



الجمهورية الجزائرية الديمقراطية الشعبية
République Algérienne Démocratique et Populaire
وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي



Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche Scientifique

École Nationale Supérieure Agronomique

Département : Economie Rurale

Spécialité : Développement agricole et rural

المدرسة الوطنية العليا للفلاحة

القسم: الاقتصاد الريفي

التخصص: التنمية الزراعية والريفية

Mémoire de Fin d'Etude

Pour l'Obtention du Diplôme Master

Thème

Assessing sustainability of farms in development areas on the Algerian south - case of Ghardaïa -

Présenté par : **Mr Ahmed BEKOUCHE**

Soutenu publiquement le : **30/11/2020**

Devant le jury composé de :

Mémoire dirigé par :

Mme AKLI Samia

Maître de conférences A, ENSA

Président :

M. DAOUDI Ali

Professeur, ENSA

Examineurs :

Mr ASSASSI Sami

Maître de conférences B, ENSA

2015/2020

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I - SUSTAINABILITY AND CHALLENGES OF FARMS

1.1. The concept of sustainability in the literature	6
1.1.1. Sustainable development and its origins.....	6
1.1.1.1. First claims	7
1.1.1.2. Birth of a concept.....	7
1.1.1.3. Various representations.....	8
1.1.2. Sustainable development in economic theory	10
1.1.2.1. Weak sustainability	10
1.1.2.2. Strong sustainability.....	10
1.2. Sustainable agriculture	11
1.2.1. Definitions	11
1.2.2. The multifunctionality of agriculture.....	14
1.3. Agricultural holdings and farming	16
1.3.1. Definition of the concept	16
1.3.2. Farming forms.....	18
1.3.3. Sustainable agricultural holdings.....	19

CHAPTER II - AGRICULTURAL SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

2.1. Assessing sustainability at farm-level	20
2.2. Hierarchical structure in sustainability assessment tools	21
2.3. Farm-level assessment Methods.....	22
2.3.1. Examples of methods of sustainability assessment	23
2.3.1.1. The IDEA method.....	23
2.3.1.2. Framework for Evaluating Sustainable Land Management (FESLM).....	25
2.3.1.3. Ecological Footprint (EF)	26
2.3.1.4. Sustainability Assessment of Farming and the Environment (SAFE).....	26
2.3.1.5. Response-Inducing Sustainability Evaluation (RISE)	27
2.3.1.6. The sustainable farm tree (TREE method).....	27

CHAPTER III - AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF SAHARAN AREAS

3.1. General presentation of Algerian Sahara.....	28
3.2. Natural resources	29
3.2.1. Soil resources.....	29
3.2.2. Water resources.....	32
3.2.2.1. Surface water resources.....	32
3.2.2.2. Groundwater resources.....	33
3.2.2.2.1. The Continental Intercalary.....	34
3.2.2.2.2. The Terminal Continental	35
3.3. Agricultural development of Saharan areas	35
3.3.1. Laws related to agricultural development of Saharan areas	36
3.3.1.1. Law on Access to Agricultural Land Property.....	36
3.3.1.2. law relating to the development of agricultural areas by concession.....	37
3.4. Current situation: strengths and weaknesses	38

CHAPTER IV - METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

4.1. Elaboration of the evaluation tool	42
4.1.1. Adaptation process.....	42
4.1.1.1. Components' adaptation.....	43
4.1.1.2. Indicators' adaptation.....	43
4.1.1.3. Elementary units' adaptation.....	45
4.1.1.3.1. Elementary units applicable without change.....	45
4.1.1.3.2. Elementary units that were reformulated	46
4.1.1.3.3. Selecting and removing sustainability units.....	48
4.1.1.3.4. The new added elementary units	49
4.1.2. Score adjustment for selected indicators	55
4.1.3. Testing the new method.....	56
4.2. Sampling and conducting surveys	56
4.3. Questionnaire.....	56
4.4. Data analysis.....	57

CHAPTER V - EMPIRIC ANALYSIS RESULTS

5.1. Characterisation of the surveyed farms	58
5.1.1. characteristics of farmers and their households.....	58
5.1.1.1. Age of Farmers.....	58
5.1.1.2. Origin and residence of farmers.....	58
5.1.1.3. Farmers' marital status and households	60

