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**Key messages**

- Ecuador, developed specific institutions related to agroecology (Sustainable and Agro-ecological Productive Development Directorate; Undersecretary of Family and Peasant Agriculture) at the Minister of Agriculture; and an enabling policy framework. Despite this agroecology remain under developed. Ecuador has 9 policy instruments that can be used to enhance relevant programmatic interventions at MIES (IEPS), BanEcuador, MAATE (Socio Bosque), MAG (PITPPA) and MINEDU (TINi).

- 17 actors interviewed mentioned 48 limiting factors for current scaling up of agroecology in Ecuador. Those factors belong to 6 dimensions, rated from the greatest to the least important dimensions as follow: i) market, ii) alliances, iii) political, iv) economic, v) knowledge and vi) productive resources. The key factors identified as barriers were the lack of agroecological markets and collaborations with solidarity cooperatives and consumers, but also the lack of access to credit for production.

- Considering 3 major strategic axes (short, medium and long term), 7 strategic lines encompassing 46 strategic actions were suggested by farmers, agroecological movements, academia, public officials, market and business actors, consumers and NGOs for scaling up of agroecology in Peru.

**Scalability of Agroecology**

Agroecology is defined as a scientific discipline, a set of practices and a social movement (Wezel et al., 2009). As a science, it studies how the different components of the agroecosystem interact. As a set of practices, it seeks sustainable agricultural systems that optimize and stabilize production. As a social movement, it targets multifunctional roles for agriculture, promotes social justice, nourishes identity and culture, and strengthens the economic viability of rural areas.

Particularly in Latin America, agroecology has had a tangible and positive impact on crop yields, resource conservation, food security and food sovereignty (Altieri & Toledo, 2011). It is important to highlight that agroecology has been traced back to its origin as an expression of resistance to industrial agriculture and the green revolution, a tool and an approach to achieve food sovereignty and as an alternative to current agri-food systems (Val & Rosset, 2020).

According to Parmentier (2014), Nicholls & Altieri (2018), Tuttonell (2019), the scaling up of agroecology implies not one transition, but several simultaneous transitions, at different scales, levels and dimensions; social, biological, economic, cultural, institutional, political. This process leads to more families trying to optimize their management practices in increasingly large territories, involving more people at the technical-productive level in the processing, distribution and consumption of food derived from agroecology. Moreover, if we consider that scaling combines vertical (enabling policies) and horizontal (farmer-farmer networks) processes (Rosset & Altieri 2017), in our study, we focus on vertical processes, which emphasize institutional and political dimensions as enablers of agroecology scalability (Le Coq et al., 2019).

However, from an institutional perspective, specific policies designed in favour of agroecology have rarely been recognized in Latin America (Sabourin et al.,2017; Le Coq et al, 2020). Therefore, for this study, at the level of the policy framework we assessed whether some of the various dimensions of the concept of agroecology were addressed as a policy objective if these objectives existed, how they were implemented; if, on the contrary, there were no specific policies for agroecology; if any other instruments or programs had the potential to contribute directly/indirectly to the scalability of agroecology.

¹ CIAT-Biodiversity Alliance
The main objective of public policy analysis is to clearly identify the actors involved in the process of defining, deciding and implementing a policy, and to shed light on the positions and interests of these actors (Roth, 2006; Fuenmayor, 2017). A policy's visibility tends to create commitment by both officials and civil society role-players who have to implement the policy from the bottom up, as well as politicians who have to support it from the top down. Ownership of a program reflects multi-level advocacy, implying administrative and political commitment (Brynard, 2009). Therefore, in order to understand the possibilities of scaling up agroecology, an in-depth analysis is needed of how the policies implemented directly or indirectly affect the various levels (local, regional or national).

In order to promote resilient and climate-adapted agriculture in Ecuador, the study focused on identifying barriers and opportunities, and defining viable pathways for scaling up agroecology in Ecuador through the elaboration of a Roadmap.

The following questions were addressed: i) What are the policies that are allowing or constraining the scaling up of agroecology in Ecuador? ii) What are the main limiting factors for the scaling up of agroecology in Ecuador? and iii) From the experience of the stakeholders involved, what are the actions needed to scale up agroecology in Ecuador?

