



FOOD AND NUTRITION RESILIENCE

Burkina Faso report (Deliverable n°1)



Work package :	N° 2 : Food and nutrition resilience study program.
Main beneficiary :	
Authors :	Thomas SANKARA University (UTS) and Nazi-Boni University
Working group members :	Pr Hassan Bismarck NACRO , Pr W. Dominique KABRE, , Pr Lassina OUATTARA, Dr Dié Léon KASSABO, Dr Yda Alexis NAGALO, Dr Mamadou TRAORE, Dr Jérôme T. YAMEOGO, Dr Kalifa COULIBALY, Dr Sanwé Médard KIENOU, Dr Boundia Alexandre THIOMBIANO, Dr Théophile 2^e J. KABRE, Dr. GO Augustin.
Expiry date :	
Date of presentation :	
Type of deliverable :	Food and nutritional resilience. Burkina Faso Report
Diffusion level :	<i>Confidential or Public</i>

NEEMA has received funding from the European Union under grant agreement no. 101128930. The views and opinions expressed in this communication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

INDEX

INDEX	2
DEFINITION OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	3
I. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY	4
1.1. Issues	4
1.2 Conceptual framework	4
1.3 Mission objectives	5
1.3.1. Main objectives	5
1.3.2. Specific objectives	5
1.4. Research questions	5
1.4.1. Main research question	5
1.4.2. Subsidiary issues	6
1.5. Research hypotheses	6
1.5.1. Main hypothesis	6
1.5.2. Secondary assumptions	6
1.6. Methodological approach to the study	6
1.6.1. Documentary research	6
1.6.2. Individual interviews	7
II. LEGAL, INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORK	7
2.1. Legal framework	7
2.1.1. At international level	7
2.1.2. At regional level	8
2.1.3. Sub-regional level	8
2.1.4. At national level	8
2.2 Institutional framework	10
2.2.1. International and sub-regional institutional framework	10
2.2.1.1 World Food Program (WFP)	10
2.2.1.2. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	10
2.2.1.3. Food Safety Committee (CSA)	10
2.2.1.4. Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS)	11
2.2.2. National institutional framework	11
2.2.2.1 National Food Safety Council	11
2.2.2.2. General Directorate for Studies and Sectoral Statistics (DGESS)	11
2.2.2.3. National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (CONASUR)	12
2.2.2.4. Société Nationale de Gestion des Stocks de Sécurité Alimentaire (SONAGESS)	12
2.3 Policy framework	13
2.3.1. National Agro-sylvo-pastoral Strategic Investment Plan	13
2.3.2. National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy (PNMS) 2020-2029	15
III. DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS (SWOT ANALYSIS)	16
3.1 Political and security context	16
3.2 Economic background	16
3.3 Environmental context	17
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	26

DEFINITION OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

FAO	:	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FIDA	:	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ASPHF	:	Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral, Fisheries and Wildlife
CASEM	:	Ministerial Sector Board of Directors
ECOWAS	:	Economic Community of West African States
CILSS	:	Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
CNCN	:	Conseil National de Concertation en Nutrition
CNRST	:	National Center for Scientific and Technological Research
CNSA	:	National Food Safety Council
CONASUR)	:	National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation
CSA	:	Food Safety Committee
DGESS	:	General Directorate for Studies and Sector Statistics
FASA	:	Food Security Support Fund (
FASA	:	Food Security Support Fund
SWOT	:	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
IPCC	:	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
HLPE	:	High-Level Expert Group on Food Security and Nutrition
ODD	:	Sustainable Development Goals
OFNACER	:	Office National des Céréales
OHADA	:	Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa
WHO	:	World Health Organization
WAHO	:	West African Health Organization
PAM	:	World Food Programme
PASP	:	Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Products
PCAE	:	Common Environmental Improvement Policy
CAADP	:	Detailed Program for the Development of African Agriculture
NTFPS	:	Non-timber forest products
PNIASP	:	National Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Strategic Investment Plan
PNMN	:	National Multisectoral Nutrition Plan
PNRUSSA	:	National response plan for food safety emergencies
PSMN)	:	Multisectoral Nutrition Strategic Plan
SAN	:	Food and Nutrition Security
SIM	:	Market Information System for agricultural products
SISA	:	Food Safety Information System
SNS	:	National Food Security Stock
NAHS	:	National Food Security Strategy
SONAGESS	:	Société Nationale de Gestion des Stocks de Sécurité Alimentaire (National Food Security Stock Management Company)
UA	:	African Union
UNHAS	:	United Nations Humanitarian Air Service
UNICEF	:	United Nations Children's Fund

I. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. Issues

Food and nutritional insecurity is a recurring problem throughout the world in general, and particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. In recent years, the situation has worsened, as food insecurity is no longer simply a consequence of insufficient national production, but also depends on the dysfunctions and failures of national, regional and international markets (Soulé, 2011). According to estimates on the state of food security and nutrition in the world, between 702 and 828 million people faced hunger in 2021. In Africa, at the same date, 278 million people were suffering from hunger. Africa also has the highest prevalence of undernourishment (FAO, IFAD, WHO, 2022). According to 2023 data, food insecurity has increased in Africa. It is much more prevalent in rural than in urban areas in almost all regions (FAO, WHO, WFP, UNICEF, 2023). It is due to multiple factors. As early as 1996, the Rome Declaration on World Food Security recognized that poverty is the main cause of food insecurity¹. Other causes are linked to the weakness of food systems, conflicts, climate change and high income inequalities².

Burkina Faso is not spared by this phenomenon, for in addition to the climatic crises it experiences every year, the country is experiencing other health, political and security crises. In 2021, nearly half of all Burkinabè were affected by insecurity and its consequences (Ouedraogo, 2023). Food insecurity affects more than one household in three (35.4%). It is more prevalent in rural areas (37%) than in urban areas (31%). Despite Burkina Faso's ratification of international, regional and sub-regional texts and the adoption of laws at national level, the problem of food and nutritional security persists.

To grasp this all-encompassing context, the study poses the problem of the challenges of food and nutritional resilience in West Africa, by country and region of the participating universities. In other words, how can we improve food and nutrition security in West Africa, particularly in the 4 countries concerned?

1.2 Conceptual framework

The concept of resilience has become a hot topic in food security and nutrition policies. From storms to droughts and extreme climatic events, crises continue to hit poor populations. There are several approaches to resilience, depending on the author and the time. The notion of resilience, used in several disciplines - physics, psychology, ecology - and in development, is now used in the field of food security (Mutéba and Tshilumba, 2020).

Thus, according to the fourth report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2007), resilience is seen as "the capacity of a social or ecological system to absorb disturbances while retaining its basic structure and operating mechanisms, the ability to organize and adapt to change". This IPCC approach to resilience evolved in the fifth report on climate change in 2014, to incorporate the system's learning and transformation faculties that enable it to anticipate disturbances and transform them into opportunities (Ouedraogo, 2023). Resilience is seen as a unified response to shocks resulting from catastrophic events and crises, as well as to stressors associated with ongoing exposure to risks that threaten well-being. Resilience is also of particular interest as a generalized capacity to respond to a range of threats that have become increasingly unpredictable (FSIN, 2014). These definitions also have three elements in common, namely the ability to recover from a shock, the ability to adapt to a changing environment, and the ability to transform an enabling institutional environment. Food resilience cannot be understood without taking into account all the related concepts. These include the concepts of "shock", "risk" and "vulnerability". Thus, the concepts of food and nutritional resilience are increasingly evoked in situations where recurrent food crises present themselves as shocks within social groups (Mutéba and Tshilumba, 2020). The conceptual framework of food and nutritional resilience is based on that of food security.

Thus, food security as a political priority has led to it becoming a major issue for international development policies (Alpha et de Raymond, 2021). The most commonly accepted definition of the concept of "food security" today is that of the 1996 World Food Summit: "Food security exists when all people, at all times, have economic, social and physical access to sufficient, safe

¹ "Poverty is a major cause of food insecurity" (Rome Declaration on World Food Security, November 13-17, 1996).

² www.lafaimexpliquee.org

and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." (Boucobza, 2012). The nutritional dimension is an integral part of the concept of food security (CSA, 2017). This definition highlights four main dimensions of food security. These are the availability of food in sufficient quantities and on a consistent basis; access for all people to the resources needed to obtain food that ensures a nutritious diet; satisfactory use of nutritionally sound food; and stability in the availability, accessibility and quality of food (Terlizzi, Bengoumi et al., 2016). Against this backdrop, the Rome Declaration on World Food Security reaffirmed the right of every human being to adequate food and the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger.

Most national agricultural policies are defined in terms of food security, which is their ultimate objective (Dury, 2016). In Burkina Faso, the security crisis has had a major impact on the agricultural sector, making certain production areas inaccessible, abandoning farms and destroying the means and supports of production. Today, insecurity is a major threat that risks undermining development efforts in the sector, if vigorous responses and resilience strategies are not proposed. Resilience is understood as the dynamic capacity to achieve food and nutrition security objectives, despite disruptions and shocks (Brial, Ferrari, et al., 2022). The notion of resilience implies thinking about the global threats to our food supply and taking a systemic approach to the way our society is organized to feed the population. This approach leads us to consider both the failings of the current food system (malnutrition, socio-economic inequalities, environmental impacts) and its vulnerabilities (Cuillier, Durand and Guiraud, 2022). It is also defined as the ability of communities and systems to cope with shocks, but also to prepare for them, or even to avoid and adapt to them over the long term; it possesses a strong ambition, even more so than the fight against poverty and against vulnerability (Lallau, Laissus-Benoist et al., 2018). From the above, food resilience can be considered as the ability of a territory to ensure the satisfaction of its inhabitants' food needs in the face of various hazards of a climatic, natural, industrial or sanitary nature, etc., likely to disrupt the functioning of its food system (Rouxelin, Richard, Chabanel, 2022).

