to come inside the conference area. She greeted everyone good morning and shared the experience they had that was delayed due to on their trip to Naga where they have had round-table discussions with partners in Bicol. Ms. Zamar then invited Mr. Rene Cerilla, PAKISAMA President, to sing a song by Yoyoy Villame that introduces most of the provinces in the 3 different regions of the country, Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. An opening praise was then offered by Mr. Cerilla.

Ms. Zamar informed, “As of November 21 there was a total of 80 organizations and 110 participants had confirmed their participation to this workshop. We are glad that many had come and we would like to request the participants to stand up to be recognized as soon their names
are called. She called on the representatives of the participants present from the Office of Congresswoman Leni Robredo, Department of Agriculture, Land Bank, etc. AsiaDHRRA, PhilDHRRRA, We Effect, Alliansa Agrikutura ng Pilipinas, CODE NGO, Project Development Institute (PDI), PAKISAMA, Asian Farmers Association and representatives of federations and cooperatives. We would also like to welcome the presence of our foreign friends by calling the delegation to include from CSA, WFP, IFAD, etc.” She then invited Mr. Benny Aquilino, Ms. Lany Rebagay and Mr. Marek Poznanski, the Chairperson of PAKISAMA, Representative from AFA and the CSA, respectively, to give their welcome remarks or messages to the participants.

Mr. Aquilino started, “I don’t think I have more to say but to say good morning to everyone. I just hope that as we keep on going, I hope that we continue achieving our organizations’ or cooperatives’ objectives and hopefully achieve the. I hope that we all be active in the discussion and share the most during the workshop. Welcome to everyone.”

Mr. Poznanski greeted the participants good morning and said, “We are a small NGO but we have been supporting farmers by strengthening farmers organization (FOs) which we continue to do all over the world. We have this kind of activity to support economical growth through organizations like AFA, PAKISAMA and many others. This is to see how to better involve FOs since in different parts of the world, this is difficult to do. Like in the Philippines, there was an effort from government to do this but in Brazil, there is a strong social support as an experience that can be done in the Philippines and in other countries like being led by FAO, WFP and other international organizations. What we hope that through this kind of event – even if government is doing these – is not an easy task but government needs to be the initiator and happy to see that this continues. I welcome everyone to the workshop and we hope to have a productive deliberation.”

Ms. Rebagay said, “Good morning everyone and bon dia to our guest from Brazil, Mr. Celso Ludwig and others. Masaya na mainit dahil sa marami at malakas na tsansa para palakasin ang Institutional Purchase na maraming magsasaka na magsusupply sa gobyerno at business sectors. Start something on what is really happening in the field. It is good to know that there are so many of us here in the workshop and so many of us will be able to think together and hope that we are able to discuss and share our experiences on institutional purchases and learn from each other. On behalf of AFA, I welcome you all. As we say in the Philippines, Mabuhay!”

Ms. Zamar formally introduced herself, “I am Jane Zamar and I will be the Overall Workshop Coordinator. Before I introduce our keynote speaker for today, I will be sharing with you an
Overview of this workshop to include the objectives and activities that we will undertake until the end of today.” Please refer to Annex B: Workshop Design and Program. She then introduced Undersecretary Rosalina L. Bistoyong, who will deliver the keynote speech of the Secretary of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), Mr. Virgilio de los Reyes.

Undersecretary of DAR, Ms. Rosalina L. Bistoyong started by saying, “Good morning everyone. I am privileged and honored to deliver the message of the Honorable Secretary of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), Mr. Virgilio de los Reyes, who is supposed to be here but could not come due to a last-minute instruction from the President and had asked me to deliver his keynote speech to this workshop. In addition to the Secretary’s speech, I will include some feedback on my own personal experience when I went to Brazil with Mr. Cerilia for 8 days.”

Ms. Bistoyong read, “Let me extend the sincere appreciation of DAR to AFA and its partners in organizing and convening this International Workshop on Institutional Purchase. I welcome the farmers and development partners from across countries, and also acknowledge other partners from CSA in Belgium, the World Food Program (WFP) that has always been very generous and an able partner Daniel. This is a follow-up event to the study tour where delegation from the Philippines visited Brazil. The study tour provided insights and valuable lessons on program implementation with zero hunger program and food acquisition program, legislation and institutional purchase with the community food hog and strong implementation with government and civil society organizations.

The partnership against hunger based on the success of the Brazilian Government in providing unconditional services, agricultural extensions services, program nutrition needs, had greatly contributed to the involvement of DAR in the Partnership Against Hunger and Poverty (PAHP). Also, it highlighted the participation of the World Hope Program together with WFP, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Brazilian Government in the PAHP that thus became a collaborative undertaking of DSWD/DA/DAR. The PAHP aims to increase the productivity and enhance farm-based income of small farmers and provide nutritious farm products to school children. The direct recipients and stakeholders of the PAHP are the small-holder farmers and family farms and the feeding programs other than PAHP pre-schoolers enrolled in day care centers. The day care centers under the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) benefited from the nutritional, fresh and chemical free vegetables that are supplied by small-holder farmers and organizations under the agri-enterprise of DAR with full support from the Department of Agriculture (DA). Our bottom lines are clear, as we strive towards making the small-holder farmers from better off selling their produce and services to groups and aspire towards contributing to the nutritional needs of the children, making the social goods better off by buying from farmers.
There are more under the program since under this scheme, these small-holder farmers mostly the agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs) are assured market for their produced and at the same time, ensuring quality, healthy and nutritious food for our children in the day care centers.

Another essential aspect of the PAHP is monitoring and evaluation (M&E) which is determining the targets and baselines of the covered population and ensuring the transparency of program implementation and great importance also is monitoring the improvement of this target population and assessing the impact of the program assistance. In the aspect of institutional procurement, the DSWD, DA and DAR prepared a manual on community participation of PAHP. This manual set guidelines on the procurement in government and lessons from experiences in community-based development program. The guidelines are focused on how the small-holder farmers, organizations and families farm in rural communities with their participation in managing procurement by being directly involved in planning, procurement, implementation with focus on how the community can participate as contractors or service providers under the negotiated procurements scheme.

The movement procedure puts forward in this manual, the lessons gathered from calamity projects, good local government practices and in making rules and guidelines. The manual has already been submitted to the government’s Procurement Board. Once this is approved, expect a more efficient procurement and faster procurement activities. This is supported by the Brazilian Government, WFP and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The implementation of PAHP was initially implemented in the Bicol Region, the place we visited. After this, we actually rolled out in Region 8, particularly in areas severely affected by typhoon Yolanda and in the Zamboanga peninsula where problems associated by malnourishment and poverty are prevalent. The PAHP is a program that supports small-holder farmers and enterprises develop and food security programs with social protection measures, supplementary feeding and sustainable livelihood components. The sustainability of PAHP demands the able support and strong position of CSOs to ensure that communities are involved from the early stages of the program.

At this point, I would like to take this opportunity to report the two (2) pieces of legislation - the Food Security Act has already passed and conveyed to the committee’s level of approval, and the other bill which is actually, a food scheme in the guidelines for the implementation of the National Food Security Act which is authored by one of the participants in the study tour to Brazil in July, Congresswoman Leny Robredo, our vice presidential candidate for this year’s election. Also filed is a similar bill that actually puts forward the implementing guidelines for Food Security Act. This has been filed 3 months ago, Lawrence if I am not mistaken. The progress of these two important bills gives and sets the framework for the National Food Security that is similar of the what were learned from the Brazil Tour Program.

To conclude the speech of the Secretary of DAR, he is pleased to be associated with PAKISAMA and CSA in our endeavor to pursue PAHP under the bill under current administration. The reason why we have in fact implemented this program in Regions 5, 8 and 9, and all provinces where we can also monitor. We look forward to the sustainability of our own partnership program against hunger and poverty in our country.”

Ms. Zamar thanked Undersecretary Bistoyong for delivering the keynote speech of the Secretary of DAR and continued saying, “We are all saying that we are looking for markets towards and engage government in an institutional purchasing scheme, who in turn is looking for partners to increase farmers’ income. Thus our workshop today is about international
Knowledge and Sharing on Institutional Purchase will be focused on this and more than 60 percent of our participants are farmers. To moderate the first Session of our workshop which is on General Orientation on Global Perspective on Institutional Purchase and Sustainable Development Goals or SDGs, I would like to invite Ms. Regabay of AFA.”

