



IFOAM Workshop Report Participatory Guarantee Systems for East Africa

Commissioned by

IFOAM

IFOAM Head Office

Charles-de-Gaulle-Str. 5

53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49 - 228 - 92650 - 10

Fax: +49 - 228 - 92650 - 99

Email: HeadOffice@ifoam.org

www.ifoam.org

Consultant

Chris May (Bioglobal Ltd)

Table of Contents

1.0 Purpose of the workshop	3
2.0 Participants.....	3
3.0 Methodology	3
3.1 Key Workshop Activities.....	4
4.0 Outcomes.....	5
4.1 Bonde La Chem Chem (a local PGS).....	6
5.0 Conclusion	6
6.0 Recommendations for Follow-up	7
6.1. KOAN and NOGAMU should review their existing PGS	7
6.2 Follow-up meeting for East African PGS stakeholders	8
6.3 PGS structured so that they sustain themselves	8
6.4 IFOAM Task Force.....	8
Annex 1 Issues from the PGS in East Africa Report.....	9
Annex 2 Bonde La Chem Chem (a new PGS in Tanzania)	10
Annex 3 Resource Materials used during the workshop	12
Annex 4 Notes from PGS Group Work – ‘steps in the process for gaining a seal’	13
Annex 5 List of Workshop Participants	14
Annex 6 Summary notes from PGS Group work Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda	15

Glossary of Terms

BLCC	Bonde La Chem Chem
ICS	Internal Control System
IFOAM	International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements
NOAMS	National Organic Agricultural Movements
NGO	Non Government Organisation
PGS	Participatory Guarantee System

IFOAM Participatory Guarantee Systems Workshop

Arusha, Tanzania, April 2007

1.0 Purpose of the workshop

The Arusha Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) workshop was convened and supported by IFOAM with organizational support in Tanzania from Grolink.

The overall aim of the workshop was to advance the understanding of Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) and the role they might play within the developing organic sector of East Africa.

2.0 Participants

The participants were drawn from the 3 national organic coordinating bodies of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda as well as representatives from UGOCERT, TANCERT and EnCert. Resource persons included IFOAM representatives (Bonn HQ and Kenya), a PGS operator from South Africa and Grolink team members. (See list attached in Annex 5)

3.0 Methodology

The workshop was held over 2 days, April 2 – 3 2007.

As far as possible a participatory approach was followed to include plenary discussion and group work. The process followed was intended to build on the participants experiences with PGS and to use this as a basis for strengthening their country's PGS. Uganda and Kenya have already established PGS systems while Tanzania is in the development phase. A critique of the Uganda and Kenya systems was covered as part of the 'PGS East Africa Report' prepared by Gunnar Rundgren (Grolink). A number of the workshop participants had been consulted in the preparation of this document which provided an important focusing and launching point for a number of workshop activities.

The key workshop activities are described below.

3.1 Key Workshop Activities

- A pre-workshop field trip was undertaken to a new PGS which the stakeholders have called Bonde La Chem Chem (BLCC), located near by to Arusha. The purpose of the visit was to learn about this new private initiative. This initiative was particularly relevant and interesting as it provided an excellent example of a grass roots approach to establishing a PGS without external help. This PGS provided an excellent model for critical analysis (Summary notes for BLCC in Annex 2).
- A presentation by Gunnar Rundgren of his 'PGS in East Africa' Report that included his overview and the key findings of the report. The presentation was followed by a facilitator-lead discussion around the issues raised in the key findings. The 'PGS East Africa Report' was used as the guiding document to focus the discussion, in particular Chapter 6.
- PGS case study presentations from New Zealand and South Africa were followed by plenary discussions.
- The participants from Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda Group were combined into 2 groups to work together to consider, expand and prioritise the key issues identified in the 'PGS East Africa Report' (see Annex 1). This process was followed by a plenary discussion and included the addition of 2 additional issues.
- A critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the BLCC as it stands as a PGS was carried out and the outcomes from this process are summarized in Annex 2.
- Building on the participants' experience with PGS in Kenya and Uganda and drawing on the knowledge gained during workshop sessions, the Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda groups shaped or reshaped a PGS framework for each of their countries with the focus on building a PGS around the core PGS concepts of transparency, participation and accountability. A key outcome of this activity was the 'enlightened' discussion that followed-on as part of the reporting back process.