1.3 Mission objectives

1.3.1. Main objectives

This study aims to analyze the challenges of food and nutrition resilience in West Africa, by country and region of the participating universities.

WP2 is at the heart of the project, and its aim is to develop a new FNR program tailored to the needs of food systems in the Sahel and West Africa, and more specifically in Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger and Senegal, taking into account the impact of the Green Pact for Europe and the "Farm to Table" strategy.

Agriculture occupies a unique position at the heart of the European Union's society, environment and economy.

In this context, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) combines social, economic and environmental approaches to create a sustainable agricultural system in the EU.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

Specifically, the study will :

1. analyze the general context of the legal and institutional framework for food and nutritional resilience;
2. take stock of food and nutrition resilience governance structures;
3. identify strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities for food and nutrition resilience;
4. analyze the country's overall food and nutrition resilience;
5. propose practical recommendations to ensure food and nutritional resilience.

1.4. Research questions

1.4.1. Main research question

What are the role and services that municipalities and community organizations (associations, cooperatives, etc.) should provide to smallholders, to facilitate the sustainable development of agricultural production systems with a view to sustainable food resilience (resistance to climate change and food security)?

1.4.2. Subsidiary questions

1. What sustainable agricultural development and management services do smallholders need from local authorities and community organizations?
2. What synergy mechanisms are needed between the various players (communes, organizations, associations, cooperatives, decentralized state services, regional authorities, etc.) to move towards sustainable food resilience?
3. What are the legal, institutional, managerial and financial capacities of communes and community organizations to sustain agricultural investments and facilitate agricultural production? What are the strategies for strengthening these capacities?
4. What is the link between food resilience and the security situation? What are the security capacities of communes and other stakeholders to guarantee stable agricultural production?
5. How can we increase the socio-economic role of women in agricultural production?
6. How can communes and community organizations facilitate access to land for small-scale farmers, especially women?

1.5. Research hypotheses

1.5.1. Main hypothesis

The main hypothesis is that communes and community organizations (associations, cooperatives, etc.) should provide material, technical and financial support to smallholders, to facilitate the sustainable development of agricultural production systems with a view to sustainable food resilience.

1.5.2. Secondary assumptions

1. Individual smallholders lack the resources and know-how to initiate and sustain agricultural development projects. To do so, they need to join forces and benefit from material, personal, financial and technical support from the local public administration.
2. The local authorities act as a forum where all the players come together. They are responsible for coordination, long-term planning, supervision and financial provision of the whole, and must integrate and support all players so that they can effectively contribute according to their roles and potential (principle of subsidiarity). The various community organizations are responsible for day-to-day management.
3.
 - a) The legal powers of communes have not yet been sufficiently clarified to enable them to assume the role of coordination, planning, supervision and financial foresight in agricultural development and management.
 - b) The role of community organizations in managing agricultural projects is not sufficiently defined.
 - c) At present, neither communes nor community organizations have the human and financial capacity to ensure the sustainable maintenance of agricultural development projects.
 - d) Communes and communal bodies can only play a supportive role if they have the necessary human and financial resources.
4. Without security, agricultural development is impossible. It is the responsibility not only of the state, but also of the local community, to guarantee security for producers.
5. At present, women do not play a sufficient role, as they do not have the necessary opportunities to own land or means of production. However, there are a few positive examples of how women can advance agriculture, particularly in certain sectors such as the production and marketing of vegetables for local markets.
6. Structural obstacles hinder small farmers' access to production land. Municipalities are still not doing enough to facilitate access for small farmers.

1.6. Methodological approach to the study

1.6.1. Documentary research

Documentary research was the first activity undertaken as part of this study. It consisted in collecting agricultural, food and nutrition policy documents, laws, decrees, national and sectoral strategies, preparatory documents and reports on agricultural development projects and programs, from various ministries and other government and civil society bodies. These documents were analyzed using a specially developed analysis guide.

This documentary research enabled the team to carry out an in-depth analysis of the general situation of food and nutritional resilience in the country, as well as the legal and institutional framework for food and nutritional resilience. It also enabled us to identify the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities of policies and institutions involved in food and nutrition resilience. Documentary research continued throughout the process.

1.6.2. Individual interviews

Individual interviews covering the general situation of food and nutrition resilience in the country, the legal, policy and institutional framework for food and nutrition resilience, as well as the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities of these different policies and institutions, were carried out with players from the ministry in charge of agriculture, health, and researchers in the agricultural, food and nutrition fields. Interviews were also conducted with farmers' organizations, civil society players and international bodies.

II. LEGAL, INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORK

The issue of food and nutritional resilience in Burkina Faso is addressed by a complex legal arsenal, incorporating a range of international and regional legal instruments, which inspire and complement a national legal system tailored to specific needs. This substantial system is implemented by an institutional framework that sets out the bodies and mechanisms needed to guarantee food and nutritional resilience at operational level.

2.1. Legal framework

Food and nutritional resilience in Burkina Faso is supported by an international, continental, regional and national legal arsenal.

2.1.1. At international level

At international level, Burkina Faso is bound by several legally binding international legal instruments of immediate relevance to food and nutritional resilience. These include:

- the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, adopted in 1992 and its protocols, the Kyoto Protocol, 1997 and the Paris Climate Agreement, 2015 ;
- The Convention on Biological Diversity, adopted in 1992, and its additional protocols, in particular the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, adopted in 2000, and the Nagoya Kuala Lumpur Additional Protocol on Liability and Redress, 2010;
- the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, ratified by Decree No. 95-569 RU of December 29, 1995;
- the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) of December 16, 1966;
- Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, ratified by Decree No. 2004-300 of July 20, 2004;
- the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, ratified by zatu AN VII-02 of August 23, 1989.

The facilitation and popularization of these legally-binding international agreements are reinforced by non-mandatory instruments that are particularly relevant for guiding and defining the modalities of food and nutritional action by governments. These include

- the United Nations 2030 Agenda, a reference framework for sustainable human development. With seventeen (17) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), they contribute to the nutritional security of populations by 2030. The National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy is part of the implementation of MDG 2: "eradicate hunger, ensure food security, improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture" ;
- the Global Nutrition Targets 2025 defined by the World Health Assembly, which provide a framework for prioritizing interventions to achieve the desired results by 2025. These targets, of which there are six (06), focus on increasing the rate of exclusive breastfeeding, preventing overweight, anemia in women of childbearing age, and undernutrition (stunting, low birth weight and acute malnutrition in children under 5). The PNMN integrates all these targets;

- the Global Strategy for Infant and Young Child Feeding, 2002, which aims "to improve the nutritional status, growth and development, health and survival of infants and young children through optimal feeding", as pursued in the PNMN.

2.1.2. At regional level

At the African level, nutritional and food resilience is addressed by a vision set out in the AU's Agenda 2063, "The Africa We Want", (2nd Edition) according to which: "(...) the Heads of State and Government commit to transform agriculture at the continental level and make it an important lever contributing to national and farmer prosperity, and to Africa's collective food security". In this regard, the Malabo Declaration adopted in 2014 and translated into the new cycle of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP+10), sets targets at the level of African states to: (i) eradicate hunger by 2025, (ii) halve poverty by 2025 through inclusive growth and transformation of agriculture, and (iii) strengthen financing for investment in agriculture.

This vision is reinforced by a set of binding legal instruments designed to protect nature and guarantee agro-sylvo-pastoral activities consistent with the objectives of conservation and rational use of natural resources. Burkina Faso has ratified the following conventions:

- African Convention on Nature and Natural Resources ;
- Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Importation of Hazardous Wastes;
- the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights of June 27, 1981.
- The Uniform Act relating to the law on cooperative societies, adopted on December 15, 2010 in Lomé, which provides a legal framework for farmers' organizations wishing to adopt a collective approach to the management of agro-sylvo-pastoral activities.

2.1.3. Sub-regional level

At the regional level, the ECOWAS agricultural policy (ECOWAP+10) aims to: (i) ensure food security and sovereignty, (ii) better integrate the nutritional dimension, (iii) affirm and develop the complementarity/specialization of agricultures in the regional space, (iv) promote sustainable intensification models, reduce climate impacts and adapt to climate change, (v) increase the resilience of family farms, (vi) better prioritize at regional level, and (vii) govern the intersectoral. The agricultural policy guidelines are complemented by ECOWAS's comprehensive strategic framework for the sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture, 2019 (ECOWAP). Mention should also be made of the West African Health Organization's (WAHO) Strategic Plan 2016 - 2020, in its strategic axis 1, program 2, on the fight against diseases, which emphasizes the fight against nutritional imbalances in one of its components.

In addition to these agricultural policy documents, there is the Dakar Declaration on the Sahel Irrigation Initiative, which aims to strengthen the scope and scale of infrastructure for irrigated agriculture. These agricultural policy instruments involve conventional arrangements for the management of water resources in river basins such as the Niger and Volta. From a perspective of integrated water resource management, Burkina Faso defines its agricultural, nutritional and food policy taking into account the imperatives of concerted management and priority for the socio-economic development of the states sharing these resources.

In all cases, these initiatives should be harmonized with the ECOWAS environmental policy, taking into account the requirements of environmental assessment and the conservation of natural resources in the community. In the same vein, it is worth noting the UEMOA's Common Environmental Improvement Policy (PCE) (2008), which aims to reverse the major trends in the degradation and reduction of natural resources, the deterioration of living environments and conditions, and the maintenance of biodiversity.