Understanding the political and institutional framework

The political and institutional framework consists of strategies, laws and plans that can affect agroecology. Relying on the concept of policy mix (Flanagan et al., 2011) we consider agricultural, environmental, social, and economic policy as the main domains that can affect the scaling up of agroecology. The objectives and actions are detailed in the political and institutional framework documents. However, in order to understand how this framework affects the scaling up of agroecology, policy implementation must be evaluated (see Figure 1).

The policy implementation translates into instruments, which define the actions of the State. The instruments are different types, e.g., regulatory, incentives, (Lambin et al. 2014). On the ground, they are translated into programs that constitute the actions’ programmatic grid. These instruments can be implemented both by public officers and international cooperation partners.

Enabling policies have the potential to create the conditions for the agroecology transition in multiple phases (alternative practices substitution and agroecosystem redesign), at different territory scales and dimensions such as i) agricultural resources, ii) policy, iii) market, iv) alliances, v) knowledge and vi) economic, (Anderson et al., 2019; Mier Y Terán Giménez Cacho et al., 2018; Gliessman, 2016).

The study followed 3 steps in line with the research questions. The first step consisted of public policy documents review to identify policies, budgets and programs that contribute to the scaling up of agroecology.
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The second step consisted of 20 interviews with 8 types of actors representing the various components of the food system (see Table 1). The third step consisted of a workshop validation where the study results were presented, and actions suggested by the actors were identified to promote the scaling up of agroecology.

Table 1 List of participants interviewed. July 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Actor</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences-FLACSO Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Breastfeeding and Nutrition, FUEGOS ¡Que Rico Es! <a href="https://www.quericoes.org/">https://www.quericoes.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment - (2 officials) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture: Seeds Project, Cocoa and Coffee Project, Sustainable and Agroecological Productive Development Directorate, (4 staff members)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>Observatory for Rural Change, Agroecological Collective and Ecological Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>HEIFER, EKORURAL, RIKOLTO SEDAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>Plaza de Vida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Sur-siendo Cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Stakeholders who participated only in the validation workshop

Agroecology in Ecuador’s public policy

Around the 70’s and 80’s, in Loja and Chimborazo, many NGOs promoted agroecology with peasant communities. In 1987, the “Grupo Solidaridad” — First solidarity basket was created, incorporating food sovereignty and agroecology. Later, in 1990, the Ecuadorian Agroecology Coordinator (CEA) was established.

Regional expansion of agroecology took place in the period 1996-2006, promoted by NGOs such as HEIFER, and...
regional agroecological producer networks. At the time, diverse social and political movements pushed for a National Constituent Assembly where the demands of agroecological producers were gathered (Gortaire, 2016) (see Figure 2).

An important milestone in public policy in 2008 was the integration of the demands of peasant and indigenous movements in the articles of the Constitution of Ecuador (Art. 281, 401, 410). The following year, a relevant normative instrument was approved (and still valid today): Law of Food Sovereignty (LORSA) that promotes agrobiodiversity conservation and internal commercialization. This law created the SISAN - an articulated set of social and state actors involved in the participatory construction of public policies, as well as ensuring compliance with the LORSA through the coordination of the Plurinational and Intercultural Conference of Food Sovereignty (COPISA).

In 2011 the Law of Social and Solidarity Economy was approved, and in 2012 the Law of Agrobiodiversity and Promotion of Agroecology (promoted by COPISA). Nevertheless, the latter law received modifications when turned into regulations and its name was changed in 2017 as “Law of Agrobiodiversity, Seeds and Promotion of Sustainable Agriculture”. The interviewees disagreed with some articles, for instance, allowing GMOs to be used for scientific purposes, as well as replacing the agroecological approach with a sustainable agriculture approach. This action weakened even more the reliability of the government regarding the previous agreements made in such a long and complex process.