5.1.1.4. Level of education of farmers	60
5.1.1.5. Pluriactivity of Farmers.....	61
5.1.2. characteristics of the surveyed farms.....	62
5.1.2.1. Localisation	62
5.1.2.2. Legal status and origin of land of farms.....	62
5.1.2.3. Agricultural areas	63
5.1.3. Production system.....	64
5.1.3.1. Cropping systems	64
5.1.3.1.1. Cereal crops	65
5.1.3.1.2. Arboriculture	66
5.1.3.1.3. Market gardening and other crops.....	67
5.1.4. Breeding systems	68
5.1.4.1. Supply source	69
5.1.5. Irrigation techniques	70
5.1.6. The labour capital	70
5.2. Descriptive analysis of sustainability	72
5.2.1. Analysis of agro-ecological indicators	72
5.2.1.1. Analysing indicators of ‘Domestic diversity’ component	72
5.2.1.1.1. Diversity of annual and temporary crops (A1).....	72
5.2.1.1.2. Diversity of perennial crops (A2).....	72
5.2.1.1.3. Livestock diversity (A3).....	72
5.2.1.1.4. Valorisation and conservation of genetic resources (A4).....	73
Component of “domestic diversity”	73
5.2.1.2. Analysing indicators of ‘Space organisation’ component	74
5.2.1.2.1. Crop rotation (A5)	74
5.2.1.2.2. Size of plots (A6)	74
5.2.1.2.3. Organic matter management (A7).....	74
5.2.1.2.4. Ecological regulation zones (A8).....	74
5.2.1.2.5. Management of fodder areas (A9).....	75
Component of “Space organization”	75
5.2.1.3. Analysing indicators of ‘Farming practices’ component.....	76
5.2.1.3.1. Fertilization (A10).....	76
5.2.1.3.2. Liquid organic effluents (A11).....	76
5.2.1.3.3. Pesticides (A12)	76
5.2.1.3.4. Veterinary treatments (A13).....	76

5.2.1.3.5. Soil resources protection (A14).....	76
5.2.1.3.6. Water resource management (A15).....	77
5.2.1.3.7. Energy dependence (A16).....	77
Component of “Farming practices”.....	77
5.2.2. Analysis of socio-territorial indicators	78
5.2.2.1. Analysing indicators of ‘Quality product and territory’ component.....	78
5.2.2.1.1. Quality approach (B1).....	78
5.2.2.1.2. Enhancement of buildings and landscape heritage (B2)	78
5.2.2.1.3. Inorganic waste management (B3).....	78
5.2.2.1.4. Social involvement (B4).....	78
Component of “Quality of products and of territory”	79
5.2.2.2. Analysing indicators of ‘Employment and services’ component	79
5.2.2.2.1. Short trade (B5).....	79
5.2.2.2.2. Autonomy and development of local resources (B6).....	80
5.2.2.2.3. Services, multi-activities (B7).....	80
5.2.2.2.4. Employment contribution (B8)	80
5.2.2.2.5. Collective work (B9).....	80
5.2.2.2.6. Probable farm sustainability (B10).....	80
Component of “Employment and services”	81
5.2.2.3. Analysing indicators of ‘Ethics and human development’ component	81
5.2.2.3.1. Animal welfare (B11).....	81
5.2.2.3.2. Training (B12).....	81
5.2.2.3.3. Work intensity (B13).....	82
5.2.2.3.4. Quality of life (B14).....	82
5.2.2.3.5. Isolation (B15).....	82
5.2.2.3.6. Reception, hygiene and safety (B16).....	83
Component of ‘Ethics and human development’	83
5.2.3. Analysis of economic indicators.....	84
5.2.3.1. Analysing indicators of ‘Viability’ component.....	84
5.2.3.1.1. Economic viability (C1).....	84
5.2.3.1.2. Annual repayment capacity (C2).....	84
5.2.3.1.3. Structural debt ratio (C3).....	84
Component of ‘Viability’	84
5.2.3.2. Analysing indicators of ‘Independence’ component.....	85
5.2.3.2.1. Productive diversification(C4)	85

5.2.3.2.2. Commercial diversification (C5).....	86
5.2.3.2.3. Sensitivity to aids (C6).....	86
5.2.3.2.4. Contribution of external incomes (C7).....	86
Component of ‘Independence’	86
5.2.3.3. Analysing indicators of ‘Efficiency’ component	87
5.2.3.3.1. Global efficiency (C8).....	87
5.2.4. Analysis of sustainability scales	87
5.2.4.1. Agro-ecological scale.....	87
5.2.4.2. Socio-territorial scale	88
5.2.4.3. Economic scale.....	89
Conclusion	89
5.2.5. Total sustainability of the surveyed farms	90