2.1.4. At national level

On a national level, we should first mention the June 1991 constitution, in particular article 14, which states that "natural wealth and resources belong to the people. They are used to improve their living conditions". In addition to the constitution, there are various other legal texts at national level that contribute to addressing the issue of resilience in nutrition and food in Burkina Faso. Among these laws are the following:

- Law n°048-2017/AN of November 16, 2017 on the animal health and veterinary public health code;
- Law no. 02-2001/AN of February 08, 2001, providing a framework for water management in Burkina Faso;
- law n°034-2002/AN of November 14, 2002 on the orientation law relating to pastoralism (LORP) in Burkina Faso;

- Law n° 034-2009/AN of June 16, 2009 on rural land tenure in Burkina Faso;
- Law n°003-2011/AN of April 5, 2011 on the forestry code in Burkina Faso;
- Law n°034-2012/AN of July 02, 2012 on agrarian and land reorganization (RAF) in Burkina Faso;
- Law No. 050-2012/AN of October 30, 2012 regulating interprofessional organizations in the agricultural, forestry, pastoral, fisheries and wildlife sectors;
- law n°006-2013/AN of April 2, 2013 on the environmental code in Burkina Faso;
- Law n°008-2014/AN of April 08, 2014 on the orientation of sustainable development in Burkina Faso;
- Law n°070-2015/CNT of October 22, 2015 on the agro-sylvo-pastoral, fisheries and wildlife orientation in Burkina Faso;
- law no. 017-2018/AN of May 17, 2018 on the Burkina Faso agro-sylvo-pastoral, fisheries and wildlife investment code.
- Law N°028-2008/AN of May 13, 2008 on the Labor Code, articles 1, 145 to 148, which guarantees maternity leave and the right to rest for breastfeeding when returning to work;
- Law N°049-2005/AN of December 21, 2005 on reproductive health, article 7 of which guarantees child health, in particular neonatal care/child monitoring, vaccination, growth monitoring and child nutrition;
- Law N°23/94/ADP of May 19, 1994 on the public health code, in articles 3, 9, 11 to 15, 19 to 22, 23 to 25, 33 to 43, which emphasizes the protection and promotion of good dietary and nutritional conditions;
- Law No. 25/99/AN of November 16, 1999 governing SONAGESS, and providing general regulations for publicly-owned companies, and the revised OHADA Uniform Act of January 30, 2014 on the Law of Commercial Companies and Economic Interest Groups;
- law no. 012-2014/an on the prevention and management of risks, humanitarian crises and disasters;
- Law 012/ 2014 on the prevention and management of risks, humanitarian crises and disasters;
- Law N° 23/94/AN on the Public Health Code, adopted on May 19, 1994. These regulations are reinforced by Law N° 022-2005/AN, establishing the Public Hygiene Code in Burkina Faso.
- The General Code of Local Authorities in Burkina Faso (LOI n°055-2004/AN du 21 décembre 2004 portant code général des collectivités territoriales au Burkina Faso)
- Law n°009-2018/AN of May 03, 2018, on expropriation for public utility and compensation of persons affected by public utility and general interest developments and projects in Burkina Faso.

In addition to these laws, interministerial decrees and orders in favor of nutrition have been signed. These include

- Decree No. 94-233/PRES/MICM of June 13, 1994 creating the Société Nationale de Gestion du Stock de Sécurité Alimentaire (SONAGESS);
- Decree N°2009-601/PRES/PM/MASSN/MEF/MATD on the creation, composition, powers and operation of the National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (CONASUR);
- Decree N°2014-178/PRES/PM/MASSN/MATS/MEF on the powers, organization and operation of the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (SP/CONASUR);
- Decree N°2014-178/PRES/PM/MASSN/MATS/MEF on the powers, organization and operation of the Permanent Secretariat of the National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (SP/CONASUR);
- Article 18 of Decree N°2018-0093/PRES/PM/MS of February 15, 2018 on the organization of the Ministry of Health, creating a technical secretariat in charge of improving the food and nutrition of mothers and children;
- Decree No. 2008-003/PRES/PM/MS/MAHRH/MASSN/MEF of January 10, 2008 on the creation, powers, composition, organization and operation of the National Nutrition Consultation Council (CNCN);
- Decree No. 2002-464/PRES/PM/MS of October 28, 2002 creating the Nutrition Department;
- Decree No. 99-377/PRES/PM/MS of October 28, 1999 establishing the National Public Health Laboratory and its amendment;
- Decree No. 93-279/PRES/SASF/MICM of July 28, 1993 on the marketing and related practices of breast milk substitute products (SLM);
- Decree No. 61-348 of August 16, 1961 on the protection of plants and animals;

- Decree No. 94-14 of January 6, 1994, which institutes a national certificate of conformity, the purpose of which is to certify that products intended for consumption comply with the quality, weight, quantity and packaging requirements accepted in Burkina Faso. This decree has been the subject of three implementing orders: i) interministerial order 95-27 MICM.MEFP of April 5, 1995 lays down the procedures for inspecting products intended for consumption in Burkina Faso, as well as the procedure, place and sanction of inspection; ii) Joint Order No. 2003-007/MS/MFB/MAHRH/MCPEA, which lays down the procedures for monitoring the sanitary quality of food and related products; iii) Joint Order No. 08-008/MS/MCPEA/MEF, which determines the list of products subject to the national certificate of conformity and the sanitary quality certificate;
- interministerial order N°2013-1033/MS/MASA/MICA/MEF of September 27, 2013 regulating the import, marketing and use of salt in Burkina Faso;
- interministerial order N°2012-0232/MICA /MS /MEF/MAH of October 30, 2012 on the mandatory fortification of refined vegetable oils with vitamin A and soft wheat flour with iron and folic acid;
- Joint Order N°2011-0265/MICA /MS /MEF of December 09, 2011 establishing the characteristics of oils intended for consumption in Burkina Faso;
- Joint Order N°2003-007/MS/MEFP/MAHRH/MCPEA of January 03, 2003 setting out the procedures for monitoring the sanitary quality of food products and similar products.

2.2 Institutional framework

2.2.1. International and sub-regional institutional framework

A number of international and sub-regional institutions have local offices in Burkina Faso, working with the government to help vulnerable populations achieve food and nutrition security.

2.2.1.1 World Food Program (WFP)

The World Food Program is the world's largest humanitarian organization, responding to emergencies and providing food assistance to vulnerable populations affected by conflict, environmental disaster or the negative effects of climate change. In Burkina Faso, the WFP has been working with the government for many years. It has stepped up its action in Burkina Faso since the start of the security crisis through various interventions that complement and reinforce government action. In particular, the WFP has launched the operations of the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service (UNHAS), to facilitate the access of humanitarian actors to places where access is difficult. In March 2023, for example, a total of one hundred and thirty-three thousand (133,000) vulnerable people were supplied in four regions of the country (Centre-North, East, North and Sahel).

2.2.1.2. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is the specialized agency of the United Nations in charge of eliminating hunger worldwide. In Burkina Faso, the FAO works with populations through food and nutritional assistance, cash transfers, training in income-generating activities and agricultural methods, emergency living assistance and the provision of agricultural equipment. It has an emergency and resilience office. The organization has implemented several programs in Burkina Faso, with a view to combating hunger and strengthening the food resilience of vulnerable populations. As part of its actions, since 2021 the FAO has been implementing a structuring project entitled "Strengthening household resilience through adaptation and mitigation actions to the effects of climate change and COVID 19, in the Boucle du Mouhoun region of Burkina Faso". From 2002 to 2016, it implemented the Programme de gestion intégré de la production et des déprédateurs (GIPD) in Burkina Faso. This program was aligned with government policies and strategies to improve food security, increase rural incomes and sustainably manage natural resources. For several years now, the FAO has been supporting the country's authorities in their efforts to promote food and nutritional resilience.

2.2.1.3. Food Safety Committee (CSA)

The Committee on Food Security (CFS) was created in 1974, and since its reform in 2009, has become the main international and intergovernmental platform acting in favor of the food and nutrition security of its members. In 2009, the CFS set up a High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE). This group provides the CFS with independent scientific analysis and advice at its request, which serves as a basis for the Committee's discussions. The HLPE has two components: (i)

a Steering Committee, made up of internationally renowned experts in various fields related to food safety and nutrition, and (ii) a Roster of Experts, from which specialists are selected to form the project teams responsible for analyzing specific food safety and nutrition issues and drafting reports.

2.2.1.4. Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS)

Created on September 12, 1973 following the great droughts of the 1970s, the Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) comprises thirteen member states, including Burkina Faso. It supports its member states through various programs and projects designed to help them better understand and meet the challenges of sustainable development. Its mandate is "to invest in the search for food and nutritional security and the fight against the effects of desertification and climate change for ecological balance and sustainable development in the Sahel and West Africa". CILSS interventions are supported by the following five (05) regional support programs: (1) Regional support program for food security and nutrition (PRA/SAN); (2) Regional support program for natural resource management and climate change (PRA/GRN-CC); (3) Regional support program for population, gender and development (PRA/PDG); (4) Regional support program for access to markets for agricultural and agrifood products (PRA/Markets); (5) Regional support program for water management (PRA/ME).

2.2.2. National institutional framework

At national level, several institutions are involved in implementing food and nutrition policy, including the National Food Security Council (CNSA), the General Directorate for Studies and Sectoral Statistics (DGESS), the National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (CONASUR), and the National Food Security Stock Management Company (SONAGESS).