By 2013, the “National Festival of Food Sovereignty” was created, and agroecology was promoted through academic conferences by universities and movements. In addition, around 130 agroecological circuits were promoted and the Law on Food Consumption, Nutrition and Health was approved, which opened the way to a National Commission of Consumers for Food Sovereignty. Moreover, the National Plan for Good Living 2013-2017 was approved this year.

In spite of all the instruments mentioned above, over the years SISAN and COPISA lost their representativeness and ability to influence public policy in favour of food sovereignty and agroecology. Additionally, the budget allocated for implementation related to agroecology was reduced or cancelled. Meanwhile, the organic approach began to take on greater relevance in terms of regulations, as it showed potential demand from foreign markets, especially for the production of cocoa, bananas and coffee.

In 2017, family and peasant agriculture was boosted in public policy, whereby the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) created the Undersecretariat of Family and Peasant Agriculture. This year a family farming label was created through the Ministry of Agriculture and the Family Farming Program.

In 2020, the School Food Law was approved, allocating a 35% quota in public procurement processes to family and peasant agriculture, the popular and solidarity economy sector, and associative enterprises. Problems remain, however, in terms of compliance with the related rigorous quality and safety controls. Also, the National Agricultural Strategy for Rural Women was approved that same year, seeking to make women’s work in family farming more visible, promoting the conservation of natural resources and sharing their culinary heritage.

Agriculture in Ecuador contributes 9% of the GDP where national priority crops have been oriented towards agroexports of bananas, cocoa, sugar cane and coffee; while agroecological movements have been promoting food sovereignty, agrobiodiversity and agroecological peasant agriculture. For this reason, the concrete and consistent integration of agroecology into public policies is perhaps the main challenge, and it will require finding common ground and coalitions among various stakeholders and within the movements themselves in order to make a greater political impact to promote agroecology.

**Main limiting factors for the scaling up of Agroecology**

The actors interviewed mentioned a great diversity of limiting factors for the scaling up of agroecology. These factors were ordered by major dimensions and considering the number of mentions by the interviewees (see section 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the Ecuador report). The factors related

---

2 For more detail on the limiting factors and the diversity of appreciation according to the types of stakeholders interviewed, see section 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the Ecuador report in Valdivia-Díaz and Le Coq, 2021.
to the following dimensions were prioritized in order of importance: i) market, ii) alliances, iii) political, iv) economic, v) knowledge and vi) productive resources (see Figure 3).

This prioritization consolidates the diverse visions/experiences that stakeholders have with respect to the factors that they consider limiting agroecological scaling up.

The key limiting factors identified by the stakeholders were the following: in the market dimension (limited strategies of market channels differentiation), in the alliance dimension (limited partnerships between farmers with solidarity cooperatives and consumers) and in the economic dimension (limited credit for agroecological production).

![Figure 3 Number of limiting factors mentioned by the 17 interviews in Ecuador.](image)

The market was the dimension with the highest number of limiting factors (14), where 3 of the most important factors were highlighted. The first is the limited promotion of alternative agroecological markets such as short circuits, solidarity baskets and agro-tourism. The second is the lack of differentiation strategies such as the Participatory Guarantee System (SPG), and that could be formally recognized by the government. The third is the lack of channel diversification in line with the productive capacity of the farmers.

All the factors in this dimension are connected to the lack of road and internet infrastructure. On the other hand, short circuits are very limited due to the complexity for producers to access the formal and associative permits required by public norms.

The responsible consumer is crucial according to the interviewees. However, agroecological producers’ associations and consumers have limited connections with each other. In addition, people do not have a social, environmental and cultural understanding of why agroecology is important for the consumer. Although in the pandemic, the importance of healthy eating became evident.

The Alliances was the second dimension that had a large number of factors mentioned, with (7) limiting factors, of which 2 factors are the most important. First, there is a need to promote more intermediaries/solidarity cooperatives so that they can better assist agroecological producers to access different marketing channels. Second, it is necessary to reinforce more responsible consumer campaigns throughout the country, connecting them actively with agroecological producers.