4.0 Outcomes

Key themes that were emphasised throughout the workshop process were participation, transparency and accountability, as well as the practicality of having a PGS that is affordable to small-holder farmers. The 'PGS East Africa Report' highlighted the fact that the Kenyan and Ugandan PGS were very much ICS (Internal Control Systems) orientated and suggested that this approach was in effect non-participatory as these systems were developed largely independently from the key stakeholders, namely the farmers.

The workshop process revisited, on a number occasions, the theme of participation and various examples were drawn out to explain and describe different ways stakeholders could participate in PGS to include key roles in the design and implementation of their PGS. In the concluding session of day 2 of the workshop, participants were able to articulate a good understanding of the 'P' in PGS and the ways in which it could be expressed.

On the question of accountability and particularly financial sustainability of PGS, the discussions was less conclusive and there seems to be still some way to go in order for PGS and even the national organic associations (NOAMs) to be able to stand alone without external support.

Discussions around the close links between the NOAMs, other NGOs and other funding providers highlighted the need for the NOAMs to be mindful that the agendas of external organizations could confuse the development and the dynamics of PGS. The NOAMs must develop clear PGS focused objectives and ensure that other project partners understand and where possible embrace these objectives.

On the question of transparency the group appeared comfortable around the idea that their systems should be documented and processes open to external scrutiny, for example consumers and traders could take part in farm assessments (inspections).

The question of PGS terminology and the need for PGS terminology to be clearly different from ICS terminology in order not to confuse consumers and organic certifiers was discussed. Conrad Hauptfleish (Bryanstone Organic, South Africa) contributed to this discussion by providing examples from the Bryanstone PGS as follows. Instead of certify they use the word endorse; for inspect they use assess and for organic they use PGS endorsed (where the word organic cannot be used).

The draft PGS frameworks for each country might still be in the initial phase of development but the plenary presentations and discussions around each example were diverse and demonstrated that the workshop participants were clearly able to articulate the working elements of a PGS. The challenge for the workshop participants will be

redesigning their existing systems in ways that actively include farmers and other stakeholders. This process will take commitment, time and resources.

4.1 Bonde La Chem Chem (a local PGS)

The field trip which began the workshop formed an important part of the overall programme as it provided a real life example of a local initiative to set-up a PGS. It also provided the workshop participants with a hands-on opportunity to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the BLCC as a PGS. The key outcome from the participants' critique of BLCC was the need for more transparency, particularly in the way they describe their systems and their approach to organic production. This could include a written organic standard and a description of how organic and not organic activities are handled by the BLCC group as well a documented description of the roles and responsibilities of the different group members.

5.0 Conclusion

The underlying assumption of a PGS is the idea that farmers can be trusted to be organic. Ways in which trust is expressed can be culturally specific and therefore there is no one script for the development of a PGS and how it might function. Thus, in the case of East Africa while the countries may have agreed to build their PGS upon the East African Organic Standard, the internal processes they develop to express and 'measure' a farmer's and farmer group's commitment to a PGS can be different. What is important is that the systems are transparent, participatory and there is accountability in the systems. To ensure that these core features of a PGS are integral to the PGS of East Africa it is important to step away from the ICS top down approach and build their PGS in ways that engage all stakeholders actively in the development and implementation process.

Overall the workshop was a success as it enabled the participants to immerse themselves in PGS concepts and then apply them to their own situations and in a participatory way develop frameworks for themselves. As the workshop progressed, the collective mindset of the workshop participants became expansive around the ways a PGS could be designed. The challenge will be to draw from the workshop experience to enthuse their colleagues and find ways to work collaboratively with Third Party certifiers to advance PGS in East Africa.