2.2.2.1 National Food Safety Council

The CNSA is an ad hoc structure for consultation and monitoring of the implementation of the National Food Security Strategy (SNSA). At central level, it comprises a steering body represented by the General Assembly; a technical body (Technical Committee); an executive body (Executive Secretariat), and several decentralized structures at regional, provincial, departmental and village level (Regional, Provincial, Departmental and Village Food Security Councils). To accomplish its missions, the Executive Secretariat is supported by specialized structures responsible for coordinating and managing intervention tools and instruments.

2.2.2.2. General Directorate for Studies and Sectoral Statistics (DGESS)

Attached to the Ministry of the Digital Economy, Posts and Digital Transformation, the DGESS is elevated to the rank of central structure by Decree n°2016-381 /PRES/PM/MINEFID on the organization of the Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Development. As a result, DGESS has representations in all the ministries attached to the Ministry of the Digital Economy, Posts and Transformation. It is responsible for the Food Security Information System and Early Warning. Among other things, the DGESS is responsible for :

- Conducting the studies required to define the Department's policies, plans and strategies;
- monitoring and evaluating the socio-economic and environmental impact of the Ministry's policies, plans and strategies;
- monitoring and evaluating projects and programs included in the Ministry's policies, plans and strategies;
- centralize, verify, analyze, synthesize and disseminate all data relating to all sectors of the department;
- organizing meetings of the Ministerial Sector Management Board (CASEM) and monitoring implementation of their recommendations;
- promote the private sector and strengthen synergies between the public sector on the one hand, and the private sector and civil society on the other, in the fulfillment of the Ministry's missions;
- monitor the implementation of national policies, strategies and plans;
- carry out all other missions entrusted to it by the Secretary General or the Minister, relating to its area of competence.

2.2.2.3. National Council for Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation (CONASUR)

Since the droughts of 1973 and the famines that followed, Burkina Faso has experienced a multitude of natural and man-made disasters. Natural disasters make already fragile populations even more vulnerable. Every year, Burkina Faso is hit by floods, strong winds and, in some regions, pockets of drought. The Inform Risk Index analyzes vulnerability and capacity to cope with shocks. The values of this index indicate that the Sahel region has a high level of risk compared with the other regions of Burkina Faso.

As far as insecurity is concerned, it has been gaining momentum in Burkina Faso since 2015, affecting an ever-increasing number of people. For the first time in its history, Burkina Faso is faced with internally displaced persons, with more than 2.06 million individuals having fled their homes, and more than 115,136 displaced households as of March 31, 2023. Insecurity affects all regions of the country, mainly the Centre-Nord and Sahel regions, which recorded 40.3% and 32.8% of displaced persons respectively during the same period. In areas of heightened insecurity, women and children have limited access to basic social services. These IDPs are in addition to the mainly Malian refugees present in Burkina Faso prior to the deterioration in the national security situation. In November 2018, the country registered 25,107 refugees and asylum seekers.

Moreover, on the health front, the country has been suffering from an outbreak of dengue fever since 2013. Annual epidemics of measles and meningitis are still a concern. The situation is aggravated by the Corona Virus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, which increases the risk of health insecurity for the population (IMF, 2020). COVID-19 has led to a drop in foreign trade, in this case imports during the first half of 2019. In addition, a large number of people found themselves in a situation of unemployment with the closure of markets and certain services. The major consequences of these disasters are the growing impoverishment of vulnerable households, the deterioration in their state of health, and an increase in the prevalence of malnutrition.

CONASUR was set up as part of the drive to make harm reduction a national priority. It is a national coordination structure with branches at all administrative levels. It manages the National Emergency Relief and Rehabilitation Organization and Coordination Plan, and acts as secretariat for the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. It has a permanent secretariat (SP-CONASUR) responsible for fulfilling the following missions:

- implement the National Multi-Hazard Disaster Preparedness and Response Plan in collaboration with the relevant ministerial departments;
- coordinating social and humanitarian response to disasters, including rehabilitation ;
- develop a culture of disaster prevention among local populations and elected officials, through behavior-change communication;
- implement the national disaster management strategy and disseminate the related law;
- coordinate the activities of CONASUR's branches (CORESUR, COPROSUR, CODESUR);
- assess the extent of losses and prepare the declaration to call on national and international solidarity if necessary;
- ensure the reception, assistance and socio-economic reintegration of people displaced and/or returning from abroad following crises;
- design and implement rehabilitation programs.

2.2.2.4. Société Nationale de Gestion des Stocks de Sécurité Alimentaire (SONAGESS)

The mechanism for preventing and managing food crises has existed since colonial times. This mechanism was based on a food security system comprising a collection network, a price stabilization fund, and cooperatives selling agricultural products and basic necessities. Following the serious food crises of 1973, the government grouped the collection, storage and sales network under a single institutional structure, the Office National des Céréales (OFNACER). With the advent of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP), which required the State to withdraw from competitive areas and production sectors in favor of the private sector, OFNACER was dissolved in 1992. But the State soon realized that controlling food insecurity was fundamental to any sustainable development policy. It therefore created SONAGESS in 1994.

SONAGESS is governed by the laws governing commercial companies and economic interest groups, and is subject to private-sector management rules. Notwithstanding its social missions, SONAGESS is authorized to undertake all commercial, industrial, financial, securities and real estate operations directly or indirectly related to the pursuit of food security for the people of Burkina Faso.

SONAGESS' main missions include :

- manage the National Food Security Stock (SNS) ;
- manage Intervention Stock (IS) ;

- managing public food aid ;
- manage the Agricultural Market Information System (SIM) ;
- support cereal banks and other food security players;
- build up and manage the Regulatory Commercial Stock (SCR).

Since 2013, SONAGESS and its partners have committed to:

- increase the National Food Security Stock (SNS) from 35,000 to 50,000 tonnes;
- increase the Intervention Stockpile (IS) from 10,000 to at least 25,000 tonnes;
- carry out resilience operations each year for the benefit of vulnerable populations (point of sale of cereals to vulnerable populations).

A number of tools have been put in place to ensure the implementation of the assessment and response planned by the system. These include the national plan for the organization and coordination of emergency relief and rehabilitation (food security component), the response plan, the Food Security Information System (SISA) and the Food Security Support Fund (FASA). The institutions involved in national food policy are numerous and diverse. These actors carry out actions in favor of the rural environment, concerning land security and water management. Unfortunately, very little is done in urban areas, apart from the hygiene and sanitation awareness campaigns run by the former Direction de l'Hygiène Publique et de l'Éducation pour la Santé (DHPES). It is in this context that Héron (2016) asserted in his thesis entitled "Les mangeurs urbains burkinabè, entre satisfaction et sécurisation alimentaires", that there is no urban food policy in Burkina Faso.

Despite institutional plurality, the problem of food security remains acute, leading us to question the effectiveness of institutions in the fight against food insecurity. One of the key factors in this failure is that national food policy relies heavily on international institutions such as the World Food Organization (WFO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). However, these structures are guided by political and economic interests. Consequently, everything they do is geared to the needs of donors. This is confirmed by the fact that national food policy, instead of increasing domestic production, focuses on importing food products whose prices depend on the world market. Hundreds of millions are spent every year on these products, which cross our borders without quality control. The cases of meat seized and incinerated in the city of Ouagadougou confirm this state of affairs. The Corona virus pandemic in 2019 has worsened the situation of food insecurity in Burkina Faso.

2.3 Policy framework

Under the impetus of the Burkinabe government, the State has developed various policies to promote food and nutritional security, complemented by various initiatives taken by its bilateral and multilateral technical and financial partners and other non-state or non-governmental players. The issue of food and nutritional security is not only of concern to the international community. It also concerns Burkina Faso, which has taken part in various world summits dealing with the issue of food and nutrition.

With regard to the policy framework, the National Agro-sylvo-pastoral Strategic Investment Plan and the National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy (PNMS) 2020-2029 will be discussed.

2.3.1. National Agro-sylvo-pastoral Strategic Investment Plan

The government has formulated and is implementing a National Agro-sylvo-pastoral Strategic Investment Plan, which it adopted in 2021 and covers the period 2021-2025. This policy is part of a drive to structurally transform the PASP sector and provides strategic guidance on priority investments. It is a reference and orientation framework for all players in the agricultural sector. In light of Burkina's realities, the analysis of the sector's situation has identified eleven (11) major challenges to be met over the 2021-2025 period, taking into account the findings from the implementation of previous programs and with a view to the sector's structural transformation. The main challenges are to: (i) sustainably increase the productivity and production of SPPFH products in compliance with environmental standards; (ii) improve the mobilization, control and efficient management of production water in a context of climate change; (iii) ensure the sustainable management of land and forest, wildlife, pastoral and fishery resources; (iv) improve access to land and secure tenure of SPPFH production areas; (v) improve market access and the added value of SPPFH commodity chains ; (vi) develop competitive human capital to meet the development needs of the PASP sector; (vii) strengthen the resilience of vulnerable ASP households, including IDPs; (viii) develop innovative financing mechanisms for the PASP sector; (ix) strengthen stakeholders' access to appropriate financial services; (x) strengthen

governance (coordination, steering of interventions and monitoring-evaluation and capitalization) of the PASP sector and (xi) ensure food security for the Burkinabe population. These challenges will be met through four (04) strategic axes, broken down into actions and activities set out in the Operational Action Plan (PAO). These are: (i) axis 1: productivity and sustainable production of the PASP sector, (ii) axis 2: competitiveness of the agro-sylvo-pastoral, fisheries and wildlife sectors, (iii) axis 3: sustainable management of natural resources and (iv) axis 4: governance of the PASP sector. The scope of action of the National Strategic Investment Plan for the agro-sylvo-pastoral sector is that of the "Agro-sylvo-pastoral production" sectoral policy, and the vision is entitled: "By 2025, the PASP sector is resilient, modern and competitive, accelerating the structural transformation of the national economy, driven by family farms and modern agricultural enterprises, and sustainably guaranteeing the food and nutritional security of the population". With a view to achieving food sovereignty, the overall objective of the PNIASP is to "sustainably increase productivity and market access for ASPHF products, in order to improve food and nutritional security and accelerate the structural transformation of the economy".

