

Article

Characterizing Agroecology in North Africa, a Review of 88 Sustainable Agriculture Projects

Mélanie Requier-Desjardins ^{1,2,*} , Olfa Boughamoura ^{3,4} and Elen Lemaître-Curri ⁴

¹ CIHEAM-IAMM, UMR SENS, F-34093 Montpellier, France

² SENS, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, F-34093 Montpellier, France

³ CERTOP, University of Toulouse le Mirail, F-31100 Toulouse, France

⁴ CIHEAM-IAMM, Univ Montpellier, F-34093 Montpellier, France; lemaître-curri@iamm.fr

* Correspondence: requier@iamm.fr

Abstract: Agroecology refers to the greening of agrosystems with the mobilization of ecosystem services in order to limit exogenous inputs, enhance biodiversity and moderate the exploitation of natural resources. Agroecological practices offer pathways for transformation and transition not only of agricultural systems but of entire food systems. Through its objectives, agroecology aims at both sustainable land management and the strengthening of the livelihoods of producers and rural people and thus contributes to the fight against desertification. Currently, there is little scientific literature on the characteristics of agroecology in the Maghreb region. Several studies provide important information but they do not allow drawing up a global panorama of agroecology in the region. The proposed article highlights general characteristics of agroecology in North Africa from a review of 88 sustainable agriculture projects, which it analyzes, through an inventory of agroecological practices supported by these projects, from the frameworks of the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, 2019, on the principles of agroecology and the transition levels approach developed by Gliessman and fellows since 2007. The results show (i) differences in the observed practices depending on the agrosystems and (ii) predominant common practices across these diverse agrosystems; (iii) significant evolution in these practices over time. The majority of the agroecological innovations identified are at the plot and farm scales, with the exception of those found in oasis and mountain agrosystems, where practices integrate the scales of the territory and value chains in a more complete way.

Keywords: agroecology; North Africa; agroecological practices; sustainable agriculture projects; agricultural transition



Citation: Requier-Desjardins, M.; Boughamoura, O.; Lemaître-Curri, E. Characterizing Agroecology in North Africa, a Review of 88 Sustainable Agriculture Projects. *Land* **2024**, *13*, 1457. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13091457>

Academic Editors: Hanoch Lavee and Ioannis N. Daliakopoulos

Received: 22 July 2024

Revised: 31 August 2024

Accepted: 2 September 2024

Published: 7 September 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the countries of the North African region, agriculture is often a pillar of development policies. It is, for example, the case of Egypt, Morocco and Algeria [1,2]. Depending on the country, between 20 and 45% of the population is rural, and agricultural activity employs 10 to 35% of the working population (data from [3,4]). The agricultural sector is characterized by the predominance of family farming, with many small- to medium-sized farms [5]. Locally, agro-climatic and demographic contexts, topography and water availability affect the occupation of space by agriculture as well as the types of production systems. In land systems, there are trends towards both land concentration [6,7] and land fragmentation [8,9].

The strong population growth and rapid increase in the urban population in recent decades [10] have led to sustained growth in the demand for food. The demand for food products has increased fivefold in the space of fifty years [11]. This increase in demand mainly concerns cereal products, vegetable oils, sugar plants and livestock feed, particularly oilcake.

To meet growing needs and limit food imports, particularly of cereals, agricultural production has been intensified in the region. In the wake of the Green Revolution, the use of chemical inputs has increased since the 1960s. Intensification has led to an increase in productivity per hectare, limited by a high variability in the yields of rainfed crops, which occupy the majority of agricultural areas in the region, with the exception of Egypt. Intensification has also resulted in excessive pressure on water resources, particularly underground and fossil resources, with the creation of irrigated perimeters and the multiplication of boreholes. Finally, intensification results in a significant degradation of soil resources, their erosion by the cultivation of marginal and unsuitable soils and their salinization by inappropriate irrigation practices.

The economic costs of desertification and land degradation are documented by a series of studies, including by the World Bank since the 2000s [12,13]. Those highlight losses in soil productivity linked to forms of erosion. The main causes, in terms of anthropogenic uses, are linked to overgrazing, marginal land cultivation and irrigation, but also to deforestation and the loss of fertile land linked to urban sprawl [14,15]. The average annual value of the economic losses generated, which in the early 2000s varied from 0.44% (Tunisia) to more than 1% of GDP (Algeria, Egypt), represents mainly the environmental cost of the growth of the primary sector based on the intensification and cultivation of new and more vulnerable land.