The political dimension was the third important aspect that had a large number of factors mentioned, with (7) limiting factors. Despite all the political instruments created, agroecology has not been considered crucial to public policies in terms of its contribution to popular economy (family agriculture) and public health. The interviewees suggested that agroecology should be addressed as public policy by ministries such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education. In this dimension, the lack of intersectionality, lack of budget, and lack of political commitment were also mentioned.

Within the economic dimension, 6 limiting factors were mentioned. The lack of financial loans for agroecological production through funding programs for family and community agriculture was considered crucial. As important as access to loans was considered specific financial training for farmers, to improve their annual financial planning.

Within the knowledge dimension, 6 limiting factors were mentioned, of which 3 are the most important. The first is the loss of agroecological knowledge among young people, especially women. The second is the lack of co-learning processes (farmers’ schools) involving rural and urban youth. The third is the insufficient incorporation of agroecology into the academic curricula and technical centres.

Within the productive resources dimension, 6 factors were mentioned, of which 3 are the most important. The first is the limited access to native seeds. The second is the lack of productive inputs such as machinery due to the excessive cost of imports. The third is the reduction of arable land due to the increase in prices as a result of urbanization.

ROADMAP FOR ECUADOR

After recognizing the wide diversity of barriers to the scaling up of agroecology, we evaluate to what extent the limiting factors were addressed by the current public policy instruments in implementation. Thus, a prioritization of the limiting factors was made according to the current degree to which they are addressed by public policies and programs.

Based on this prioritization, a roadmap proposal was derived that takes up the actions proposed by the actors interviewed and discussed during a virtual workshop held in November 2021. After the workshop, actions proposed by stakeholders were reorganized according to time scale (short, medium and long term), considering in the short term the relevant actions for the scaling up of agroecology.

---

1 For more detail on the rating of the programs contribution to address limiting factors, see section 3.2.4 of the Ecuador report in Valdivia Diaz and Le Coq, 2021.

4 For more details on the actions proposed by the stakeholders interviewed, see section 3.3.2 of the Ecuador report in Valdivia Diaz and Le Coq, 2021.
that can benefit from a policy framework or ongoing programs, in the medium term, actions that may take longer to implement due to the complexity of the factors identified as barriers and for which instruments already exist but need to be strengthened, and in the long term, actions that address factors that are more complex to resolve and for which policy instruments do not yet exist to facilitate them.

Hereafter we propose pathways for the scaling up of agroecology in Ecuador presented as a roadmap including 7 strategic lines encompassing 46 strategic actions, distributed among 3 strategic temporal axes.

Suggested strategic guidelines for the scaling up of agroecology in Ecuador


Stakeholders have indicated that in the short-term, it is important to promote access to diverse marketing channels. This can be achieved by promoting policies that encourage the development of solidarity cooperatives, consider artisanal processes in their biosafety standards, and promote greater consumer awareness of agroecology.

1.1 Encourage policies towards the promotion of solidarity cooperatives that allow access to various marketing channels.

i. Implement the Organic Law of the Popular and Solidarity Economy - Art. 24. by encouraging the creation of production cooperatives that promote agroecology through the National Institute of Popular and Solidarity Economy (IEPS)

ii. Encourage mentoring of producers to become entrepreneurs and/or cooperatives through learning modules (solidarity business plans and commercial articulation) promoted by Sustainable and Agroecological Productive Development Directorate of MAG and IEPS.

iii. Prepare an annual public procurement plan in SERCOP where cooperatives from the Popular Solidarity Economy (EPS) are included as potential food suppliers through the National Institute of Popular and Solidarity Economy (IEPS) and the Ministry of Economic and Social Inclusion (MIES).

iv. Enforce the "Organic Law of School Feeding", where family agriculture and EPS cooperatives are included as potential food suppliers in the WFP (World Food Programme), linking it to the strategy to fight chronic child malnutrition.

v. Promote long-term physical spaces for the development of bio-fairs, where they can have storage facilities and food loading and unloading areas. This can be developed at the municipal level under the Organic Law of Food Sovereignty (LORSA).

vi. Promote the commercialisation of agroecological products in different channels: i) family baskets, ii) HORECAS sector and iii) supermarkets. This can be done in collaboration with SOMOS EPS of IEPS, ministries and local governments.