The investment strategy for the agro-sylvo-pastoral production sector is based on the Politique sectorielle de production Agro-sylvo-pastorale (PS-PASP), itself based on the Étude nationale prospective (ENP Burkina 2025). The PS-PASP aims to develop a productive sector that ensures food security, is more market-oriented and creates decent jobs based on sustainable production and consumption patterns.

In addition, it operationalizes the second National Economic and Social Development Plan (PNDES-II) in its axis 4: "boosting growth sectors for the economy and jobs". The ambition of PNDES II for the PASP sector is to: (i) develop a more market-oriented, productive and resilient agro-sylvo-pastoral, wildlife and fisheries sector; (ii) develop quality and resilient infrastructures, to foster the structural transformation of the economy; (iii) reverse the trend of environmental and natural resource degradation to foster climate resilience and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Government policy is an essential factor influencing agro-sylvo-pastoral investment in any area, since it benefits from a legal-institutional environment through the legislative and regulatory tools that frame the evolution of the agro-sylvo-pastoral sector in Burkina Faso.

Despite the plenitude of the legal texts governing the sector, notable shortcomings remain in their application. These include poor dissemination and appropriation by stakeholders, and the absence of implementing decrees for certain laws.

The diagnosis of the PASP sector highlights strengths that can act as a lever for its development, but also some weaknesses that limit its performance. The main strengths of the PASP sector are :

- in terms of production, processing and marketing bases: (i) the existence of farmland, lowlands and irrigated perimeters, developed pastoral areas and a potential of NTFP-producing species, (ii) the existence of water reservoirs and dams for ASP production, (iii) the existence of ASPHF product processing units and marketing and storage infrastructures (counters, warehouses, markets);
- production support instruments: (i) the existence of mechanisms for supplying inputs and equipment for ASPHF production, (ii) the existence of an advisory support network for stakeholders (public and private);
- at institutional level: (i) the existence of policies, regulations and legal texts that guide and frame actions in the sector, (ii) the existence of consultation bodies and frameworks for the governance of the sector and natural resources, (iii) the existence of professional organizations and private service providers, (iv) the existence of a permanent Secretariat for the coordination of agricultural sector policies.

The sector's major weaknesses are (i) poor access to credit, financial services, inputs and equipment for HPSF production, (ii) low intensification of HPSF production systems, (iii) poor professionalization and organization of HPSF production sector players, (iv) poor access to markets for processed and unprocessed HPSF products, (v) severe degradation of natural resources and water resource mobilization facilities, (vi) low adoption of sustainable production and consumption practices and technologies, in particular agroecology, (vii) poor security of land and pastoral and conservation areas, and (viii) weakness of the sector's monitoring and evaluation system.

In addition, opportunities were identified that could stimulate and support the emergence of a competitive sector creating decent jobs. These include (i) the existence of valuable research results, (ii) the availability of technical and financial partners in the field of HPSF production, (iii) the existence of potential markets for HPSF products (national, regional and international), (iv) the existence of private service providers in the field of HPSF production, (v) the existence of innovative financing mechanisms (Green Climate Fund, Climate Investment Fund, Global Environment Facility, PPP, etc.), and, (vi) the existence of financing institutions (Funds, Banks, etc.), and (vi) the existence of financing institutions (funds, banks, MFIs, decentralized financial systems, etc.).

However, the sector is facing a number of threats that could undermine its development efforts. The main threats to the sector are (i) the persistence of insecurity and conflicts linked to the exploitation of natural resources (land, water, forest); (ii) the resurgence of locust, granivore and Fall armyworm attacks; (iii) the persistence of certain animal pathologies and coronavirus disease; (iv) the reduction in ASPHF production areas due to uncontrolled urbanization, the failure of stakeholders to meet

their commitments to implement ESMPs and mining rehabilitation plans, etc. (v) the proliferation of uncontrolled artisanal gold-panning sites, a source of water and soil pollution, (vi) the resurgence of the adverse effects of climate change (poor rainfall distribution, drought, flooding, etc.), (vii) the proliferation of invasive plants in water bodies, and (viii) the persistence of socio-cultural constraints that hinder the implementation of certain actions.

However, the government recognizes the existence of a number of major risks that could jeopardize the successful implementation of the investment strategy for the agro-sylvo-pastoral production sector. These are essentially rainfed risks, as production is highly vulnerable to the effects of climatic hazards and plagues. These risks include floods, strong winds, droughts, temperature variations, rainfall variability, dusty suspensions, locust and bird invasions, pest attacks, and so on. The result is a drop in production and biodiversity. This could undermine development efforts in the PASP sector. Health risks are linked to the appearance of pathologies, contamination of ASPHF products and the persistence of coronavirus disease. Their manifestations are characterized by epidemics, pandemics, epizootics, zoonoses, food poisoning and depreciation in the quality of ASPHF products. These health crises could hamper the implementation of the PNIASP through reduced circulation of ASPHF products, a drop in production and a fall in players' incomes. Specifically, COVID 19 has led to changes in the habits of economic agents in the sector, with a negative impact on the country's economy.

The political risks that could hamper implementation of the PNIASP are political and institutional instability and poor governance. These risks manifest themselves in shifting priorities, merging or splitting institutions, and a lack of uniform vision among sector players as regards political and institutional instability. These risks, if they materialize, could lead to a reduction in investment (in terms of quality and quantity) in the sector, and exacerbate poverty among the population.

As far as socio-economic risks are concerned, the country has been facing a number of socio-economic crises in recent years, including social unrest, land disputes, community conflicts and the unfavorable international economic climate. The persistence of these crises would adversely affect the implementation of activities in the sector. The manifestations of these crises include strikes, the reduction of production areas, low budget allocations, falling commodity prices (cotton, sesame, cashew nuts, hides, livestock/meat, shea kernels) and poor access to credit for agricultural production.

In terms of security risk, Burkina Faso, like other Sahelian and West African countries, is currently facing the permanent threat of terrorist movements, with the corollary of loss of human life, numerous internally displaced persons, abandonment of means of production, and destruction of production, processing and marketing infrastructures for ASPHF products. The persistence of criminal attacks could undermine investor confidence, public morale and worker motivation, and jeopardize the implementation of the PNIASP.

In addition to the Investment Strategy for the agro-sylvo-pastoral production sector, Burkina Faso has also adopted a National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy (PNMS) 2020-2029.

2.3.2. National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy (PNMS) 2020-2029

The overall objective of the national multisectoral nutrition policy is to improve the nutritional status of populations, particularly women, children and vulnerable groups, through the implementation of multisectoral nutrition interventions. The sectors selected for sensitive interventions are those involving the following themes: (i) food security; (ii) health; (iii) water, hygiene and sanitation; (iv) education; (v) social protection, and all sectors conducive to nutrition. The SWOT analysis identified weaknesses from which challenges remain. These include (i) strengthening the fight against micronutrient deficiencies; (ii) scaling up the promotion of infant and young child feeding practices in the thirteen regions; (iii) universal access to drinking water and sanitation; (iv) contributing to disaster and humanitarian crisis management; (v) improving school enrolment and retention of girls, and the socio-economic and legal status of women; (vi) improving nutrition governance: structuring the institutional and organizational framework of nutrition stakeholders, strengthening the legislative and regulatory framework in the field of nutrition, effective and efficient financing for nutrition, human resources, adapted and continuous communication while ensuring accountability to stakeholders, transparency and the fight against corruption. In view of the challenges identified, five (05) strategic axes have been defined, namely: (i) the reduction of undernutrition, (ii) the reduction of micronutrient deficiencies, (iii) the reinforcement of the fight against overnutrition and nutrition-related non-communicable diseases, (iv) the reinforcement of food safety, and (v) the improvement of nutrition governance.

The Plan Stratégique Multisectoriel de Nutrition (PSMN) 2020-2024, reveals that in Burkina Faso, nutrition interventions are to be found in policies and programs drawn up separately by the various ministerial departments. For example, we have the Ministry of Agriculture (food and nutrition security), the Ministry of Education (nutrition and school canteens) and the Ministry of Social Action (social safety nets). In addition, there are a large number of players, both within and outside government, involved in implementing nutrition interventions. The diversity of sectors and non-governmental players makes it difficult to coordinate nutrition interventions as effectively as possible. This is why, in 2008, the government set up a Conseil national de concertation en nutrition (CNCN) with regional branches (Conseil régional de concertation en nutrition [CRCN]). The institutional and organizational framework for nutrition is governed by Decree N°2008-

003/PRES/PM/MS/MAHRH/MASSN/MEF of January 10, 2008, which sets out the creation, remit, composition, organization and operation of the Conseil national de concertation en nutrition (CNCN). This decree defines the players in the ministerial departments and institutions/organizations involved in the field of nutrition. The objective of the CNCN is to ensure the orientation and follow-up of the national nutrition policy, as well as liaison and coordination between the ministerial departments, players and partners involved in implementing the multi-sectoral national nutrition policy.