Recently, the challenges related to climate change in the region with a scarcity of rainfall and the multiplication of drought episodes [11] question the relevance of the conventional intensification path and may open the door to alternatives for the agricultural and rural future of the region, including the development and dissemination of agroecology. Agroecology refers to the greening of agrosystems with the mobilization of ecosystem services to limit exogenous inputs, enhance biodiversity, and moderate the exploitation of natural resources [16]. Agroecological practices, whether endogenous and/or introduced, offer pathways for transitioning and transforming agriculture and food systems towards sustainability.

The objective of this research is to identify the main agroecological practices in the region and their evolution in the last forty years. These practices are numerous, diversified and contextual, and the study chooses to approach them according to the major agrosystems of the North Africa region. An agrosystem is an ecosystem modified and controlled by humans and dedicated to the exercise of agriculture (crops, livestock, product exchanges, etc.). It is an agricultural unit that is coherent from a geographical and climatic point of view as well as from an agronomic and human point of view [17].

The available work on agroecology in North Africa [18–20], although growing in number, does not allow for a systematic treatment of the characteristics of agroecology in the region. This is why, in the absence of an empirical survey, the entry chosen to document this first state of agroecological practices and transition in North Africa is that of an analysis of development projects relating to sustainable agriculture.

At the regional level, the study leaves out pastoral and agropastoral systems. Livestock farming is considered here only from the point of view of its integration into agriculture. The diversity of agricultural systems is then approximated according to pedoclimatic characteristics, major land uses and demography [21]. Five main types of agrosystems are identified: cereal plains, arboreal mountains, oases and peri-urban areas, and a group of irrigated valleys and new developed land using groundwaters. A set of 88 sustainable agriculture projects is collected through a systematic web investigation to address the potential for agroecological transition in these agrosystems.

The first section introduces the notion of agroecological transition, exposes the main frameworks for analyzing this transition, and discusses them from the point of view of the types of sustainable agriculture and the characteristics of the region studied. The second section explains the methodology adopted for the selection and analysis of projects, presenting their diversity. In the third part, the results obtained are presented. The fourth part devel-

ops the main elements of discussion, resulting from the identification and characterization of the agroecological practices promoted by these sustainable agriculture projects.

Principles and Levels of Agroecological Transition, Types of Sustainable Agriculture

Agroecology, a concept that emerged in the 1930s, has become a holistic, multidisciplinary and multidimensional notion [22]. At the international level, the number of referenced publications in the field of agroecology has increased 10-fold in the space of 20 years [17]. Agroecology is at once a scientific discipline, a set of agricultural practices and a social movement [22,23]. It is presented as an agriculture able to support food systems that target the promotion of ecosystem services, regenerative use of natural resources, as well as economic diversification and social equity [24]. It is also qualified as a relevant adaptation in a context of worsening climate uncertainties [19]. Finally, it is perceived as a systemic transformation of the current conventional food system [25]. The conventional food system is defined by a combination of characteristics [26]: (i) rationalized and standardized production methods, detached from the constraints of natural environments and heavily using chemical inputs, (ii) globalized marketing circuits, (iii) sectors dominated by large agro-supply companies, agri-food and distribution and (iv) consumption patterns that are not concerned and/or aware of the conditions of production and marketing.

As a result, agroecology represents a paradigm shift for the entire agricultural and food chain, from producers and their suppliers to consumers. It involves changes in values and behaviors within societies and involves the development of new interactions [27]. These are environmental and ecological interactions between producers and their land and, more broadly, with the ecosystems that surround them. They are also human and social interactions between producers, researchers and more broadly agricultural expertise, as well as between producers and consumers, which makes it possible to design sustainable alternative food systems from farm to fork [28]. Thus, agroecology is a multidimensional process summarized in the expression “agroecological transition”.

This fundamental change is presented as a necessary process to guarantee food security: it is expressed at different scales and is based on ecological and social principles (or elements) [24,29]: ecological principles through the enhancement of natural production methods that promote inclusive and circular systems, by limiting chemical inputs and negative externalities [30]; and social principles through the valorization of local knowledge and contextualized knowledge and the promotion of participatory modes of governance in food systems [31]. According to Malassis L. [32], a food system is the way in which humans organize themselves in space and time to obtain and consume their food. This definition includes the consumer, of course, but also all actors in the food chain, not from farm to fork, but rather from plant or animal seed to molecules from waste treatment units.