vii. Recognize the Participatory Guarantee Systems (SPG) as a process of self-control and guarantee of an agroecological product for local and national commercialization, jointly promoted by the Undersecretary of Family and Peasant Agriculture, the Sustainable and Agroecological Productive Development Directorate of MAG and AGROCALIDAD.

viii. Promote local solidarity intermediaries, especially rural women with capacities in traceability systems through the MAG, AGROCALIDAD and the IEPS.

ix. Propose a differentiated biosafety regulation for agroecological artisanal products, recognising their contributions to environmental sustainability and health through AGROCALIDAD.

1.2 Promote partnerships between various actors in the agroecological food system chain.

i. Agroecological producers and consumers agree on prices through solidarity cooperatives such as Sur-siendo, where the geographical scale (urban/rural) and the producer's production capacity are taken into account.

ii. Create franchises of agroecological fairs with a social focus through solidarity cooperatives, e.g. Sur-siendo, as they have the organisational capacity to respond to regulations on the use of public space.

iii. Promote the geo-referencing of agro-ecological points of sale. This can be linked to the current guidelines of the "Que Rico Es" Campaign - https://guia.quericoes.org/ through consumer organizations and municipalities.

iv. Articulate artisanal food processors and agroecological producers, through the support of solidarity cooperatives and Decentralised Autonomous Governments.

v. Promote food banks such as EMPROVIT (Empresa Nacional de Productos Vitales) generating a chain of food supply and distribution at the local and regional level through the Ministry of Health (MSP).

vi. Differentiate a public policy for the transport of food with respect to other cargo, so as to obtain a lower rate of payment that stimulates marketing from rural to urban
areas through the Ministry of Transport and Public Works (MTOP).

1.3 Promote massive consumer awareness campaigns on agroecology throughout the country

i. Encourage the consumption of healthy agroecological food, focusing the message on flavours, experience and low cost through TV, chef influencers and Slow Food youth.

ii. Visibilise and educate consumers about certifications and their characteristics. E.g., "Sello de la Agricultura Familiar y Campesina", "SPG", "Orgánico".

iii. Promote agroecological consumer associations to raise awareness and influence public policy on agroecology in relation to industrial products.

iv. Promote rural digital education so that rural youth/adults can communicate agroecology from their territories through videos, stories and photos. This can be done in collaboration with cooperatives, NGOs and young producers.

v. Build nutritional guides and integrate them into the education of children and youth, through the Ministry of Education (TiNi Project).

vi. Promote dialogues between different generations (grandparents, grandchildren, children) for the recovery of important recipes and dishes through the Ministry of Education (TiNi Project).

2. Medium Term: Ensure a political and economic environment conducive to the development of agroecology at different territorial scales.

In the medium term, this means that there are policy instruments that can be strengthened. In Ecuador, there were instruments that in recent years have been affected by the lack of continuity, budget and administrative changes. An integrated rural development policy should sustain agroecological production in the long term because of its economic importance (the main livelihood of many poor people), as well as its environmental and public health benefits.

2.1 Ensure the continuity, budget and institutionalization of policy instruments in favor of agroecology.

i. Promote agroecology in public policies by highlighting the provision of benefits (e.g., social, health and environmental); through payments for ecosystem benefits of agroecology through the Ministry of Environment (MAATE), Ministry of Agriculture (MAG) and Ministry of Health (MinSalud).

ii. Propose a statistical study on the current supply and demand of agroecological food and its economic potential for the national and international market in order to establish policy instruments. The entity in charge would be INEC

iii. Strengthen and implement the Food and Nutritional Sovereignty System (SISAN) in coordination with ministries and local governments.

iv. Strengthen the Plurinational and Intercultural Conference on Food Sovereignty (COPISA) at the national level through a budget that allows its management to be operational.

v. Guarantee to fulfil the Organic Law of Food Sovereignty (LORSA) and the Constitution of Ecuador through a new institutional framework constructed in a participatory manner - Organic Code of Food Sovereignty - to implement public policies in favour of agroecology.