Notwithstanding the legislative and regulatory framework governing the field of nutrition, notable shortcomings remain in their implementation. In addition, there is a lack of dissemination and appropriation of the texts by the players involved, and overlapping of the responsibilities of nutrition stakeholders.

III. DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS (SWOT ANALYSIS)

3.1 Political and security context

Trajectories of the state of global food security show increasingly worrying signs in recent years (Mathieu, 2019). Strengthening agricultural policies has certainly been identified as a priority by public authorities. At the Malabo (Equatorial Guinea) summit in June 2014, heads of state and government agreed on an agenda for transforming African agriculture. Among its objectives, this Malabo Declaration calls for at least 10% of public budgets in each country to be devoted to agriculture. Unfortunately, very few countries have achieved this. In an early 2020 assessment by the African Union, only four countries seem to stand out favorably for the performance of their agricultural policies: Rwanda, Morocco, Mali and Ghana (Gaymard and Savelli, 2020). The government of Burkina Faso attaches great importance to food and nutrition policies, but this remains limited in view of the country's dependence on imported food staples. In Burkina Faso, as elsewhere in the world, over two billion people depend on Russia and Ukraine for food. Other exporting countries alone will not be able to compensate for the market imbalance caused by the war (Marie, 2022). What's more, despite international food aid programs for Burkina Faso, part of the population "suffers from chronic malnutrition and is deficient in proteins, vitamins and minerals" (Dufumier, 2004). Like Burkina Faso, food and nutritional insecurity has increased worldwide after several decades of decline. A reversal of this trend seems to be underway, putting the achievement of the second Sustainable Development Goal, "Eradicate hunger in the world by 2030", that much further away (de Lattre-Gasquet and Giordano, 2019). Starting with Burkina Faso, sub-Saharan Africa is home to a wide variety of "food-risk situations" characterized by a quantitative and qualitative gap between needs and resources (Janin, 2010). It is the only continent that has seen no significant improvement in food availability in recent decades. In fact, food crises have multiplied in recent years: in 2002 in southern Africa, in 2005 in the Sahel and West Africa, and in 2008, when "hunger" riots broke out in many usually protected capital cities (Dubresson and Moreau et al., 2011). In the context of Burkina Faso, these crises demonstrated the limits of agricultural production, which includes a relatively limited range of traditional sub-Saharan food crops (cereals, oilseeds, pulses, tubers, etc.) and vegetables (Herrera and Ilboudo, 2012). Russia and Ukraine are two major producers and exporters of agricultural products, particularly cereals (Abis and Mordacq, 2022), essential to the food security of more than three billion people living in countries where agroecological and pedoclimatic conditions do not allow sufficient production (Brun, 2022). The choices made to ensure food and nutritional security in small island economies have been conditioned by specific situations that have given rise to a model of dependence based on the logic of free trade, leading us to question its viability (Brial and Ferrarier et al., 2022). This crisis reveals the negative social, economic and political consequences, both immediate and future, of the development model promoted and defended, with its inequalities of access to resources (land, water, labor, credit) which tend to reproduce food insecurity and poverty (Janin, 2008).

The current political context is characterized by high social demand in a country with limited resources (PNMN 2020-2029). It should also be noted that the socio-political and security situation, which has encouraged the displacement of populations, has only served to reinforce the food and nutrition crisis. Not only has it affected the internally displaced population, mostly farmers, but it has also affected urban consumers, who depend exclusively on the market for their food. As a result, the low-income, food-deficit country is experiencing the greatest difficulty in obtaining the supplies it needs to prevent hunger and malnutrition. For the poorest urban households, food often represents more than half of the budget (Brunel, 2008). In the context of Burkina Faso, agriculture would necessarily be the foundation for rebuilding the economy, and hence society. Today, everyone agrees that priority should be given to food self-sufficiency (Partant, 2007).

3.2 Economic background

From 1990 onwards, Burkina Faso, like other African countries, adopted a structural adjustment program. This led, among other things, to the shrinking of the state and its disengagement from several productive sectors, and the positioning of the private sector as the driving force behind economic development. In reality, the state remains a key player in economic and social development. Even Burkina Faso's private sector owes much of its dynamism to the state. In reality, Burkina Faso's private sector is still dominated by the informal sector, alongside an embryonic formal sector. The primary sector accounts for 40% of Burkina Faso's exports and employs over 80% of the working population (Ouédraogo et al., 2007). The liberalization of agricultural markets as part of structural adjustment programs systematically favored export crops to the detriment of crops destined for domestic markets (Azam, 1995). Firstly, the specialization of economies and production is an essential argument in favor of free trade, as it is the condition that theoretically justifies it: each country exports its additional production to meet the needs of other territories, and imports goods produced more efficiently elsewhere, deriving greater economic, social and environmental benefit than if they were produced locally (Brial et al., 2022). In this way, producers in the South have been wiped out by the invasion of low-cost agricultural products, which their governments have favored over domestic production in order to relieve national budgets already strained by debt payments. For a good two decades now, the cities of the South have been fed by farmers from the North, while the peasants of the South have been leaving the countryside, unable to earn a sufficient income from their activity (Brunel, 2008). Production and marketing structures were then dismantled, and markets were no longer guaranteed. Farmers were left to fend for themselves in an unprecedented competitive environment (Racaud, 2016).

Both food and cash crops compete for access to the means of production (labor and fertilizers in particular) (Guenot and Huchet-Bourdon, 2014). Only cash crops receive chemical and technical inputs. For food crops, family farmers generally use part of the fertilizers intended for cotton. This hardly constitutes food and nutritional security. This is why Georges Courade and Jean-Claude Devèze (2006) argue that poorly managed liberalization of certain cash crop sectors has sometimes contributed to their disorganization. Small-scale family farming accounts for roughly a third of the world's population, and is largely based on farms of less than two hectares (Azoulay, 2012), with obsolete methods and instruments. It is against this backdrop that Georges Courade and Jean-Claude Devèze (2006) point out that the future of African family farming remains a cause for concern, after more than fifty years of development aid, despite the efforts made and the warnings, such as René Dumont's in *L'Afrique noire est mal partie*. In contrast to family farming, over the last 40 years the cotton system has played a significant role in the evolution of the agricultural panorama, and has set an example for the organization and structuring of commodity chains. This integrated system has given Burkinabe farmers access to modern means of production dedicated to this cash crop (Guenot and Huchet-Bourdon, 2014).

Despite the economic successes it boasts, the government has not managed to significantly reduce the food and nutrition crisis, and the exclusion of family farmers from financing agricultural inputs affects the vast majority of this group. Moreover, urban populations in particular are constantly complaining about rising food prices. This justifies the fact that profitable agriculture is far from "meeting the need to feed a growing and increasingly urban population, to ensure a decent living for farmers, and to retain a large share of the demographic growth that cities cannot accommodate" (Dubresson et al., 2011). The financial and economic crisis affecting the global economy will not make it any easier to find solutions to avoid the recurrence of such incidents, and to meet the food challenge of a world that will be home to two billion more people by 2050 (Bourgeois, 2009). However, developments on the world market since the turn of the century, and recent food riots triggered by rising food prices, have led many observers to question (at last) the relevance of cotton specialization and its ability to boost food crops (Herrera and Ilboudo, 2012).

The structural adjustment policies implemented in Burkina Faso from 1990 onwards have not helped to reduce these social deficits. On the contrary, they have sometimes exacerbated these deficits in certain agricultural sub-sectors, increased the vulnerability of certain social groups, and led to the impoverishment of the population. On the African continent, women play a central role in subsistence farming. Yet women have fewer rights to land, less access to rural information and services, and are less mobile because of family responsibilities (Fall and Jacquemot, 2023). Their participation in the exercise of power is limited, even if women's organizations are gradually enabling them to strengthen their influence (Courade and Devèze, 2006). This lacklustre situation calls for appropriate measures to ensure their access to land.

3.3 Environmental context

Burkina Faso, a landlocked Sahelian country in West Africa, covers an area of 274,200 km². The country's strong demographic growth is a source of growing pressure on natural resources (water, land, forests, wildlife, etc.). Burkina Faso's agriculture is at the heart of the world's environmental future. Global warming alone is expected to lead to a 20% drop in agricultural yields in Africa by 2050, at a time when production will have to more than double to feed nearly one in two people by the end of the century (Gaymard and Savelli, 2020). In fact, agriculture is an economic sector that is highly exposed to climatic uncertainty: droughts, floods, insects, etc., combined with precarious land or agronomic potential endowments, prevent the "food gap" from

closing, i.e. adjusting local agricultural production to high demand, due, in some parts of the world, to demographic pressure (Pouch, 2020). Secondly, pollution of all kinds attributable to the food system is significant, in particular due to the chemical and pharmaceutical products abundantly used in agriculture. These nuisances are compounded by greenhouse gas emissions (Rastoin, 2013). The environmental context is marked by ongoing degradation of the vegetation cover, impoverishment of arable soils, depletion of water resources, and a reduction in agro-sylvo-pastoral production areas due to the development of mining and gold panning (PNIASP 2021-2025).