This is reflected in the integration of the agricultural, environmental, socioeconomic, cultural and political dimensions [33].

The principles and elements listed by HLPE and FAO are summarized in Table 1. They make it possible to characterize the realities and potentials of agroecological transitions. The proposed categories do not directly address the political dimension of agroecology, except through the notion of responsible governance, and insist on the social and cultural dimensions of agroecology.

Table 1. Principles (HLPE) and elements (FAO) of agroecology and their scales of application.

	HLPE Principles (2019)	FAO Elements (2018)	Scales
	<i>Improve resource efficiency</i>		
1.	Recycling: Prioritizing the use of local renewable resources, as well as closing nutrient and biomass resource cycles as much as possible.	Recycling	FI, FA
2.	Reduction of inputs: Reducing or eliminating dependence on purchased inputs and increasing self-sufficiency.	Efficiency	FA, FO

Table 1. Cont.

	HLPE Principles (2019)	FAO Elements (2018)	Scales
<i>Building resilience</i>			
3.	Soil health: Securing and improving soil health and functioning to improve plant growth, in particular through the management of organic matter and improvement of the biological activity of the soil.		FIE
4.	Animal health: Ensuring the health and welfare of animals.		FI, FA
5.	Biodiversity: Maintaining and enhancing biodiversity is important for maintaining species diversity, functional diversity and genetic resources. This makes it possible to maintain the biodiversity of the agroecosystem in time and space, at different scales from the field to the farm and up to the landscape	(Part of) Diversity	FI, FA
6.	Synergy: Enhancing positive ecological interactions, synergy, integration and complementarity between elements of agroecosystems such as animals, crops, trees, soil and water.	Synergy	FI, FA
7.	Diversification: Diversification of the sources of income of smallholder farmers to ensure their financial independence and provide them with new opportunities to meet consumer demand. This also allows benefitting from additional opportunities to generate value.	(Part of) Diversity	FA, FO
<i>Ensuring fairness/social responsibility</i>			
8.	Co-creation: Improving collaboration and equality in knowledge sharing by involving local farmers and exchanges with scientific experts to foster local innovation.	Co-creation	FA, FO
9.	Social values and diets: Promoting food systems that respect the culture, identity, tradition, social and gender equity of local communities, thereby providing healthy, varied, seasonally and culturally appropriate diets.	Social and human values Food culture and traditions.	FA, FO
10.	Connectivity: Promoting proximity and trust between producers and consumers by promoting fair distribution and short networks and by reintegrating food systems into local economies.	Circular Economy and Solidarity	FA
11.	Justice: Supporting just and sustainable livelihoods for all actors in food systems, especially smallholder food producers, through fair trade, fair employment and the fair treatment of intellectual property rights.	Lead, Governance	FA, FO
12.	Land and Natural Resource Governance: Strengthening institutions to improve the sustainable management of natural and genetic resources, including recognition and support for family farmers, smallholders and rural food producers.	Lead, Governance	FA, FO
13.	Participation: Encouraging social organization and increased participation of food producers and consumers to support decentralized governance and local adaptive management of agriculture and food systems	Lead, Governance	FO

Clef/Keys: Scale of application: FI = field; FA = farm, agroecosystem; FO = food system. Source: From Wezel et al., 2020 [34].

Social principles (equity, social responsibility) appear to be the most numerous (six principles) along with those of resilience (building resilience, five principles). Two principles characterize the direct improvement of efficiency in the use of resources (recycling and reduction of inputs).

In reality, all of these principles integrate ecological and social dimensions: for example, the governance of land and natural resources has a direct impact on the ways in which resources are used, on their availability and ultimately on their quality. The principle of recycling has an ecological dimension (improving the use of resources by using collected rainwater, using crop or soil cover plant residues and certain non-conventional water previously analyzed or purified) but also a social dimension (recycling of equipment within the farm, commercial recovery of by-products, remobilization of know-how).

These principles all apply at the farm scale, with the exception of two of them: soil health applies at plot scale, and participation is mainly mobilized at the level of food value chains. Eight (8) principles ultimately apply at the scale of food systems: participation, governance of land and natural resources, justice, social values and diets, co-creation, diversity and reduction in inputs. These eight principles are also relevant for a territorial analysis of the transition.