vi. Advocate for the enactment of the Draft Law for the Sustainable Development of Agricultural Development and the Organic Code of Food Sovereignty, which includes agroecological family farming and agrobiodiversity as national policy.

vii. Promote the development of a National Plan for Agroecology, taking into account the needs and proposals of diverse actors, such as (Study for a baseline for the implementation of the UN Decade of Family Farming in Ecuador) through Subsecretariat of Family and Peasant Agriculture, and Sustainable and Agroecological Productive Development Directorate of Minister of Agriculture (MAG).

viii. Increase the public budget in favour of family and agroecological agriculture for the implementation of actions at the local government level.

ix. Declare specific national territories for agroecology and agrobiodiversity through territorial development plans, local and regional ordinances and the Ministries of Agriculture (MAG) and Environment (MAATE).

x. Promote the participatory construction of public policies for agroecology, involving actors related to the food system, e.g., cooperatives, entrepreneurs, consumers, peasant organisations, organic producers, among others. Searching for common ground and coalitions in favour of the development of agroecology.

2.2 Facilitate economic funding for the development of the various phases of agroecology scalability.

i. Promote the credit offered by BANECUADOR Super Mujer Rural that provides a credit for orchards and small-scale agricultural production covering an amount of up to 3 thousand dollars. This as part of the National Agricultural Strategy for Rural Women, 2020 of MAG.
ii. Promote the credit offered by BANECUADOR for i) Rural Youth (US$20,000), ii) Good Agricultural Practices (US$150,000), iii) Cocoa & Coffee (US$150,000) and iv) Beekeeping (US$20,000) because of their potential to address the limited access to credit.

iii. Establish differentiated credit lines for sustainable production models at different scales. Especially for small-scale agroecological production, with a low annual % rate.

iv. Provide training to producers on how to manage their finances so that they have a better understanding of their selling prices and investments.

v. Reduce tariffs and income taxes on machinery for agricultural production to make them more affordable.


Despite the existence of co-learning spaces promoted by NGOs and agro-ecological movements some years ago, there are not enough political instruments that are addressing access to co-learning platforms for agro-ecology at rural and urban level, especially for the youngest.

3.1 Promote platforms for intercultural co-learning and innovation on rural and urban productive systems.

i. Develop an intercultural education policy at all levels (primary, secondary, higher) where the diversity of agro-ecological systems in the country's regions is made visible through the Ministry of Education (MINEDU).

ii. Include in the curriculum of agricultural and livestock technical schools training in agroecological practices and their connection with markets.

iii. Renew the agrarian extension systems through the creation of an Agrarian Agency at the level of parishes and municipalities, where agroecological promoters can provide on-the-ground support to solve agricultural problems. The entities in charge MAG, INIAP and NGOs.

iv. Articulate the 130 agro-ecological circuits, recognising and replicating the NGOs' work and networks at local and regional level for learning processes through pilot projects proposed by the municipalities and cantons.

v. Strengthen the co-production of knowledge through an agreement between the intercultural policy of the Ministry of Education (TiNi Project), the Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation and the - Traditional Knowledge area - of the Undersecretariat of Family Agriculture of MAG and INIAP.

vi. Articulate research and innovation agendas for agroecology through academic exchanges between young students from universities, technical colleges and research centers, with the creation of an "Agroecology Observatory".

3.2 Guarantee access to seeds, soil and water for agroecological production.

i. Generate local capacities to learn how to become seed growers and nurserymen, recover local knowledge and promote seed exchange.

ii. Regulating chemical inputs entering the country through the approval of the Organic Code for Food Sovereignty.

iii. Promote more input processing centers such as in Loja and Pichincha, including vermiculture, composting, bio-fertilizers among other soil conservation strategies. Entities in charge: private companies, cooperatives and local governments.

iv. Control land sale prices by generating ordinances that prevent speculation, especially in crop-land areas of the territory.

v. Improve infrastructure for water catchment and source conservation. Entity in charge SENAGUA of MAATE.

vi. Generate differentiated public policy for the use of water, where costs for agroecological agriculture should be lower.
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