Table 1.
Strengths and weaknesses of food and nutrition security

FORCES	WEAKNESSES
<p>a) Institutional level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existence of a National Food Safety Council ; - existence of the National Food Security Council and regular meetings of its bodies; - existence of a national nutrition consultation council (CNCN); - integration of nutritional inputs into the national supply system through the Centrale d'achat des médicaments essentiels génériques (CAMEG); - existence of the national food security stock (SNS) ; - existence of the Food and Nutrition Security Information System and trade statistics production structures; - existence of a nutrition information system (SMART survey, routine data collection, early warning system); - existence of a National Nutrition Information Platform (PNIN); - the existence of organized players in the various links of the sector; - existence of national and regional consultation frameworks ; - existence of market and price control and monitoring structures ; - existence of regulatory frameworks ; - Networking of the system through the CNSA's decentralized structures (Conseil Régional de Sécurité Alimentaire, Conseil Provincial de Sécurité Alimentaire, Conseil Départemental de Sécurité Alimentaire); - existence of planning tools and tools for managing food and nutrition crises ; - existence of an INFOSAN emergency contact point at the Ministry of Health and focal points in key ministries involved in food safety; - existence of a CODEX Alimentarius focal point at the Ministry of Agriculture. 	<p>a) Institutional level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate institutional anchoring ; - weak synergy between players ; - lack of a suitable methodology for identifying and targeting vulnerable households ; - dysfunctional consultation frameworks (regional, provincial and departmental) ; - Poor appropriation of management and planning tools ; - difficulties in capitalizing on SAN initiatives; - Lack of regular production of statistics on market garden production and PNFL ; - low capacity of the livestock market information system ; - no forage balance sheet for the whole country ; - insufficient consideration of nutrition issues in certain national and local development programs and policies; - poor operationalization of consultation frameworks on nutrition at the decentralized level; - insufficient promotion of local food consumption; - low level of access to drinking water and sanitation ; - low school enrolment among girls ; - inadequate implementation of the disaster and humanitarian crisis response plan ; - women's unequal access to production resources ; - inadequate legislative and regulatory framework for nutrition ; - insufficient communication in favor of nutrition.

<p>b) Political level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existence of a National Food and Nutritional Security Policy ; - taking SAN into account in national development policies ; - implementing decentralization and taking greater account of the regional and local dimensions of food security ; - compliance with the commitment by governments to devote 10% of their national budgets to agriculture); - existence of the National Social Protection Policy ; - existence of law 034 on rural land tenure ; - existence of an annual response and support plan for vulnerable populations, food insecurity and malnutrition (PRSPV); - integration of nutrition into the minimum package of activities of health facilities and at community level; - existence of operationalization plans for certain nutrition interventions (ANJE and PCIMA plans, strategy to combat micronutrient deficiencies, etc.); - National food safety emergency response plan (PNRUSSA). 	<p>b) Political level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient empowerment of farmers' organizations in natural resource management ; - insufficient agricultural and technological extension due to the directive nature of its management ; - concentration of partners' activities in certain areas; - transfer of powers without the concomitant transfer of resources to local authorities; - the lack of consideration given to social protection in food security policies and strategies; - insufficient resources allocated to advisory support for producers ; - insufficient integration of nutrition into regional and communal development plans and programs; - insufficient in the fight against micronutrient deficiencies ; - low level of implementation of ANJE activities at community level in the regions.
<p>c) Capability level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - significant potential for exploitable natural resources (land, water, forest, wildlife, etc.) ; - the existence of proven technologies developed by research into agro-sylvo-pastoral, wildlife and fisheries production; - existence of numerous varieties of cereal, vegetable, fruit and tuber crops adapted to soil and climate conditions and to consumption, processing and marketing needs; - existence of a network of trading and storage infrastructures; - existence of food security and intervention stocks (SSAI) for social price sales (VPS) and control stores; - availability of qualified human resources to implement the NSSP. 	<p>c) Capability level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low capacity (material and financial) of the Early Warning System; - persistence of the extensive production system ; - the isolation of certain production areas; - poor access to credit, financial services, inputs and ASPHF production equipment; - low intensification of ASPHF production systems, - the low level of professionalism and organization among players in the ASPHF production chains; - poor access to markets for processed and unprocessed ASPHF products; - severe deterioration of natural resources and water resource mobilization facilities; - poor security of land and pastoral and conservation areas; - lack of competitiveness of local products ; - insufficient market information ; - low coverage (geographical and target) of specific preventive and sensitive nutrition interventions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate equipment and infrastructure for packaging, preservation, processing, storage and marketing; - insufficient quantity and quality of human resources ; - inadequate storage facilities for nutritional inputs ; - shortcomings in quality control of food production, storage and use; - low availability and accessibility of food products to the population.
<p>d) Economic level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the existence of a large number of projects and programs in the field of food and nutrition security; - adherence to and effective support for projects and programs by politicians and TFPs ; - the existence of technical and financial partners working in the field of nutrition; - the existence of growth poles ; - existence of a potential land development plan ; - existence of the Fonds d'Appui à la Sécurité Alimentaire (FASA). - 	<p>d) Economic level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - insufficient funding for nutrition ; - insufficient contribution of national players (State and Private) to the financing of SAN, including inputs; - difficult access to credit for producers ; - low supply of certain food security support funds (FSSI; FEIA); - low government budget allocation for PRSPV implementation.

Table 2.
Analysis of opportunities and threats to food and nutrition security

OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
---------------	---------

<p>a) Institutional level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existence of research structures (CNRST, Universities, CIRDES, etc.); - existence of supranational resilience bodies ; - existence of an international and regional context favorable to nutrition (SUN Movement, United Nations Strategy, USAID Framework, EU Framework); - political will to improve the anchoring of nutrition through the creation of the Technical Secretariat in charge of improving food and nutrition for mothers and children. 	<p>a) Institutional level :</p> <p>institutional instability.</p>
<p>b) Political level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Burkina Faso's adherence to international and regional instruments favourable to food and nutritional security (SUN Movement, REACH, AGIR, USAID Framework, EU Framework, ANRS, ODD2); - existence of incentives to promote products (processing, fairs, shows, promotional days, etc.); - partners' commitment to the system and their participation in the various bodies ; - existence of the TEC / UEMOA ; - willingness of TFPs to support resilience actions ; - the country's subscription to the African Risk Capacity (ARC) drought insurance scheme. 	<p>b) Political level :</p> <p>worsening security situation.</p>
<p>c) Capacity level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - creation of a regional reserve in the ECOWAS zone with a volume of 411,000 tonnes divided into a physical stock of 140,000 tonnes and a financial stock of 271,000 tonnes; - existence of texts governing the free movement of people and goods within the ECOWAS zone. 	<p>c) Capability level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recurrence of natural and man-made disasters ; - high population dependency rate ; - degradation of soil fertility ; - persistent insecurity of land tenure, which limits investment; - an upsurge in crop pests and diseases; - persistent conflicts over the use of natural resources (land, water, forests); - the reduction of production areas due to uncontrolled urbanization; - increased adverse effects of climate change ;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proliferation of invasive plants in water bodies.
<p>d) Economic level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - existence of a buoyant sub-regional market (cowpeas, sesame, onions, corn, livestock and non-timber forest products); - strong mobilization of TFPs to finance the PNDES ; - low level of fluctuation in cereal market prices (constitution/reconstitution/destocking). 	<p>d) Economic level :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - heavy dependence on external financing ; - persistent fraud and contraband sale of spoiled/expired products ; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - fluctuations in the foreign exchange market.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Food and nutrition resilience in Burkina Faso requires the strengthening of the Strategic Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Investment Plan and the National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy. These two national food and nutrition policies, while relevant, present risks that handicap the achievement of their objectives. However, if the following recommendations are taken into account, these risks could be minimized, thereby strengthening their implementation and facilitating the achievement of their results.

❖ Recommendations for the National Agro-sylvo-pastoral Strategic Investment Plan

In order to improve the National Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Strategic Investment Plan, the following recommendations should be taken into account:

- Strengthen the dissemination of the PSNIASP and ensure greater appropriation by stakeholders ;
- adopt all the implementing legislation needed to make the PSNIASP operational;
- facilitating access to credit, financial services and ASPHF production inputs and equipment;
- intensify ASPHF production systems;
- improve the organization of players in order to professionalize the ASPHF production chains;
- facilitate access to markets for processed and unprocessed ASPHF products;
- promote sustainable production and consumption practices and technologies, in particular agroecology;
- secure land and pastoral and conservation areas ;
- strengthen the sector's monitoring and evaluation system ;
- secure land tenure and reduce conflicts related to the use of natural resources (land, water, forests);
- ensure that the commitments made by stakeholders in the implementation of ESMPs and mining rehabilitation plans are respected;
- control the proliferation of uncontrolled artisanal gold-panning sites, a source of water and land pollution.
- the development of the PASP sector could be strengthened by minimizing the risks in this sector, and in particular by adopting the following measures:
 - promote agricultural insurance, support research (genetic improvement of plant and animal species, development of innovative farming techniques and technologies, etc.);
 - promote dry season production ;
 - strengthening the early warning and climate information system ;
 - promote best practices in climate change adaptation and mitigation and agroecology;
 - develop water management and production diversification strategies through adaptive action research.

Health risks should also be minimized, in particular by adopting the following measures:

- ensure strict application of the veterinary code;
- reinforce epidemiological and phytosanitary surveillance ;
- ensure the application of legal texts governing pesticide management;
- develop adequate infrastructures and undertake actions to disseminate good practices in the production, harvesting, packaging, transport, storage, processing and marketing of ASPHF products.

Political risks should also be minimized through the adoption of the following measures:

- mobilization of all stakeholders and ownership of the strategy and implementation principles to achieve the objectives;
- strengthening the coordination of agricultural policies ;
- compliance with program budget principles ;

- Intensify inspections and monitoring of the management of public assets and the strict application of current legislation;
- the adoption of the following measures could help minimize socio-economic risks:
- strengthening dialogue with social partners ;
- setting up and operationalizing land management bodies.