**Session 1: General Orientation on Global Perspective on Institutional Purchase and Sustainable Development Goals or SDGs**

Ms. Rebagay started the session by reviewing the key points raised by Undersecretary Ms. Bistoyong from the keynote speech of Secretary of DAR, Mr. de los Reyes. She elicited feedback from the participants who mentioned about the background or rationale for conducting the workshop, about the Brazil partnerships and collaboration with government and NGOs, about resources and security to include supplying of products to some school feeding programs at day care centers, FOs’ efforts to meet the needs of day care centers, etc. She then defined with the participants the definition of institutional purchase and its implications to their current situation as key players or participant to this endeavor.

As part of the general orientation for the workshop, Ms. Rebagay informed that to start with the global orientation there will be a video message to be introduced by Ms. Caroline Amrom, program Officer of CSA. She elaborated that the talks under Session 1 are intended to level off their understanding on the basic concepts of institutional purchase and overview of issues on the supply side, farmers’ capacity and legislation. She then called on Ms. Amrom to introduce the video message.

**Message from Mr. Olivier de Schutter, Former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food**

Ms. Amrom introduced Mr. Olivier de Schitter, former UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food (2008-2014) through a video message that was especially prepared for the workshop.

“Good morning. I am extremely pleased to be able to contribute to this important seminar that is convened together with CSA and other partners like PAKISAMA, a well-known Confederation of Small Farmers and Fishers’ Organizations in the Philippines. The conference today is dedicated to the question how the public purchasing of food can support small farmers and small fishers in the Philippines. And it is I must say, an extremely important topic. One that I could measure the importance of, when I was between 2008-2014 the United Nation’s Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food.

If you do some purchasing of food by public administrations, by schools, by hospitals, is the uniquely effective way to encouraging transition to sustaining food systems that follow ecological
practices thus improve health outcomes and that increase incomes for small farmers by giving them better access to markets thus contributing to rural development and the reduction of poverty.

As we see is that various parts of the world, governments are understanding whether these are local or national level governments, the importance of these tools in reshaping, rebuilding and improving the food systems. We have in fact a situation in which between 6 and 10% of the GDP of countries worldwide is in the hands of the public sector and from those 6-10% significant part is for buying food and therefore using these strategies in promoting farmers’ produce. Let me provide some examples in my work across the world. I will begin for example with a most classic example of public food purchasing program making a difference.

In Brazil we have a very impressive the Program for Purchasing of Food for School Feeding or PNKE an expressive program for purchasing for school feeding and serving out more than 50 million pupils across the country which. In 2009, a law was adopted in Brazil that there is this project where they buy their produced from farmers at least 30% of their food comes from small farmers once in Brazil they call, family members. Showing how this school feeding program is able to provide support in improving the economy. We have a similar approach in Bolivia. In Bolivia it was adopted in 2015. It has adopted a law where we Law No: 622 on school feeding and get food locally. There again, Bolivia commits to support the incomes of small farmers. The WFP itself has a component of its work which is a homegrown school feeding program which also encourages food aid to be supportive at the same time by sourcing as well from mostly small-scale local producers.

We similarly have developments in hospitals and other public institutions. In the United Kingdom for example, has adopted for hospitals that are managed by the National Health Service (NHS), hospital food standards or proposals where they we try to encourage hospitals to source from UK producers. In UK again, for public administrations, a buying standards of catering services program of 2011 where have they provide organizations in need. Now, across all these examples Governments at all levels try to choose food programs for schools, hospitals, public administrations, etc. as a tool to move this food purchasing system and this has 4 components if you wish. The first one is of course that food sources has to come from local sources to support local community economy and also to improve the quality of food that is provided. We should keep in mind that when food has to travel long distances from where it is produced to where it is consumed, when food that has to be preserved for a longer period of time, when food will be processed in ways that will lessen food from its important nutrients to refrain from it to be less healthy should then be cooked fresh in the schools.

Secondly, food in these programs comply with certain nutrition compliance. All over the world, schools now understand that it is very important element for pupils be better fed, to have healthy food served to them which they at times do not have access in their households, and their families have a better quality of food as they are provided. In India, we have ordinances enabling that makes it an obligation for schools throughout the country to cook food that will be better for the health of the people they serve. Thirdly, food is categorically sourced from one particular farmers in order to support them. Very often they do not have the opportunity to reach markets being enjoyed by larger food producers. Of course not all small farmers find it easy to enter into these programs and so it is important to provide them with technical support, training, and to involve organizations of small farmers in the designing of programs to support small farmers to prepare them for such as these public programs for them to be competitive. For
example providing them with adequate information about standards, logistics to transport their food in order to be competitive for this type of public program.

Most and finally for these public programs typically has to consider the standards that in a way to help them maintain and ensure that they are sustainable and in respect to the ecosystem. This I think is very important to allow these public purchasing programs to also contribute to shift into agri-ecology in farming. It is important however to realize that without these standards that are developed into a top-down version in giving out small farmers who are not able to meet the requirements. These standards may have exclusionary effects that here again, farmers’ have to be involve and for their organizations would be able to provide support and not leaving out some farmers who are not able to do that since they are not associated. Provided all these conditions are met and are participatory in fashion and that now as a project initiated by PAKISAMA, and for this reason, we are carefully watching what is happening and hope that these continue to inspire many others in many regions of the world and looks forward for the success of the program. Once again, many thanks for welcoming me to this conference and all the best to the program.” Please refer to Annex C; Video Message of Mr. Olivier de Schutter.

Global Perspectives

Ms. Rebagay introduced the next resource speaker, Mr. Israel Klug, PAA Africa Coordinator, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Mr. Klug started by saying, “Good morning everyone, I was supposed to show pictures of experiences but was not able to do so due to the long trip back from Naga. Nonetheless, I will talk on institutional purchase and share with you the common characteristics and the conditions that you have to consider. I have already heard that the Government of the Philippines has already initiatives ed several efforts in this regard. Some of the characteristic were already represented in the video. And finally, I will try to give you an idea on how the basic conditions that is essential to implement the policies of institutional purchase. But first, let us define what institutional purchase is all about.

What is Institutional Purchase?

International purchase is when government decides to buy food from small farmers’ association and cooperative. In that case the government’s procurement will be kept institutional food procurement from small farmers.

Institutional purchase has the following Main Characteristics. These are: 1) Obviously, the contract is between the government and the farmers or farmers association and cooperatives or farmers representatives. There is no legal bound and no big company in the middle between the government and between the farmers. The contracts are direct between the government and farmers association. 2) There is special role in relation for the procurement around the world. The government procurement for anything for food and for any other things is created by law. Usually the law says everybody should apply for and compete to sell products to the government. Thus, small farmers become the same as a big company – to include importing food or commercializing food and they may have different power positions in the market.
So, the second characteristic of institutional purchase is that government is taking this into consideration. Government is tailoring the procurement roles in a way that small farmers participate in the government procurement. They have adaptation in the whole integration and thus people will not be taking it as a problem. If there are no rules, it means that it will be a problem. I am not saying that there are no rules. There are special rules. Small farmers should complain with those special rules. The third characteristic is that the procurement and purchase should be regular and equal. Instead, procurement programs are not about one purchase per year and after 2 years they will purchase a little bit more - the institutional procurement. We saw a video about the Brazilian case where government is procuring food regularly because there are problems and the program is supposed to be predictable.

I will now share with you the four (4) main points which cover the following aspects: i) Why government is buying food?; 2) What are its benefits?; 3) What are its implications in the implementation of different programs; and 4) What are the basic conditions on institutional purchase? Mr. Klug explained each of the 4 main points as follows:

1) **On why government is buying food.** I will just highlight 3 different reasons – to have a food stock to be able to respond quickly whenever there is a need; to provide nutritional and balanced food assistance to vulnerable people such as children, elderly especially those who are not able to afford; and to provide caloric needs of people in emergency situations and provide the food so quickly. In some countries, they are eating in schools but at times they are also taking home to share with their families at home. Each one of the programs have different reasons. School feeding focused in increasing nutritional status of children – shaping the future consumers and elders. In which way government is able to tackle of institutional purchase. To buy food from small farmers and small farmers’ cooperatives. Main characteristics 1) government directly to the farmers (nobody in the middle); 2) there are special rules and regulations in procurement considering that the law is regulated – to sell products to government; 2) government detailing regulations to meet the needs of the people. 3) institutional procurement or purchase programs have to be more regular – like what the UN person was saying. The program has to be predictable.