The workshop concluded the following:

- Each country would adopt the East African Organic Standards as a basis for their PGS Norms.
- A convenor/facilitator to coordinate the overall PGS development in East Africa would not be appointed. Rather it was concluded that each NOAM (National

Organic Agriculture Movement) would take responsibility for the advance of PGS in their own country.

- The group work output from the workshop session to describe ‘steps in the process for obtaining a seal’ should be developed further with the key steps elaborated along with a critique of each countries output. The workshop facilitator agreed to document the output as per Annex 4 but the task of elaborating and providing a critique was left unresolved.
- The NOAMs for each country would draw from their own models and their subsequent internal discussions to further develop their PGS. To help them develop national pilots for the adoption of PGS their initial focus would be to work with farmer groups that are already established.
- These models would be ready at least in part for discussion at the East Africa Organic Conference 28 May-1 June, Dar es Salaam Tanzania.

6.0 Recommendations for Follow-up

‘There is a clear need to develop PGS in East Africa. In particular it seems to be relevant and applicable for smaller groups of farmers with joint marketing. The development must involve the farmers and preferably other local stakeholders and should result in systems that they feel comfortable with.’² The following recommendations are made to move the PGS development process forward.

6.1 KOAN and NOGAMU should review their existing PGS

KOAN and NOGAMU should review their PGS in order to build into their systems procedures that enable and encourage all their key stakeholders to take part in the design and implementation of their PGS. This would include the documentation used as well as decision making processes. TOAM which is building a PGS from scratch should ensure the same.

The group work output from the workshop session ‘Steps in obtaining the seal’ (see Annex 4) should be developed further, with the key steps elaborated in more detail. To test the extent that core PGS concepts have been captured each group should continue to critique themselves by asking such questions as ‘are our systems transparent (internally and externally), are we accountable to each other and do our stakeholders share in decision making about who can use the seal’.

² PGS East Africa Report, Gunnar Rundgren

6.2 Follow-up meeting for East African PGS stakeholders

While it may be possible for the workshop participants to come together, as a peripheral activity, within other regional meetings, it is recommended that a specific meeting of the NOAMs be facilitated within a suitable time frame (within the next 6 months) and at which their 'new' PGS can be presented and discussed.

The focus of this meeting should include discussions around both process and systems. The rationale for a specific PGS meeting is that it will provide a target date by which their 'new' PGS will be developed and it will provide the forum for sharing their common experiences. A critical part of this process of peer review is to inspire each other and to look at each others' PGS in the light of transparency, participation and accountability as well developing PGS terminology that is common to PGS.

6.3 PGS structured so that they sustain themselves

For the NOAMs it is important that they develop their PGS so that overtime they can become independent from external influences and financially viable. They must plan from the outset to manage external funding and use it to secure this goal. To do this they must develop clear PGS-focused development objectives and ensure that other project partners understand and where possible embrace these objectives.

6.4 IFOAM Task Force

The IFOAM PGS Task Force must continue to actively facilitate the development of resources to help support the development of PGS around the world. PGS are underpinned by important basic concepts and the further these are elaborated by example the easier it is for others to understand and develop their own PGS systems.

With reference to East Africa and other places there is a need for:

- guidance on how to ensure the financial viability of a PGS, thus, the preparation of a basic guiding framework to help PGS operators to identify core costs and shape a basic PGS budget would be valuable, and
- The development of a PGS terminology that is unique to PGS and not borrowed from ICS and third party certification.

Annex 1 Issues from the PGS in East Africa Report

From Chapter 6 Key Issues, *East Africa PGS Report*

The following issues were discussed by 2 randomly selected groups and prioritized 1-9 (1 being the most important to 9 as least important) as follows:

Issues	G1	G2
Lack of supply an obstacle for local market development	2	1
Perceived issue with small premiums	6=	9
Need for Quality Assurance in the market	3	3
Need for labeling and promotion	5	2
Certification too costly	6=	6
Standards too demanding	9	7
Certification procedures too demanding	8	4
Existing organic farmers locked into export and can't sell locally	4	8
Many farmer groups are weak	1	5
Additional issues added to the list during plenary discussion (not prioritized)		
Possibility for conflict between PGS and Third party		
Government support required for organic sector		

The responses show that there was general consensus between the groups as to which issues were most pressing. On the issue of the possibility for conflict between PGS and Third party operators there seemed to be a resolve between the participants that both parties should work together throughout the PGS development process and through this interaction both parties would understand how they have the potential to complement each other rather than compete with each other.