Contractualization of public-private partnerships, and development of business intelligence.

The adoption of the following measures could help minimize security risks:

- develop strategies for accessing and monitoring ASPHF production areas;
- strengthen collaboration between stakeholders and the defense and security forces (FDS);
- strengthening initiatives to integrate internally displaced persons (IDPs) in host localities.

❖ **Recommendations for the National Multisectoral Nutrition Policy (PNMS) 2020-2029**

In order to achieve the overall objective of the multisectoral national nutrition policy, the implementation of the following measures is useful:

- Promote the participation of national players (State & Private) in financing nutrition, including inputs;
- Strengthen consultation frameworks on nutrition at the deconcentrated level ;
- Take greater account of nutrition in regional and local development plans and programmes;
- Strengthen the implementation of ANJE activities at community level in the regions;
- Strengthen the quantity and quality of human resources;
- Create and strengthen appropriate storage infrastructures for nutritional inputs;
- Reinforce quality control of food production, storage and use;
- Increase the availability and accessibility of food products to the population;
- Enhancing and promoting the consumption of local food ;
- Increase access to drinking water and sanitation;
- Increased school enrolment for girls ;
- Strengthen the implementation of the disaster and humanitarian crisis response plan ;
- Promoting women's access to production resources ;
- Improving the legislative and regulatory framework for nutrition ;
- Reinforce communication in favor of nutrition.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Marie-Rose Mercoiret, Farmers' organizations and agricultural policies, Dans *Afrique contemporaine* 2006/1 (n° 217), pages 135 to 157
- Sylvie Brunel, La nouvelle question alimentaire, in *Hérodote* 2008/4 (no. 131), pages 14 to 30
- Adèle Brial, Sylvie Ferrari, Sandrine Gombert-Courvoisier, Jean-François Hoarau, La résilience alimentaire en milieu insulaire. Entre autonomie alimentaire et libre échange, in *Économie rurale* 2022/4 (n° 382), pages 133 to 145
- Marie Fall, Pierre Jacquemot, L'autonomisation des femmes, une réponse à l'insécurité alimentaire en Afrique ? In *Afrique contemporaine* 2023/1 (N° 275), pages 9 to 38
- Georges Courade, Jean-Claude Devèze, Introduction thématique. Des agricultures africaines face à de difficiles transitions, in *Afrique contemporaine* 2006/1 (n° 217), pages 21 to 41
- Hervé Gaymard, Pierre-Ange Savelli, Les agricultures africaines et nous, in *Politique étrangère* 2020/4 (Winter), pages 147 to 160
- Quentin Mathieu, Dégradation de la situation alimentaire mondiale, in *Paysans & société* 2019/6 (No. 378), pages 38 to 43
- Pierre Janin, Crise alimentaire mondiale. Désordres et débats, in *Hérodote* 2008/4 (n° 131), pages 6 to 13
- Sylvain Racaud, Agriculture, marché et extraversion dans les montagnes d'Afrique de l'Est, In *Autrepart* 2016/4 (N° 80), pages 105 to 121
- Alain Dubresson, Sophie Moreau, Jean-Pierre Raison, Jean-Fabien Steck, Mutations des agricultures, In *L'Afrique subsaharienne* (2011), pages 109 to 142
- Matthieu Brun, Ukraine: how far will the shockwave for global agriculture and food go? In *Sesame* 2022/1 (N° 11), pages 8 to 9
- Rémy Herrera, Laurent Ilboudo, Les défis de l'agriculture paysanne : le cas du Burkina Faso, In *L'Homme & la Société* 2012/1-2 (n° 183-184), pages 83 to 95
- Denis Ouédraogo, Moussa Kaboré, Blaise Kienou, Insécurité alimentaire, vulnérabilité et pauvreté en milieu rural au Burkina : une approche en termes de consommation d'énergie, Dans *Mondes en développement* 2007/4 (n° 140), pages 65 to 84
- Thierry Pouch, La sécurité alimentaire dans une société du risque, in *Paysans & société* 2020/3 (No. 381), pages 9 to 14
- Lucien Bourgeois, L'alimentation du monde est d'abord un problème politique, Dans *Pour* 2009/3-4 (N° 202-203), pages 167-176
- Jean-Paul Azam, La diversité des ajustements dans l'agriculture, in *L'Afrique maintenant* (1995), pages 231 to 258
- Adèle Brial, Sylvie Ferrari, Sandrine Gombert-Courvoisier, Jean-François Hoarau, La résilience alimentaire en milieu insulaire. Entre autonomie alimentaire et libre échange In *Économie rurale* 2022/4 (n° 382), pages 133 to 145
- Aurore Guenot, Marilyne Huchet-Bourdon, Rôle du coton sur la filière maïs au Burkina Faso, In *Économie rurale* 2014/3 (n° 341), pages 107 to 119
- Marc Dufumier, Introduction. Sécurité alimentaire, environnement et question agraire, in *Agricultures et paysanneries des Tiers mondes* (2004), pages 5 to 33.
- Bernard Bachelier, Sécurité alimentaire : un enjeu global, in *Innovation politique* 2012 (2012), pages 463-482
- Gérard Azoulay, Sécurité alimentaire mondiale et crise structurelle d'un mode de fonctionnement de l'économie agricole, in *L'Homme & la Société* 2012/1-2 (n° 183-184), pages 61 to 81
- François Partant, L'agriculture, espoir d'une reconstruction? In *La ligne d'horizon* (2007), pages 162 to 190
- Sébastien Abis, Diane Mordacq, La fragilité alimentaire mondiale et la guerre d'Ukraine, in *Politique étrangère* 2022/3 (Automne), pages 25 to 37
- Anaïs Marie, Ukraine. Bombe alimentaire mondiale, in *Revue Projet* 2022/3 (N° 388), pages 47 to 50

- Marie de Lattre-Gasquet, Thierry Giordano, What prospects for agriculture and food security in sub-Saharan Africa in 2050? In *Annales des Mines - Réalités industrielles* 2019/3 (August 2019), pages 50 to 56
- Ouédraogo A., 2023. Food insecurity and resilience in Burkina Faso: a comparative analysis of households of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in reception centers and local households in the commune of Kaya. Master's thesis, ULiège, Faculté des Sciences, 50 p.
- Ministry of Health, 2020. Multi-sector nutrition strategic plan 2020-2024. 124 p.
- MARAH, MEEA, MESRI, MEFP, 2022. Plan Stratégique National d'Investissement Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral (PNIASP) 2021-2025. 59 p.
- MARAH, 2017. Politique nationale de sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle (PNSAN) 2018-2027. 64 p.
- Ministry of Health, 2016. National nutrition policy. 35 p.
- Lougué/Sorgho L. C., 2020. National multisectoral nutrition policy 2020-2029. 89 p.
- MAAH, MEEVCC, MRAH, MINEFID, MATD, 2018. Sectoral policy "agro-sylvo-pastoral production" (PS-PASP), 218-2027. 44 p.
- Baoua I., Traoré S. M., Garba I., Maiga I. H., Halidou S. T., Alhassane A., Maigary I., Mohamed H., Massaoud W., Houssou E. S., Keita A. K., Amewuame M., Agoumou - A., Aziz B. M., A., 2020. Rapport Régional sur la Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle au Sahel et en Afrique de l'Ouest 2020, CILS. 65 p.
- Alpha, (Arlène), De Raymond, (Antoine Bernard), Aide internationale et sécurité alimentaire", In: *Un monde sans faim*. Edited by Antoine Bernard de Raymond, Delphine Thivet, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 2021
- Boucobza, (Xavier), "La méthode de promotion de la sécurité alimentaire. Une application de la lex publica?", In: *Revue internationale de droit économique*, 4 (t. XXVI), 2012, 71 to 85
- Brial, (Adèle), Ferrari, (Sylvie), Gombert-Courvoisier, (Sandrine), Hoarau, (Jean-François), "La résilience alimentaire en milieu insulaire. Entre autonomie alimentaire et libre échange", In: *Économie rurale*, October-December 2022. For more information: <http://journals.openedition.org/economierurale/10828>.
- Committee on World Food Security (CFS), *Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition*, 2017 Edition
- Cuillier, (Benjamin), Durand, (Lionel), Guiraud, (Noé), " Une application numérique au service de la résilience alimentaire des territoires ", In : *Cahiers de l'action*, 1, N° 58, 2022, 77- 82
- Dury, (Sandrine), " Filières et sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle : deux concepts indépendants ", In Estelle Biénabe, Alain Rival, Denis Loeillet. *Développement durable et filières tropicales*. Paris, Éditions Quæ, 2016.
- Fanny Rouxelin, Annabelle Richard, Boris Chabanel, E. L. (2022). Food resilience: feeding territories in times of uncertainty. *UTOPIES*, N° 35, pp 21.
- Lallau, (Benoît), Laissus-Benoist, (Perrine), Mbetid-Bessane, (Emmanuel), "Introduction: la résilience peut-elle passer de la théorie aux pratiques?", In: *Revue internationale des études du développement*, 3 (N° 235), 2018, 9- 25
- World Food Summit, FAO, Rome, 1996.
- Terlizzi, (Biagio Di), Bengoumi, (Mohammed), EL Bilali, (Hamid), Dragotta, (Alberto), "Valorizing knowledge for food security", In: *Mediterra 2016: Zero waste in the Mediterranean* (2016), pages 385 to 414



NEEMA has received funding from the European Union under grant agreement no. 101128930. The views and opinions expressed in this communication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.