2) Despite the fact that programs have different objectives still it has the same elements and benefits. **What are these benefits?** I will ask the farmers, if I am government I will ask you what are the benefits for you. A participant responded the profit will be higher since it is direct to government. Another participant says there is a sure market – assurance for a good price to farmers. He continued saying that farmers will have lower risks to produce. They will be able to earn more since transaction cost will be lower.

3) **Implications in the implementation of different programs:*** I will go back to the 3 objectives I have mentioned in number 1. If government implements, or buy from farmers from their reserves this is simple to implement since government will just buy in few cases and easy for government and for the farmers – few times in a year. The contract modality will be simple and it will have less effect on price regulations. Reserves can be used so easily. On the second objective, when buying fresh food, you will need to work more specialized with a number of farmers a little bit more complex as compared to the previous one as there is a need to have a contract with the farmer and/or need to replace. Benefits are on promotion of health. Farmers will get more money as farmers will produce those where they will easily earn. On the 3rd is almost with the reserves, to provide food assistance government can assist in the distribution.
4) **Basic conditions on institutional purchase.** Small farmers need private or inputs services in any productive center. If there is none, purchase will not work properly. 2) Where governments buy for different situations such as cereal reserves but government should have a budget through a national program for example that needs to be funded – simple. 3) the government’s procurement must be adopted in a way that is not so it will scale up with difficulties. 4) implementation capacity – if the government has all the above (1-3), government should have the capacity – there has to be a government managerial mechanism and accountability mechanisms to adopt in implementing the program.”

Ms. Rebagay thanked Mr. Klug and synthesized that in institutional purchase the following elements are needed – there has to be laws, rules and regulations and budget. It was pointed out that there is no magic recipe such a different type of cooking where a secret ingredient may be needed based on the taste needed. She cited that the following session will discuss on how useful is institutional purchase. If Mr. Klug talked about definition, another resource speaker will speak on Challenges. Ms. Rebagay then called on the next speaker, Summary and Synthesis of the Global Perspectives of Institutional Purchases, Ms. Caroline Amrom of CSA.

**Summary and Synthesis**

Ms. Amrom started by saying, “Good morning. I think I would have a difficult task following the presentation of a Specialist like Mr. Klug. She cited it is to see if institutional purchase has to be defended. So the question we want to respond to is that institutional purchase can be seen as the problem for funding. It is obvious for most people in this room that we now found a model that brings out a lot of good social impact, environmental impact and nutritional roles and that children needs to be supported through. The family farmers usually have weak position in the local and national markets. And what we see the implementation with the usual trade development the condition is more difficult to have. Because of this social importance and because there is weakness, it is important for authorities to intervene in the program. So there is a generous side of the global market.”

Ms. Amrom continued, “there are 2 kinds of tools that the government can use. There is the supply management instruments like control, export, and import for those who are really engage in bonding tools and it comes from a lot of the World Trades Organization (WTO) roles. It is not so easy for the government to implement this whereas demands and purchases can be easily implemented and the government can be re-oriented this way. The institutional purchase can be a part and can be seen as a tool in government’s objectives and concerns. A lot of the institutions use the institutional purchase power engagement in the institutional scene like the sustainable program that could be reflected in purchase or institution.

But I must say that the international purchase program can involve a member of the family of farmers where they have to really think about the program and what is the best program that they would like to have. It would be at a local government level. The objectives should be something to be easy to develop and satisfactory for the farmers and must really benefit the
farmers. There are few elements that can help us to institutionalize the purchase program. I am giving you a basic lecture about the program. So it has been underlined that there are three main dimensions: 1) the supply side dimension; 2) demand dimension; and 3) policies and legal and environmentally-sound aspects. These are important dimensions to look at as they are interacting. Also, the important thing is for each of the dimensions to have a situation in the beginning as they are confronted as well with different constraints and opportunities. It is important for anybody to adapt with all aspects as they have to confront the challenges that will result to problems or specific challenges.

Ms. Amrom explained the specific supply side challenge that is being said yesterday was likewise existing in the field so this is not something new in our dimension. For producers to respond to the demand side dimension, there is a need to increase the quantity and quality dimension of production. Do we need to be reliable on products that they deliver? Do we need to understand the different markets? Do we also need procedures and contract negotiations? We do compare people from one individual to another and also there is a better farmer than the other. Looking at all these challenges, we have seen from the different experiments that all problems can be also be seen here in the Philippines? The farmers’ organizations that are being organized by small-holder farmers is a key factor and that they have to remember always the quantity and quality of production as they mean a lot to them. So from what we are seeing now, we are not just looking at individuals but for people/farmers to be efficient. The other dimension side challenges the budget constraints. It is really more expensive to buy from small farmers – difficult to buy from several small farmers because they used to buy and process with big companies. This is not efficient. There are a lot of obstacles as well like we would see that we do know how to deliver, how to cook fresh foods and staff would know access on institutional purchase. But having good interaction with farmers’ organizations, maybe some of these problems can be solved and even be given good solutions or can be solved early and get faster or strong through dialogue. Like for example, we don’t know each other’s menu, each other’s difficulties in the menu that the farmers’ solution is through a dialogue.

Moreover, we can see environmental challenges where farmers would need to adapt their procurement procedures. The family farmers and farmers’ organizations are always able to compete. But in the challenge with changing policies and legal frameworks, we need to know what are the changes and constraints and what are the limits to come for that are due for revision so that the day care centers being serviced would know. Again, we need a dialogue between the different experiences and different dimensions so farmers’ organizations are able to defend their respective objectives. Of course, there is much for improvement of the program as it is not something fixed that it would require constant dialogue between government towards a more sustainable program that responds to the needs of the farmers and their communities and targeted clients. Finally, we have to look at the different factors since institutional purchase is a program that usually have common problems. We need to contribute to the right of food… can we really have it? Do we need so many tricky words with the intervention? Do we need institutional collaboration? Can we use dialogue with the benefits of the program? Thank you.”

For more details, please refer to Annex D: Institutional Purchases: A Lever of Development for Family Farming.

Ms. Rebagay thanked Ms. Amrom and asked the participants what they have learned from Session 1. She pointed out that institutional purchase is buying of food items directly from the farmers that require laws, regulations and budget. As what Ms. Amrom had said, there are so many challenges and that the supply and demand sides can be responded to by farmers’ organizations since an individual farmer may not be able to do this.
**Session 2: The Philippines Institutional Purchase Program**

At 11:10 a.m., Ms. Rebagay introduced Ms. Bobet Coral, the Knowledge Management Manager of PAKISAMA, to moderate Session 2, The Philippines’ Institutional Program. It was noted that Session 2 of the workshop is to generate deeper understanding on the key features and status of the Partnership Against Hunger and Poverty Program (PAHP) of the Philippines and identify key issues on program design, implementation and policy. Ms. Coral called on Mr. Lawrence Cruz, PAHP Program Coordinator’s session who shared Updates of the PAHP in the Philippines.

Mr. Lawrence started, “I am going to give you today an update of PAHP based on the Brazilian experience. Institutional purchase is just one of the four (4) pillars. As a start, I would like to share with you the historical back ground on how PAHP came about. After the tour in Brazil, along with several farmers and partners from the Department of Agriculture (DA) and Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), we prepared a framework based on the Philippines’ perspective and their collaboration with other program partners and government. We also put together the resources to resolve food security – ensuring that there will be food supply and some of the government programs such as part of the institutional purchase. These are: i) feeding program of the Department of Education; ii) feeding program of the Department of Health (DOH); iii) inmates of the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG); and iv) community team which is popular in Brazil.”
“Following the above framework as agreed with partners, the Brazilian government provided technical assistance after a series of consultations with the local government unit of Bicol together with the now Congresswoman Ms. Leny Robredo and the communities and other partner-organizations. As part of the commitment of the Government of Brazil, a national consultant was likewise sent by FAO to conduct another assessment based on the initial implementation of the PAHP. This assessment led to a national workshop where all findings were shared with partners by Mr. Flavio with emphasis on what more has to be improved in the PAHP.

On the PAHP, here are what we have done so far.

What have we done so far?