Annex 2 Bonde La Chem Chem (a new PGS in Tanzania)

The Bonde La Chem Chem group was visited by the Arusha PGS workshop participants as a pre-workshop activity. The BLCC group has recently established a PGS. The group includes 64 families and the key organic crop is Hibiscus Rosea which is solar dried and sold for tea and juice making.

The PGS workshop participants were welcomed by the BLCC group, this welcome was followed by a detailed discussion that covered the background and activities of the group.

Onsite activities included hibiscus growing and drying as well as mushroom growing.

As a workshop activity PGS workshop participants completed a strengths and weaknesses evaluation of the BLCC PGS as follows.

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Already formed	Dependent on Miriam's leadership, drive and capital
Have market for products	Not communicating effectively to the outside world on how they build trust within their system
Knowledgeable	Situated remotely – transport expensive
Spread of responsibilities	Trust equates to paid up status for its members
Organised management	Land constraints – renting
Internal TRUST	The relationship between organic and not organic production activities of the members is unclear.
Local context	No clear organic standard or related awareness raising
Common set of rules	Focus on organic is not clearly articulated
Diversification of production	Commodity approach
Adding value where they can	Labeling easily copied
Transparency	No documentation other than financial records.
A strong leader with resources to invest	
Good balance of male and female members	
Families are members	
Developing an internal bank	
Marketing – happening but strategy seems confused	

Recommendations from the PGS Workshop Participants to BLCC

BLCC should develop documentation that allows for transparency and enables the group to be able to tell their story.

The story could include:

- Information about the locality.
- General background that includes something about the group, size, products etc
- A recognized basic organic production standard.
- Description of the PGS management systems they have set in place.

Annex 3 Resource Materials used during the workshop

- ‘East Africa PGS Report’, Gunnar Rundgren, Grolink, March 2007
- EcoVida Training Manual (English version), Brazil, 2004
- IFOAM PGS Posters

Annex 4 Notes from PGS Group Work – ‘steps in the process for gaining a seal’

As a part of the workshop process each country group was given the opportunity to describe a process through which their producers would go through to get a seal/certificate.

The key outcome from this process was the plenary discussion that followed.

The notes below were the catalyst for the plenary discussion and while they are incomplete in places they provide a useful summary of key points. There were two aspects to the ‘design’ process. Firstly to identify key tasks as they related to a key activity and secondly to identify who would be responsible for implementing the tasks.

The framework to guide this discussion was drawn from the EcoVida Training Manual Chapter 1.

Annex 5 List of Workshop Participants

PGS Workshop

Arusha

Participants, itinerary and funding

Person	Organization	Country	Contact
Chris May	BioGlobal	New Zealand	biomays@clear.net.nz
Anne Boor	IFOAM	Germany	a.boor@ifoam.org
Gunnar Rundgren	Grolink	Sweden	gunnar@grolink.se
Eustace Kiarri	KOAN	Kenya	koansecretariat@elci.org
Jack Juma	KOAN	Kenya	via Kiarri
Samuel Ndungu	KOAN	Kenya	via Kiarri
Moses Kiggundu	NOGAMU	Uganda	admin@nogamu.org.ug
Irene Kugonza	NOGAMU	Uganda	ikugonza@nogamu.org.ug
Derrick Tenywa	NOGAMU	Uganda	dtenywa@nogamu.org.ug
Gama Jordan	TOAM	Tanzania	gamajam2002@yahoo.com
To be added to list	TOAM	Tanzania	via Gama
Dick Ayoku (Charles Walaga can not come)	UgoCert	Uganda	dayoku@ugocert.org
Leonard Mtama	TanCert	Tanzania	LM@TanCert.org
Musa Njoka	EnCert	Kenya	musanjoka@yahoo.com
Konrad Hauptfleisch	BOM	South Africa	konrad@bryanstonorganicmarket.co.za
Patricia Wangongu	IFOAM	Kenya	patricia@mboyawangongu.com pwangongu@yahoo.com