CHAPTER VI - Discussion

6.1. Critical analyses of sustainability of the farms	93
6.1.1. Agro-ecological scale	93
6.1.2. Socio-territorial scale.....	95
6.1.3. Economic scale	96
6.2. Critical analysis of the method	97
6.2.1. Problems related to the construction of the indicator	98
6.2.1.1. Data reliability issues	98
6.2.1.2. Lack of regional and national references	99
6.2.1.3. The imprecise data	99
6.2.1.4. Indicators that are too rigid	99
6.2.1.5. A grid applicable to all production systems.....	100
6.2.2. Problems related to the allocation of points.....	100
Conclusion	100

CONCLUSION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABSTRACT

This work was carried out in the Ghardaïa region among 8 farms allocated within the framework of agricultural land development in its two forms (large and small development). It aims both to propose a multi-criteria evaluation tool inspired from the IDEA method in its third version for the existing production systems in the Ghardaïa region and to draw up paths for the sustainable development of Saharan agriculture. The sustainability analysis showed that the best performance was recorded at the economic scale, whereas the agroecological and socio-territorial scales are a limit for the sustainability of the large-scale development farms. On the other hand, the best performance for small-scale development is recorded at the agroecological scale and the economic scale is the limiting factor for sustainability. Therefore, the new method, abbreviated "IDEAG" has made it possible to judge the agro-ecological, socio-territorial and economic sustainability of the farms surveyed with the highlighting of practices to be improved in order to achieve a high level of sustainability. However, more improvements are needed in later studies.

Keywords: Sustainability, IDEA, adaptation, Ghardaïa, enhancement,

RÉSUMÉ

Ce travail d'enquête, mené dans la région de Ghardaïa auprès de 8 exploitations agricoles allouées dans le cadre de la mise valeur des terres agricoles dans ses deux forme – grande et petite mise en valeur -. Le présent travail vise à la fois de proposer un outil d'évaluation multicritère des systèmes de production existants dans la région de Ghardaïa inspiré de la méthode IDEA dans sa troisième version et de tracer des voies de développement durable de l'agriculture saharienne. L'analyse de la durabilité a montré que les meilleures performances ont été enregistrées par l'échelle économique alors que les échelles agroécologiques et socio-territoriale constituent une limite pour la durabilité des exploitations de la grande mise en valeur. Par contre les meilleures performances pour les exploitations de la petite mise en valeur sont enregistrées par les échelles agroécologiques et que l'échelle économique soit le facteur limitant de leur durabilité. Aussi, la nouvelle méthode, en abrégé "IDEAG", a permis de juger de la durabilité agroécologique, socio-territoriale et économique des exploitations enquêtées avec la mise en évidence des pratiques à améliorer pour atteindre un haut niveau de durabilité. Toutefois, des améliorations supplémentaires sont nécessaires dans les études ultérieures.

Mot Clés : Durabilité, IDEA, adaptation, Ghardaïa, mise en valeur,

ملخص

تم تنفيذ هذا العمل الاستقصائي في منطقة غرداية مع 8 مزارع من التي تم توزيعها في إطار سياسة استصلاح الأراضي الزراعية بشكليها (التنمية الكبرى والصغرى) ويهدف هذا العمل إلى اقتراح أداة تقييم متعددة المعايير لأنظمة الإنتاج الحالية في منطقة غرداية مستوحاة من طريقة IDEA في نسختها الثالثة كما يهدف الى تتبع مسارات التنمية المستدامة للزراعة الصحراوية. حيث أظهر تحليل الاستدامة أنه تم تسجيل أفضل أداء من خلال المقياس الاقتصادي بينما تشكل المقاييس الزراعية البيئية والاجتماعية الإقليمية عاملاً محددًا لاستدامة مزارع التنمية الكبيرة. من ناحية أخرى، تم تسجيل أفضل أداء للمزارع التنموية الصغيرة من خلال المقاييس الزراعية البيئية وأن النطاق الاقتصادي هو العامل المحدد لاستدامتها. أيضاً، أتاحت الطريقة الجديدة، والمختصرة "IDEAG"، الحكم على الاستدامة الزراعية البيئية والاجتماعية والإقليمية والاقتصادية للمزارع التي تم مسحها مع تحديد الممارسات التي يجب تحسينها لتحقيق مستوى عالٍ من الاستدامة. ومع ذلك، هناك حاجة إلى مزيد من التحسينات في الدراسات اللاحقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستدامة، IDEA ، التكيف، غرداية، استصلاح