- From menu based crops to Crop based menu
- Recommended to revisit the Feeding Program Guidelines to fit the PAHP
- PAHP roll out in regions VIII and IX
- Allocate funds for the PAHP implementation
- PAHP Implementation based on the agreed work and financial plan
- A food hub may not be necessary in some areas
- A proforma of Marketing Agreement Between ARBOs and LGUs
- An M&E system guide for the PAHP convergence teams

What we did is more on the menu since what was happening before was that DSWD provides the menu and our farmers supply the food needed. One of the findings revealed however that there are some menu that were not applicable since farmers are not able to provide what are in the menu. We have worked on this by revising the menu base with crops now being produced by the farmers. DSWD revised the menu out from indigenous materials in order to make sure that all vegetable items produced by farmers’ organizations will be sold to the major day care centers. We recommended to revisit the feeding guidelines and PAHP and ensure that improvements are made as the program roll’s out in pilot areas in regions 5, 8 and 9, and of course to DSWD’s feeding program as well.”

Mr. Cruz continued, “implementation of PAHP is based on the required financial plan and the food hub that we have decided before were likewise based on the Brazilian experience which we have later realized to be not necessary. It was realized that all the day care centers have their own required key food items that may not be part of the food hub. In the case of some FOs, food items are delivered directly to the day care centers as they do not have storage nor avail of the food hub any longer. We also developed a proforma for marketing with an agreement we call, Memorandum of Agreement between the LGUs and for the feeding program in the field. We also have the market price stipulated in the agreement. Of course, there is also
a system guide that was developed by Mr. Flavio so that what happens next after the things we have done. After the assessment from an international consultant for region 5, the LGU provided support services in inputs, training and places to show such as in Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Sorsogon and 3 other provinces in region 5.

In the second quarter of 2015, Camarines Norte has 163,000 gross sales, Camarines Sur with 46,000, and 17,000 for Sorsogon. For the third quarter, Camarines Norte slightly increased, low decrease in Camarines Sur and a little bit of increase in Sorsogon. The decrease was attributed to fault line devastation that made the production a little bit lower in the second harvest. Some of the farmers encountered drought that it affected the harvest. It is affected by drought and by high value of price of food items. For region 8, this is one of the challenges the group of the Convergence Team’s Technical Group because of the different initiatives from the FOs. Because of the schedule of the partner agencies and making it hard to make a schedule, they finally had a conversation in a workshop to convene with partner agencies. And now, they have decided not only with partner agencies but together with LGUs as well. This is with regards to the implementation of the PAHP for region 9. They have conducted a workshop together with the LGUs’ Municipal Welfare and Development Officer to orient them on how to implement the PAHP. So far, for the second quarter they have not produced yet and for the third quarter as you see, Zamboanga del Norte has a tremendous very high gross sale (see presentation). In Zamboanga Sibugay, 2 municipalities covered have 12,000 gross sales; Zamboanga del Sur has 22,000 for 2 municipalities. A 192,000 was purely sold to the day care centers. The municipalities buy all the produce from FOs for the day care cities all at fair price. The difference here is that the LGU has the transportation to reach the far-flung areas of the FOs and the food items were consolidated with others in the municipality and distribute again in the day care centers. Of course, on a flat rate price.

On the challenges of PAHP, it included on areas related to LGU support, procurement limitations, coordination between field and convergence farmers and that some Municipal Social Welfare and Development Officers (MSWDO) needed to catch up with PAHP implementation process, small-farmer holders’ fear of excess of surplus in their production and yield affected by drought. What specifically are these challenges we were faced with during the initial implementation? Despite the community participation guidelines developed, PAHP still conducted follow-up sessions to discuss concerns of participants in covered areas so LGUs are able to provide appropriate intervention. Also, we need to involve farmers in planning the menu so the team would is needed to avoid problems on excesses. There were gaps on LGUs’ support but not in all the municipalities covered but there is a need to go back every now and then and also orient the farmers and the LGU for any reasons on the support they needed. Of course as mentioned earlier, the procurement limitations. Our LGUs usually do the national procurement, this is in Republic Act or RA 9184 that provides for farmers to join the Bill process. And as mentioned awhile ago, the formulation of the field and the convergence scheme. And some of the MSWD authorities have this implementation process because mostly have no knowledge on how they are going to buy food items from the FOs. On the support of LGUs, the municipal agriculturist will continue to monitor closely the sales of procurement. Now, the farmers have the list of how much the variety of food items and when and how many kgs of food items where bought from the FOs.

Also, the small-holder farmers themselves have the fear of excess surplus of their production. One of the participants asked during workshop a week ago. What happens to the surplus? What happens to the over supplies? What happens if l am producing this type of vegetables? And co-farmers are also producing the same types of vegetables? What happens next as they will
surely affect the price? What will happen with the money that we borrowed? And the other factor to consider is drought as in the case of Camarines Sur.

As to the remedial measures, the PAHP teams were able to carry out the following:

**Remedial Measures**

- Conduct separate orientation briefings with LGU officials
- The PAHP National TWG have prepared a special procurement guidelines for PAHP using NP-CP for approval of the GPPB.
- Conduct of monthly reporting on the PAHP updates with partner agencies.
- Conduct of planning workshop involving the MSWDO and the ARBOs for the supply and demand side.

A minimum of 30% of the Smallholder farmers' produce will be bought by the LGUs based on the revised SFP guidelines.

A supplemental MOA will be signed between DSWD and LGUs stipulating the minimum of 30% SFP food item requirements will be procured to the small holder farmers organization.

Giant rice will be built in areas affected and projected to be affected by drought as part of the learnings from Brazil.

We have conducted separate orientation sessions or briefings with LGU officials. And the national technical working group have prepared special procurement guidelines for BHD. This is initiated procurement with the community participation and in line with the RA 9184 under the government procurement policy. So despite of the community manual by the national government, we have provided together with DSWD and DA, we have provided a series of meetings and drafted a special procurement guidelines for the approval of the DBB and its endorsement. There are special provisions like the threshold, with this procurement guidelines we are not only involving farmers in terms of supplying food items to the institutional purchase but we were trying to involve them to give not only the supply but with the services as well, like there were instances that there were some constructions of small infrastructures, the LGU hired and offered jobs for the construction of small infrastructures. Also, we conducted monthly updates and reporting to the partner agencies in order for them to attend monthly meetings and to prepare reports together with the partner agencies.

With regards to the demand and supply sides, it is very important that we have to involve our partners in planning the menu and the supplier’s demand because it is the agreement that the LGU will buy the food items and the farmers organization will work hard from the MOA of farmers agreement on how much will be needed by the day care centers will become part on how much will be produced by FOs. So that there will be no fear of too much excess surplus as what some of the farmers are feared.

While waiting for the legislation which was already proposed by Representative Leni Robredo, a minimum of 20% of the small-holder farmers produce will be bought by the LGUs based on the revised supplemental feeding guidelines. This was already incorporated, and in the updating the feeding guidelines of the DSWD feeding program while waiting for registration. And aside from that, in order to facilitate this food purchase to FOs at the local level, we also recommended the supplemental MOA between the DSWD and the LGUs to stipulate the minimum 20% of the
requirements of the food items for the feeding programs th will be bought from FOs. There was a question raised on why DSWD and the LGUs? It is because the DSWD Regional Offices are the ones who download the money to the LGUs for the feeding program. So the LGUs allocate the funds they need for the feeding program to the Region, and in turn will download the funds. Moreover, part of the challenges is the effect of climate change which is the drought. The system projected effects of drought as part of the learnings in Brazil that the partnership with the Bureau of Water and Soil Management (BWSM) was considered highly important since BWSM is the one that designs the systems applicable to the Philippine including the program of DAR. We also collaborate with WFP as well with the food security project not only on times that the drought affects the area but also in preparation with the area that might be affected in the future so as to lessen the impact of the drought.” Please refer to Annex E: Partnership Against Hunger and Poverty Program (PAHP).

Ms. Coral synthesized the PAHP Philippine experience as a pilot project that focused on convergence coordinating three (3) big government agencies to include DAR, DSWD and the Department of Agriculture (DA). One of the key accomplishments is the new sets of menu based on what the farmers are planting and no longer prescribed menu where ingredients are not available to farmers. The Brazil experience on the other hand, had been adopted as a model which is community-based with the day care centers as key targets whereby vegetable producers deliver directly their products to the centers. There are memorandum agreements (MOA) prepared where the farmers/FOs themselves know about the contents.