Annex 6 Summary notes from PGS Group work Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda

1. Group formation

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Group sensitization, facilitation	NGO partners	Group already formed	Group members	Orient stakeholders and members on PGS	TOAN et al
Define the PGS structure	Group			ID of existing groups	
Existing groups Reorientation of group objective	NGO partner (NOGAMU) and group			Awareness creation on formation of new groups	
New groups Define group ID Risk analysis Sensitisation – intro to standards (overview only – PGS) Decision to join.	As above NOGAMU and Group leadership Group			Group sensitization on PGS	
				Capacity building/group strengthening	

2. Joining the PGS

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Contact NOGAMU (if not already in contact)	Group leader/NGO partner	Request received – letter, telephone etc	NOAM	Prepare a simple application form for the group to complete	TOAM et al
Assessment – if ok then PGS sensitisation	NOGAMU	Application form includes info about PGS and communicates requirements – background, no. of members, activities, knowledge of organics	NOAM	Distribute application forms to interested groups	
Issue application	NOGAMU				

3. Group receives paper work

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Pledge	Group	Scenario 1		Facilitate the design, preparation and distribution of – Farm records form Production guidelines based on EAOPS Peer review forms Facilitator report forms	TOAM et al
Application form	Group	Capacity building – group management, organic principles, standards, developing internal standards, value chain development	NOAM/NGO/Peer farmers		
Code of conduct and practical standards		Scenario 2			
Note – assisting groups to participate in groups and systems Draft – comments - Plenary	NOGAMU and NGO Partners	A brief description of the group operations – internal rules, group structure and management.	Group		

4. Group completes documentation

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Assistance through demo	NOGAMU/NGO	Farmers meet with Rep from NOAMS to complete the forms	Farmers and NOAMS	Orientate group members and field officers on completion of documents	TAOM et al
Group application	Group			Training groups on record keeping	
Cost simplicity					
Return to HQ					

5. Documents to PGS office - Processing documents

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Data Capture	NOGAMU	Filing and entering in database	NOAMS and Group	Group facilitator receives and files in database	Facilitator
Data analysis				TOAM receives summary of data from facilitator and records on database	TOAM
Request additional info				Information kept in accordance with existing legislation (5 years) ??	TOAM

6. Documents check (handling)

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Peer review (cell inspections)	Cell leader and 4 members of cell	Inspection	Peers Buyers NOAMS/NGO	Familiarize the group on the objective and means on PGS Internal Quality Management system Farm visit/field school Group meetings Peer review forms Agree on the frequency for monitoring and assessment	TOAM et al
Report to group HQ	Cell leader				
Address issues	Group executive				
Issue written report to NOGAMU	Group executive				
Random inspection	Stakeholder group (trader, cell leader, consumer, NOGAMU, farmer, Third Party Certifier etc				

7. On-farm group – peer review/inspection

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
All done above section 6		Findings report - noncompliance - actions - compliance	Group	Facilitator leads peer review process	Facilitator
		Farmers discuss the Report			

8. Summary docs/reports Decision

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
On site and immediate	Random Inspection Group			Review reports from facilitator- List of farmers visited and status of each based on standards and guidelines	Facilitator/Group leaders
Issue seal to group	NOGAMU				
To be discussed – renewal procedures and follow-ups	NOGAMU and stakeholders				

9. Decision taken – release the seal

Uganda		Kenya		Tanzania	
Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities	Tasks	Responsibilities
Recommendations of which members to use seal sent to NOGAMU (List)	Group			Issue seal	TOAM
				Provide backstopping	