





Open Archive TOULOUSE Archive Ouverte (OATAO)

OATAO is an open access repository that collects the work of Toulouse researchers and makes it freely available over the web where possible.

This is an author-deposited version published in : <http://oatao.univ-toulouse.fr/>
Eprints ID : 16302

To cite this version : Ryschawy, Julie  and Joannon, Alexandre and Gibon, Annick  *Evaluating innovative scenarios to enhance mixed crop-livestock farms sustainability : A partnership methodology based on long-term farmers' strategies.* (2014) In: The 11th European IFSA Symposium, 1 April 2014 - 4 April 2014 (Berlin, Germany). (Unpublished)

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the repository administrator: staff-oatao@listes-diff.inp-toulouse.fr


11th European IFSA Symposium
1-4 April 2014 in Berlin, Germany

**Evaluating innovative scenarios to
enhance mixed crop-livestock farms
sustainability.**


*A partnership methodology based on
long-term farmers' strategies*

J Ryschawy *, A Joannon, A Gibon

* INRA INPT-ENSAT, UMR AGIR, FRANCE



A mutual objective on mixed-crop livestock



The Coteaux de Gascogne

A French less-favoured area

→ Low specialization of agriculture
(50% of farms MCLS)

Local actors : Which future for their MCLS farms?



Research : Worldwide regain of interest in MCLS

Crops

Livestock

Mutual objective : Evaluating scenarios including technical innovations that could enhance sustainability of MCLS.

A specific Local Group of Partners


- ✓ Knowledge on the area
 - ✓ *4 municipalities involved*
 - ✓ *56 farms surveyed*
 - ✓ *Databases on farmers' practices*
 - ✓ *Historical data on farms since 1950*

 - ✓ A new partnership working with local actors for our study :
 - ✓ *15 farmers within the 56 surveyed*
 - ✓ *their local advisors*
 - ✓ *2 mayors within the 4 municipalities*
- ➔ **Membership on a voluntary basis**



Basic requirements

1. Transparency :
collective steps definition and evaluation, reports, vote, ...
 2. Stability of the group
 3. Freedom of expression and respect : *post-its, gathering opinions, mediation,...*
 4. Enthusiasm!
- ➔ **Trust elaboration**



Step 1a : A retrospective study of farmers' strategies

- ✓ Studying farmers' long-term strategies as a useful material for future studies
 - ➔ *Innovations linked to their strategies*
- ✓ Typology of past farms trajectories from 1950 to 2005
 - *50 farms considered*
 - *2 collective meetings*
 - *12 individual surveys*



Type *Autonomy-led farmers (13 farms)*
"If you want something done right, do it yourself"


An illustration of a field of sunflowers on the left and a cartoon cow on the right, connected by a large, grey, double-headed arrow.

Type *Diversified family-farmers (8 farms)*
"Don't put all your eggs in one basket"

An illustration of various farm animals: a sheep, a chicken, a cow, and a pig.

Step 1.c : Participatory definition of prospective scenarios

- Whole participatory process with farmers & actors :
 - 3 collective meetings of 3 hours
 - Technical innovations in line with farmers long term strategies to maintain MCLS



A. A « post-its meeting » : 5 post-it / partner

« What is worrying you concerning the future of your farm? »



Step 1.b : Participatory definition of prospective scenarios

B. Collective organisation of the post-its :

« Which major uncertainties within the local context? »



C. Vote to select two scenarios (and two real-farms)


« How could we change our practices to adapt to those uncertainties? » → *Scenarios of technical innovations*

Type Autonomy-led farmers

→ **Scenario** : sowing forage legumes intercrops to achieve autonomy for herd feeding

Type Diversified family-farmers

→ **Scenario** : adding a finishing unit of heifers to achieve direct sales



KEY

Local actors :

Individual 

Collective 

Researchers:

Individual 

Collective 

Computer model 

Interactions 

Step 2 : Scenario exploration with the farmer

Focus of Type Autonomy-led farmer - Intercropping

Farm selected : typical MCLS of the area

A farmer deeply involved in the process

- 133 ha - 50% crops & 50 % grasslands
- 43 suckler cows – Limousine breed
- 1 Working Unit




- Precision of farmers' wishes:
Two types of intercrops to insert in the rotation
- Identification of major constraints:
 - *Periods of sowing and harvesting / work organisation*
 - *Feeding quality and low costs*

→ Legumes intercropping : pure or mixed species


S1 : Red clover and oat-vetch intercrops / S2 : Premium on red clover

Step 2 : Scenario exploration with the farmer

- Simulation with the farmer through a simple computer-based tool




- ➔ 5 to 6 visits of 3-4 hours to specify the technical scenarios
- ➔ Time at the lab to adapt the model and prepare the simulations



Step 3 : Collective evaluation of the results

- Scenario presented by the farmer himself → motivating other farmers
- Discussions on the technical routines and ... on systemic thinking !:

New technical scenarios of practices to better integrate crop and livestock at the farm scale?



Systemic thinking - *"Everything isn't always a race"*
"The performance would be to know when you are spending too much to produce".

Strong involvement of local actors

- Interest in local adapted study
 - Relevance of real cases

«*For once, it was concrete and corresponded to our ideas* »
 - New discussions on work organisation



- Importance of collective meetings
 - Posture of researchers

« *We have been listened et could express our views.* »
 - Interactions research/local actors

« *It is really interesting to share views with other core works* »

→ *Other professions could take an objective look at the local situation*

→ *For researchers, learning on contexts and realistic innovations*

Lessons and limits

- **Time, enthusiasm & confidence in the process needed !**
 - *Many time spent in organisation*
 - *Transparency as a major rule !*
- **Risks were taken «disturbing not to know where we were going»**
 - **Reflexivity of the researchers is essential**
 - *First seen as an expert...then maybe as a partner ?*
 - *Does the research question really come from the actors ?!*
 - **Specific skills needed...Communication...**
- **Which level of implication of the partners?**
- *Adaptations of the group according to steps ...and wishes!*
- *Technical discussions on local real-life farms!*
- **From «out of pure curiosity» to involvement ...**

My take-home message : Establishing a dialogue based on trust between all types of actors is not easy neither a sure thing ...

Thank you !