**Institutional Purchase Policy Research in the Philippines**

To proceed to the next topic under Session 2, Ms. Coral introduced Mr. Ernie Lim, Policy Researcher of AsiaDHRRA and currently working with Land Bank of the Philippines. His session is on Institutional Purchase Policy Research in the Philippines. Mr. Lim started, “Good morning. I will be speaking more in the Filipino for farmers to understand better. In our research, we started at looking on the consolidated versions of bills 5618 including that of Representative Robredo in August 2015 (already on 2nd reading) and other experiences worldwide. We looked at approaches of not just big but also smaller organizations including models in Japan and the United States including alternative models implemented.

The topic that I will be discussing is on Expanding Market Access for Family Farmers: Structured Demand and other Approaches. It covers the following: i) analysis of HB No. 6062 & 5618 vis-à-vis Zero Hunger Program; ii) the issue of procurement: Requirement for competitive bidding; iii) possible solutions to the procurement issue: to include Lessons from Brazil and the Masaganang Sakahan Inc. (MSI) experience; iv) other challenges for effective participation of family farmers in structured demand; and v) recommendations & alternatives. The House Bill (HB) 5618, 6062 and SB 1347 were formulated related to Structured Demand such as the National School Feeding Program Act, National Food Security Bill and on Healthy Food for Poor Children Program Act, respectively. HB 5618 on school feeding was a substitute bill and passed for second reading last May 2015 (Senate counterpart not acted upon) while HB 6062 on food security was filed by Representative Leni Robredo on August 26, 2015. The SB No. 1347 for
healthy food for poor children was filed by Senator Loren Legarda during the 15th Congress. It had specific provisions on prioritization of food procurement from local farmers and FOs but has not been refiled under the 16th Congress. On the Zero Hunger Program, several accomplishments were done in the areas of programme management structure, menu development, support services and procurement. It were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero Hunger Program</th>
<th>HB No. 6062</th>
<th>HB No. 5618</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CONSEA: 2/3 CSO reps &amp; 1/3 GO reps</td>
<td>• National Security Council:</td>
<td>• DepEd – lead implementor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food &amp; Nutrition Council Networks at regional &amp; local levels (PAA)</td>
<td>• Oversees procurement &amp; distribution of supplies, and selection of beneficiaries</td>
<td>• MOA with other implementing agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decentralized funds disbursement via Conab, states &amp; municipalities (PAA &amp; CNAE)</td>
<td>• Independent agency attached to the OP</td>
<td>• Partnerships with LGUs to encourage contribution of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring of school meal funds c/o FNDE (CNAE)</td>
<td>• Chair to be appointed by the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Feeding Councils @ the municipal level (CNAE)</td>
<td>• Consists of reps from DA, DAR, DSWD, DILG, DepEd, DOH, NNC, DOST-FNRI, 4 CSO reps &amp; 4 small-scale producers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero Hunger Program</th>
<th>HB No. 6062</th>
<th>HB No. 5618</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Subsidized credit program specifically for family farmers via PRONAF</td>
<td>• Support for small-scale producers listed in the DA’s registry and those that are agrarian reform beneficiaries:</td>
<td>• Training of DepEd personnel who will train implementers &amp; feeding coordinators at the school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural &amp; crop insurance provided</td>
<td>• Training on production, harvesting, procurement process of this Act, and other topics the DA or DAR sees fit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Credit only for those in the official registry/“Declaration of Aptitude”</td>
<td>• Subsidized farm equipment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities for storage and harvesting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building for small-scale farmers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to crop insurance; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to credit/low interest rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In carrying out these interventions, they were able to encounter the following challenges: I) unfamiliarity with procurement process; ii) requirements of buyers: volume, food safety, variety, delivery & specifications (i.e. pack sizes, packaging, sliced, washed, sorted, etc.); iii) competition from big food distributors, processors & consolidators (i.e. volume discounts & rebates); iv) lower prices of government because of bidding; and v) on the “Pole-vaulting” tendency. There are limitations on procurement or purchase orders but there is fear on government’s regulations. There is an analysis made on the different models because if the Brazil experience is good or the most appropriate one then it can be recommended for continued implementation. Moreover, to respond to the challenges, the recommendations or other options undertaken were: 1) push for related bills/policies that would strengthen capacity of family
farmers to participate in the institutional procurement process such as strengthening of agricultural cooperatives, the establishment of credit cooperative program for family farmers, promotion of organic and diversified farming, construction of alternative marketing outlets, e.g. farmers’ markets; 2) explore institutional food purchase arrangements with private institutions – private schools, hospitals, corporations and CSOs, etc.; and 3) explore adoptability of alternative and innovative approaches such as Choku-bai-jo (FMms), Michi-no-eki (road side stations) and Tekei (direct producer-consumer networks).” For more details, please refer to Annex F: Institutional Purchase Policy Research in the Philippines

Question and Answer (Q&A) Portion

After the two presentations, Ms. Coral invited questions from the participants. The questions raised and responses or answers made by the resource speakers were as follows:

My question is about special procurement because it so happen that there are venues where the farmers can bring their products. So if this is a yearly program and with 30% quota for farmers to supply, how can this be sustained?

Mrs. Luisita Z. Esmao
President of LAKAMBINI, PAKISAMA

Mr. Lim explained, “this is the reason why farmers have to be organized or be cooperativized. To encourage farmers to be in cooperatives coz there are farmers who own one half or less hectare which is quite small and would definitely be appropriate to transact business with. So farmers such as this, need to link up with other farmers. Thus, there is a need to pass a bill to strengthen small farmers’ cooperatives – strengthening their capability to compete with bigger cooperatives. With the cooperatives, clustering production is recommended as it also involves quality and quantity produce from farmers.”

Mr. Cruz responded, “as long as there are children that needed help there will be continuous procurement of produce from farmers and they should not consider this as the only option but to explore other markets as well. It is important that through farmers’ groups or cooperatives they continue searching for other outlets and not to just depend on government’s support but also to become as “entrepreneurs.” Just like in the case of Camarines Sur, with their fresh products, they are easily purchased - they are able to find ways on how to sell out their products. Moreover, we are continuously having policies that would eventually support the institutionalization of these mechanisms that will be always be accorded by its corresponding budget. As what Mr. Lim had earlier said, government is putting forward the necessary support to farmers. One of the things we focused on during our last meeting was kopra that when we will not gain with a PhP 5,000 capital, we can still sell the produce in other day care centers. When you said that PAHP was able to train you not to depend on government’s programs and that you have learned to be entrepreneurs and become good social entrepreneurs, then you become more hardworking and creative in your craft/business. To market to more outlets as in the case of Camarines Sur where FOs deal with private partners that in the local market, their produce are easily sold out and there are some FOs that bring their produce at government offices directly and they are sold out on fair price.”
"I would just like to follow-up on the budget saying that DSWD needs this much but DepEd needs more because of the incidence of malnutrition that is higher among school children as compared to day care centers as there is a 2.4 billion for 2015. But what about DOH with hospitals that have dietary requirements and then there are the other centers of DSWD as well. But the point I want to raise is how far have we gone in terms of enhancing information management particularly in terms of the demand side, what is the requirement? And on the supply side, who is doing the consolidation – the farmers group, the city or municipal offices that would inform our policy makers?"

Ms. Rosemarie Johnson-Herreon (Tootsie)
Executive Director of HealthDev Institute/PHILSSA

With all these several activities going on, so my question is when are our produce be used at the local market especially organic products? And the price of organic products? For now, we need an answer to this question especially among as farmers in the Philippines?

Mr. Jeremias Sanchez, Farmer, Cagayan Valley

“For the information of everyone, we are closely coordinating with DSWD on their budget, made changes on the menu thus they are using commodities that are being produced by the respective regions that are participating in the PAHP. They based their menu on the commodities that the farmers use.”

Ms. Judith Parlero
May-ogob Agrarian Reform Cooperative

"I would just like to relate to Lawrence who are interested on PAHP because we appreciate the program. It is good as it greatly helps the targeted groups. Discussions at national or higher level is so good but quite different on what is being discussed at the local level – to utilize what are being produced by farmers but this is not what is happening in the field because in cooking, the centers are still using those in the menu. The parents are still buying from markets even up to the least ingredients that they need in cooking. This is why we thought of having a market hub. This is what we would like to submit to DAR as we know that they are really doing their best. Information management, realities in the ground that are not actually should be happening based on what were designed. "
“Mr. Cruz explained that they are coordinating closely with DSWD and identified the products that menu should be using – this is now changed to use local products.”

Due to time constraint, Ms. Coral had to apologize for not accepting more questions from the participants. She reiterated that the purpose of the several questions raised were more on how to improve the different aspects of the program. The attention of everyone was later called by Ms. Zamar citing that due to the delayed start of the workshop, the team does not have the luxury of time that everyone agreed to be back after 1 ½ hours - for lunch break and a quick rest. All has to come back at exactly 1:00 p.m. for the afternoon’s sessions. She then wished everyone a good lunch.

Afternoon Session

The afternoon session started at 1:05 p.m. and Ms. Zamar introduced Mr. Socrates Banzuela, National Coordinator of PAKISAMA, to be the moderator for Session 3: Sharing of Good Experiences of FO’s Capacity Strengthening. Mr. Banzuela welcomed back the participants to the afternoon sessions of the workshop. For this session, the presentations are aimed for participants to: i) understand Brazil’s FOs’ experiences and lessons in engaging government in institutional food purchase including how they responded to the challenges and opportunities; ii) for Mr. Rene Cerilla, President of PAKISAMA, to share his learnings and insights on the Brazil Study Tour and his feedback on how PAKISAMA will valorize the experience to its institutional purchase initiatives; iii) to determine PAKISAMA FO’s current capacity and areas for improvement to implement institutional purchase initiatives; and iv) to share experiences and lessons learned on institutional purchase initiatives in Vietnam. Mr. Banzuela highlighted the importance of learning from experiences of others from different places.

Mr. Banzuela continued, “Let us learn from the experiences in Brazil and the pilot done here in the Philippines. For this session, let us listen from Brazil, Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam. The first speaker is a farmer from Brazil who leads a federation with more than 200,000 members. A policy coordinator, Mr. Celso Ludwig, is the Coordinator of Agricultural Policies, Federacao Nacional dos Trabalhadores e Trabajhaldoras na Agricultura Familiar do Brasil (Fetraf-Brasil). He has a small farm which is 25 hectares including grape vines. Let us all welcome Mr. Celso Ludwig.”

Session 3: Sharing of Good Experiences of Farmers’ Organizations Capacity Strengthening

Brazil Experience

“I am Celso from Brazil and I produce grapes and other food from my own farm. We are here since Saturday and the first impression I have that some Filipinos are good and helpful. As part of my presentation are experiences of family

Elementos necessários para produção de alimentos

Plano Safra da Agricultura Familiar
farmers. In Brazil, it is our hands that feed the nation, the same in the Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam. Like in Brazil there are so many people who are really hungry. What we can see in the Brazilian experience is a result from many years just like in a mango tree that you can only see the fruits after many many years. The experience that we can share is dream to dream what to achieve in 20 years. In Brazil we are 4 million family farmers consisting of 85.2% of the total establishments and occupy only 30.5% of the total areas. The first element in discovering ourselves is to know who are the family farmers, who are they? Where are they? To produce there are **5 important elements** including soil, seeds, sands, the public and producers. The great part of production in Brazil includes tobacco, beans, etc.

To arrive at commercialization, you need several policies including access to land, up to access to the market of products. It is not possible to start building a house with the roof but the floor. Like in production, it is important to start with the properties such as land to work on. Institutional per se started from the government of Lola as everything was made possible. The objectives of the program is to support the production, the quality of food and being able to provide the schools and other institutional markets with the food items they need. The other objective is to produce strategic stocks, to promote cooperativism and organizational cooperatives. As I mentioned already, the fruit is just a beginning to get the results of product, producers do not rely on institutional markets but also go into supermarkets, etc. The program in Brazil started with school feeding, hospitals, restaurants and other institutional market. It all started small and grew in time.

The management of the program involves the national council at national level and there is participation at the regional and local levels. They participate in the preparation of the menu that is to be used in the feeding centers. Here is an example of different markets such as food...
banks, restaurants and other programs for the government. As you can see, children are just small and they require less food as compared to other institutional markets. Also in Brazil, we have so many challenges. In the 10 years of implementation, there were conflicts with government but still the challenge is the budget as some times there is money or none that the person who remains is the person who washes the dishes. Not to give up in washing the dishes are there may be glasses that will be broken but its contribution is very good. He is not going to say the price but will be dependent on the local price and that it has to be researched. In Brazil, there is a limit to each farmer and also the price is not fixed. Sometimes it is up and sometimes it is down that the farmers have to discuss this so they are able to agree on what best to be done. There is an exceptional case that the buyer can change the price that the farmer will not be at a disadvantage and get lost.

The school feeding in Brazil has been established but this is not the only result as it depends on the cooperation of the farmers. The program should not be just providing food to the poor or children but has to make sure that consumers are considered as part of the local communities’ development. Now, there is a lot of experiences of cookers and those who goes to the field to see what are being produced by the farmers and they go and see as well the children eating to see the value of what they produce. To conclude the Philippines has the sea, the food, etc. and with many other resources. Salamat po.

Mr. Banzuela thanked Mr. Ludwig and synthesized the importance of attitude, long-term visions, issues on personality, capacity building – to be trained not just based on supply from government and from other markets as well. Political will is important as 17 ministries are involved (not just 3 as in the case of the Philippines) and its supportive structures. To continue with the sharing, Mr. Banzuela called on the Mr. Cerilla, to share his experiences while in Brazil. He went with Usec. Rosalina Bistoyong of DAR, Representative Leni Robredo and WFP.

**Study Tour Visit: Insights from Brazil**

Mr. Cerilla shared, “I am pleased to share about our study tour visit to Brazil last July 3-13, 2015 with a group consisting of representatives from DAR, DSWD, WFP, PAKISAMA, FIAN and the HoR Committee on Human Rights consisting of Representatives Barry Gutierrez, Leni Robredo and the Committee’s Secretary. Two years ago, the DAR and DSWD Secretaries visited Brazil to learn about its anti-poverty, social protection, human rights, and rural development initiatives. It was after that visit that a pilot project was instituted by DA, DAR and DSWD: the Partnership Against Hunger and Poverty or PAHP. Activities conducted included:

**Meetings / Field Visits**

- CONSEA (National Council on Food Security and Nutrition), SESAN (National Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition)
- National Coordinator of Crop Insurance for Family Farming
- Landless Workers’ Movement (MST)
- Field visit to “Chapadinha” Settlement, organized by National Federation of Workers in Family Farming (FETRAF)
- Site visit to smallholder farms in Brasilia to see technical extension being provided etc. organized by UN-WFP
- Ministry Of Education And Visit To A Public School and a public restaurant where the project is being implemented
- Ministries Of Agrarian Development, Agriculture And Landless Workers’ Movement
- Brazilian Secretariat of Human Rights
After the trip to Brazil, a pilot project was started in the Philippines – in Bicol and other parts of the country. Their feeding program is not just for school children but also high school and there are restaurants for those who need the supplemental food. Had a meeting with CONSEA.

The field visits were focused on seeing the “Demand Side” of the Zero Hunger Program in Brazil. The group looked at the food hub, a school in their preparation of the nutritional requirements being addressed by the local team, mingled with school children who are the ultimate beneficiaries, had lunch at a community kitchen, was briefed on the social protection program focused on beneficiaries (targeting and selection) and the impact and tangible results of the initiatives there. We visited as well the “Supply Side” of Zero Hunger to include the small-farmer holders, had discussions with FOs and discussions on the components of family farms that supply the feeding program, technical extension, business management and marketing, and a look at the results of these services to farmers’ income. We were pleased to see the links of what they were doing to include links between social protection and small-holder farming; between Brazil and other countries that implement similar initiatives; and between actual programs and the policies that enabled them. Equally important were the discussions held focused on the passing of a legislation, National Food Security Act (similar bill now pending at the HoR Committee).

At this juncture, it is high time to scale up, institutionalize, and put legislative actions on the PAHP. It is also time to consider replicating and adapting other important lessons from Brazil to the Philippines.” For more details, please refer to Annex H: Insights from Brazil, PAKISAMA.

From Brazil experiences shared, Mr. Banzuela explained that the Philippines can manage doing what Brazil has done with their program. Their efforts can be replicated in the Philippines. He then called on Ms. Coral to present PAKISAMA’s Experiences: Summary of FO Case Studies. Ms. Coral informed, “the presentation is supposed to be given by the Area Team Manager of PAKISAMA assigned in the Bicol Region. But since he is not able to come due an important matter, I will be presenting several models of Philippines’ experience in the implementation of institutional purchase involving various partners. These models include the following: i) the PAHP with a convergence program involving 3 government line agencies (DAR/DA/DSWD) with LGUs, ARBOs/ARCs/FOs and other beneficiaries and UN (FAO and WFP) with targets focused on increase of income of small farmers, improve access to food, helping solve and improve nutrition of young children, promote local economies, enhance food varieties to be produced by small farmers; and boost the production of organic products. This model presents several entry points for FOs to participate or get engaged with despite the hurdles that it will encounter along the process such as the registration; procurement and delays in downloading funds to LGUs; and financial or economic analysis.
Another model is the May-Ogob’s farmers’ case as they continue to be confident they will benefit, increase income from supplying organic vegetables to DCCs; vegetable farmers, mostly women, were given PAHP training; farmers did not traditionally grow vegetables prescribed in the menu; at the national PAHP, a new feeding guidelines on the menu was proposed; and part of the perceived benefits is the psychic income or reward from sense of well-being that organic vegetables produced will be eaten. As illustrated, presented below were the support needs of farmers’ groups:

Also described were the issues and concerns in program implementation as to production that includes land tenure, facilities, farm tools and equipment, support services (capital, social window for credit, crop insurance), training for organic vegetable and livestock production, and orientation on the supply and demand. On the area of organized/institutional marketing, issues were on procurement policies and systems, commitment of LGUs to purchase from farmers’ groups to include fund allocations downloaded to LGUs and how to get certain % of DCC market. On organizations needs are registration (with all concerned agencies and on organizational strengthening or management. PAHP management is likewise of great importance are on the to simplify indicators and on institutional commitment.”

At the last part of the presentation, Ms. Coral read the notes from the PAKISAMA ATM, Mr. Santos, who prepared the analysis. He wrote:

“Institutional purchase is an added dimension to enhancing farmers’ market power, considering its spirit, intent and nature where farmers are not merely selling but selling with a social purpose and further objective of receiving direct benefits from the goods that they sell. This is not only very innovative; it can revolutionize farmers’ approach to business. While it is true that one of the complaints aired by farmers is the difficulty to hurdle the government’s procurement process, it is still undeniable that government remains the single biggest and most reliable market. There is, therefore, wisdom in engaging this market, however difficult, which implies that any organization eyeing to penetrate this market must be fully prepared, equipped with sufficient capacities, and has gathered the will to bring down the wall.”

For more details, please refer to Annex I: PAKISAMA Experiences: Summary of Selected FO Case Studies.

Initiatives on Institutional Purchase in Vietnam
On the experiences of other countries present, Vietnam and Indonesia. Mr. Huu Van Pham of Vietnam shared, “thank you for inviting us to share our experience in our efforts against hunger in the country. We have for more than 30 years to gain independence that after the war we met many difficulties in agriculture production. This year we have very low productivity that hunger was a serious problem after the war. In 1968, there was a change in the country – the economy was opened since Vietnam imported products to other countries but was later changed that productivity increase. So in 1990 the productivity is 21 million tons and in 2000 we had 30 million tons which in 20 years we produced 2.5 million tons increase. Every year, we produce additional millions per year by exporting to many countries. We also export to the Philippines. Surprisingly low with the basic intention of recovering from the war. In Vietnam, we do not have hunger any longer but work towards -- to overcome hunger and poverty. We will show you some productive results in the past years.

First, we are supported by the state or the government. About 5 years ago, the state has no program but now sustainable production and new countryside construction program. Also there is the program – reconstruction of agriculture. Our advantage is like Philippine farmers, Vietnamese are hardworking people. The land is the goal – a small area is already identified as production. Next advantage is our experience in growing rice with thousand years of growing rice. Now, the farmers are using machines or equipment. We also have some difficulties 1) with the 30 years in the war, 70% of the people are living in the rural areas and are farmers, knowledge on technology is also limited – now Vietnam is updated with latest international and had just signed the TransPacific Trade Partnership (TPTP). But as compared with other countries particularly in rice is high but the quality is quite low. Food is likewise an issue. We have a program for the poor – they have a certificate that they are poor. They don't have to pay school fees, health needs, etc. Every year, we have an amount to pay for the poor so people contributes for the needs of the poor. Also there is this effort of slaughtering a cow for the poor people. One rich family can help a number of other poor families. The President has a regular meeting with the other government agencies to know the situation of the poor people. The farmers push for taking care of the poor.”

The translator/interpreter, Ms. Luana Swensson of FAO, added some few points to the inputs of Mr, Huu Van Pham. Ms. Swensson shared, “other efforts of the Vietnam Against Hunger or Action Plan with the support of FAO was the creation of a Steering Committee that is now drafting the 5 pillars for all people to have food, to reduce the price of rice or food, children from 2 years old should have good education, sustainable food system – good production of food and agriculture, productivity and income for small scale farmers through increased harvest.”

Initiatives on Institutional Purchase in Indonesia

I will give a brief review of what happened in our country. We do not have similar efforts but Aliansi Petani Indonesia (API) focuses on purchasing rice since government implements does not accommodate multi-quality produce of rice. Government agencies can easily buy rice from farmers as there is a government processing in the selling of rice. This is included in the IMPRESS. Government wanted the need to improve the quality of rice being produced – promoting/collaboration with organic reliance in Indonesia.
Although we are not implementing models or have experiences similar to the Brazil experience, those shared with us during the workshop will be a good learning lesson for us. Government can learn. Thank you so much for your attention.

Mr. Banzuela summarized the beautiful stories of Brazil, Vietnam, Indonesia and the Philippines that showed good possibilities. He pointed out that now the focus will be on the challenges of the institutional purchases and invited Ms. Rebagay to moderate Session 4: Sharing of Good Experiences of Government Capacity to Establish or Implement Institutional Purchase Program (Global Experience).

Session 4: Sharing of Good Experiences of Government Capacity to Establish or Implement Institutional Purchase Program (Global Experience)

Institutional Procurement of Food from Small-holder Farmers

Ms. Swensson shared, “FAO has Actions on Legislation or Contracting focused on case studies in Rwanda, Kenya, El Salvador, Guatemala, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Ghana. She informed that there will soon be publication entitled, “Institutional Procurement of Food from Small-holder Farmers, which is an analysis of the Brazilian and P4P or the PAA-Africa case studies experiences in Latin America, Africa and Asia. The study is aimed: i) to provide guidance for national government and other types of institutional buyers on designing and implementing an effective IPP for the procurement of food from local small-holder producers; ii) share lessons learned and provide advice on the main issues to be address and how to address them; and iii) No “ready recipe” - guidelines that can be adapted to distinct national contexts. The topics covered multi-faced objectives of IPPs, enabling institutional and policy environment, legal framework, demand side and procurement procedure, supply side and measuring impact and monitoring IPPs. There are 3 legal issues linked to IPPs that promotes a legal enabling environment – the regulation of public procurement; development of a legal definition of small-holder or family farming producers at national level; and the legal structure and regulation of small-holder producer organizations.
Implementation of a policy which aims to facilitate the access of small-holder farmers to institutional markets; it is necessary and advisable to adapt the legal framework – and in particular the legislation on public procurement. Adaptations can likewise be done taking into consideration the capacities and characteristics of small-holder supply but still maintaining the core principles that protect the interests of the institutional buyer. Small-holder friendly procurement procedures can take different forms and there is not a single model to be adopted. It does not only facilitates a contracting agreement itself but shortens payment times, provide customized logistical and transport systems, customize administrative procedures, and provision of services are for quality control. It is important to note that a legal definition provides a unified concept of small or family farm producers to be adopted at national level by all public policies is important for the proper development and implementation of IPPs. It contributes to the strength of the institutionalization of family farming in the country, facilitates a broader dialogue and interaction between different policies and programs having the same target beneficiaries and ensure that the public programs on family farming effectively reaches their recipients. The parameters used can vary and be adjusted to the national context and its peculiarities.

FOs is the main model adopted and supported by both Brazilian and P4P experiences for linking small-holder producers to institutionalize markets. In Brazil, although individual access is allowed, the development of formal organizations (cooperatives and associations) is one of the explicit objectives of PAA. Studies indicate that the greater is the involvement of associations and cooperatives and the higher the degree of their consolidation. An inadequate regulation of FOs may lead to significant problems as it limits its utility, hinder its performance and become an obstacles for long-term development. FOs need an appropriate enabling environment that includes a conducive and appropriated regulatory and legal framework. For more details, please refer to Annex J: Institutional Procurement of Food from Small-holder Farmers.

**Lessons Learned and Action Points in FO Capacity Building, Contracting and Legislation**

At 2:50 p.m., Mr. Klug followed on Lessons Learned and Action Points in FO Capacity Building, Contracting and Legislation. He showed a video based on the experience of Senegal (in French but with English translation in sub-title). FAO working in synergy with government and other organizations in Senegal.

**Key Issues of PAHP and Other Institutional Food Purchase Initiatives in Other Countries**

The third sharing is on Insights and Key Issues of PAHP and Other Institutional Food Purchase Initiatives in Other Countries by Mr. Daniels who is representing the Country Director of World Food Program (WFP).
Session 5: Focused discussions among groups on the different themes on what are possible in the Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam.

Mr. Virola, Jr. checked on the groupings according to region – Luzon and Visayas and Mindanao. Ms. Serrato will take care of the Luzon teams, Mr. Virola with the Visayas team and Ms. Jane Zamar for the Mindanao, to convene downstairs near the restaurant of the hotel. On the other hand, Vietnam and Indonesia will be one group and the agency representatives to form another group. All teams were given 20 minutes to discuss their challenges and action points based on demand, supply and policies. Overall, the groups are given 30 minutes to complete the discussion and will return to the conference for sharing of results.

After the group discussions, Ms. Zamar invited all the groups to convene and resumed at 4:30 p.m. with the presentation of their respective outputs during their discussion. Ms. Esmao, Mr. Celso and Ms. Marissa reported for Luzon, Mindanao and the Visayas teams, respectively. Mr. Virola, Jr. took over the moderation of the workshop presentation and discussion.

The consolidated outputs of the 3 regions were as follows:
## Results of Group Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Areas of Challenges/Issues and Suggested Action(s)</th>
<th>Action(s) to Take</th>
<th>Demand &amp; Opportunities</th>
<th>Action(s) to Take</th>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Action(s) to Take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luzon</td>
<td>Low production of palay and other products</td>
<td>Appropriate farming</td>
<td>FOs are not aware of the specific demands of LGUs/NGAs (what product, volume and price)</td>
<td>Lobby with the LGUs/NGAs on information about demand</td>
<td>Fragmented government</td>
<td>Institutional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable/uncontrolled market price of products such as rice, veggies and other commodities</td>
<td>Established contract with government agencies such as BJMP, DOH, DepEd, DSWD on supplemental funding</td>
<td>Strict policies of NFA regarding procurement of rice</td>
<td>Revisit and revise NFA procurement policies</td>
<td>Contracting procurement</td>
<td>Formulation of the menu from the ground (localized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of access to pre and post-harvest facilities such as irrigation</td>
<td>Storage facility to keep the produce for future transaction to ensure “high price” – accessing of BUB projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant government policy that will resolve the conflict between the LGU and NGAs (strengthen partnership among GA/stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pull bolting of organic palay production (PDCI case)</td>
<td>Government intervention for subsidizing additional premium price given to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSOs’ role not defined well in the IPP/PAHP</td>
<td>LGU to provide a nutritionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of assure market for some products</td>
<td>Consolidator, with system and an organization who will buy the product from the farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product development &quot;by product&quot; e.g. coconut, other products</td>
<td>Relevant technology transfer through farmers’ capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Insufficient capital for production and product development          | Linkage to financial institution  
|                                                                     | Research and development & trading part, providing technical assistance, funds for buying land to use it to guarantee funding |
| Classifying/organizing of farmer producer into certain category       | Capacity building/farmers’ training at national level for employment      |
| Difficulty to bid because the quality of products                    | Get subsidy for premium products  
|                                                                     | For the bill of Rep Robredo to be  
|                                                                     | Advocacy on the bill  
<p>|                                                                     | Promote institutional purchase program with |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visayas</th>
<th>have a higher price</th>
<th>approved</th>
<th>Will legalize the program</th>
<th>govern’t at all levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is surplus. There is little skill for value addition. Lowering becomes a risk.</td>
<td>Capacity building among farmers and FOs/cooperatives in terms of upscaling organic feed production &amp; organic seeds, farm planning &amp; records keeping</td>
<td>IRR and budget needed</td>
<td>Push for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use BUB funds to support PAHP. Must have simple feasibility study &amp; value chain analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can be adopted by LGUs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of niche product (organic) – certification and labelling</td>
<td>Procurement process must have special treatment for farmers</td>
<td>Sign MOA between LGU and farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase can be made from the farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disasters/climate change events</td>
<td>Support to climate smart agriculture</td>
<td>Menu design &amp; planning must be</td>
<td>Coordinate DSWD and LGUs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Regions 6 & 8) through incentives & crop insurance participatory (must include farmers) Farmers can suggest menu based on what they produce

Many DSWD agencies at local level & LGUs lack awareness on PAHP (business as usual) Orientation What to do with farmers' surplus? Establish bagsakan centers

Lack of supply Consolidation through FOs and federations Coordination with potential markets

Train farmers on consolidation and increased production

Need to expand the pilot programs Schools, hospitals, hotels & restaurants Coordinate and collaborate with government and NGOs

Fresh & healthy agri products organically grown rice (region 6), pakbet vegetables (regions 6, 7 & 8),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>organic pigs/chicken (regions 6, 7 &amp; 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many farmer-members of cooperatives &amp; FOs. Many involved in organic production. Availability of inputs—organic seeds, fertilizers, pesticides. Those in cooperatives are registered as business enterprises, have receipts, financial system, tax free, can act as consolidators. Avail post-harvest facilities—warehouses, mills, trucks (logistics). Value addition to surplus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High incidence of poverty &amp; malnutrition = high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capitalization for individuals/producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traders control supply because they finance production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies of farmers not organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies of farmers not organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective/inappropriate infrastructures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session 6: Feedbacks, Recommendations and Support from Resource Persons and Visitors (Panelists) on the Various Possibilities of Actions

This session was spent for eliciting feedback, comments and suggestions from the participants and resource persons on the results/outputs of the workshop. Each organization was requested to make their comments in plenary.

Towards the end of the workshop, an evaluation form was passed around to assess the success of the workshop based on participants’ feedback on the logistics e.g., venue, food and kit, program management, participation, and with questions related to what struck the participants the most, how can they apply the learnings/insights they have acquired, and how can the future events such as this workshop be improved. Completed forms were submitted to Ms. Lyza of AFA for consolidation.

Mr. Banzuela gave a synthesis of the workshop highlighting the following: “For what we have discussed during the workshop, we were able to give light on the following what is:

- Contract: government-FOs, priorities, regular: min, quota;
- Multiple Bottomlines, stakeholders, countries;
- FO/cooperative centric demand, supply, policies; and the
- Importance of government political will.

We were able to look into how it should be done. It was realized that there is No RECIPE, there is a need to wash dishes: pilot, scale up over time, procurement modalities, organizational form, regulation that would need key requirements to be complied with to include i) budget; ii) policy and capacity. On challenges, the team had to consider PO's capacity to deliver (production, market price, facilities, discipline), negotiate, advocate; and Government Capacity to provide services, synergy, budget.

Action points to consider include:

Action Points: Break the Glass: Build, build, build
- Build Enabling Environment: POLICY: Enact the Leni IP Bill viz other legislative measures. Build info based Lobby/Advocacy Group, LBP policies, budget/subsidy PROGRAM: hub, mono, fixed price, procurement/bidding, facilities, integration of various government programs, hot meals
- BUILD FO CAPACITY: consolidation, skills PRODUCTION, coop strengthening, build on strengths/success (kapataan, twh), timely-quality-quantity, organizing is key
- BUILD PARTNERSHIP: SYNERGIZE (govt, csos, etc; roles), participate in PAHP governance, implementation, maximize existing program, partnerships with FAO, WFP, IFAD, ASEAN (amrdpe/som/redpe), mtcp, learning visits

The workshop ended with closing messages from Mr. Poznanski, Mr. Benedicto Aquillo – Chairperson of PAKISAMA, and Ms. Lany Rebagay of AFA. Certificates of appreciation and participation were given out to guest speakers/resource persons and to participants, respectively. The workshop ended 6:45 p.m.
Synthesis
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