The holistic model of transition [35] characterizes five levels of transition, each associated with major types of practices, mainly at the scales of plots, farms and value chains: efficiency level; substitution level; redesign level; reconceptualization level and sustainable global food system level. The process of transition is not linear: different levels of transition can coexist in space and time. The literature recognizes, for example, that the four main types of sustainable agriculture can fall within one or more of these levels of transition [28,36–39]. They insist on the passage from one level to another through the use of the term transition, but also on the coexistence of several levels. On the other hand, the question of possible antagonisms or conflicts between different levels or models is not addressed.

At the scale of the plot or farm, there are, according to Hill and MacRae [37], three levels of consecutive classification of practices that can guarantee agroecological transition: efficiency, substitution and redesign. These levels are presented below. They are related to different types of sustainable agriculture and discussed from a North African perspective.

The first level entitled “Efficiency” aims to improve the efficiency of conventional practices to reduce the use of inputs. In the literature, it is often based on the use of cutting-edge technologies or knowledge: pest monitoring for better use of pesticides, optimal use of fertilizers according to technical itineraries, efficient irrigation or micro-irrigation to reduce water and fertilizer consumption. These practices are part of the so-called “precision agriculture” to deal with the intra- and inter-plot heterogeneity of soil and crops by using new computer or spatial technologies [40]. In fact, any action that reduces the use of inputs and water without compromising production can be considered an efficiency practice. In North Africa, such practices exist without necessarily being part of precision agriculture: in fact, producers seek to minimize production costs and therefore to reduce the use of chemical inputs for primarily economic reasons. The spread of drip irrigation on irrigated farms, promoted by public policies in these countries, is also part of the efficiency effort. Efforts to reduce the use of pesticides through the careful management of pests, diseases and crop auxiliaries and the privileged use of a range of natural solutions (pest management or integrated pest management) also fall under this level. These integrated pest management techniques are promoted by FAO in North Africa through farmer field school approaches involving producers around practical field experiences.

The second level is the substitution of conventional practices that are harmful to the environment (because they pollute or consume resources) and chemical inputs. Conservation agriculture (CA) is a mode of agricultural production that can prevent the loss of arable land while regenerating the physical qualities and organic matter content of degraded land. It provides for the maintenance of permanent soil cover, minimum tillage and the diversification of cultivated plant species. This includes replacing tillage with no-till, rotations, and the permanent maintenance of vegetation cover [41]. While some CA practices are part of substitution, other farm-level approaches based on diversification show that this type of agriculture can also be part of the third level, that of redesign.

The third level, redesign, consists of a complete transformation of the agrosystem with fundamental changes in the design of the production system, mainly based on the recognition of ecosystem services. It aims to create integrated systems benefiting from diversification and biodiversity.

CA is often criticized for its use of herbicides to facilitate the management of weeds without tillage. However, recent developments in the CA model suggest replacing herbicides with shallow tillage if the climate is drying, as well as, for areas of cereals and perennial crops, the use of herd grazing. In North Africa, for example, the integration of livestock farming into the CA model shows that the CA farm can be part of a circular management and recycling model, which extends beyond substitution, towards redesign.

The investments required at the first two levels can be significant, particularly in terms of learning and equipment. CA systems may require on-farm investment and testing over several years, and result in temporary yield losses while the system is stabilized, e.g., during development and adaptation stages, to identify appropriate equipment and cover crops, construct soil permeability, etc. The levels of transition are thus part of a continuum of practices and associations of practices rather than fixed standalone modalities.

The redesign of agrosystems based on ecological processes extends beyond the farm and requires a broader understanding of the ecological and geographical context.

Integrated agriculture is an example of a production approach that integrates the farm into its natural environment. Resulting from the development of the systemic approach in agronomy [42], it establishes a general framework anchored in biological control (crop auxiliaries, crop associations, etc.) and in work on integrated crop protection for one part; on the other hand, it is based on the notion of integrated production, which designates a coherent set of practices at the service of agriculture and nature [43]: diversification, combination of agriculture and livestock, simplification of tillage, choice of varieties, reduction in chemical inputs, etc., but also the search for yield levels compatible with soil preservation. Integrated agriculture thus promotes product quality and the sustainability of agriculture. Finally, it recognizes the importance of agroecological infrastructures (hedges, low walls, etc.) on a scale that extends beyond the scale of the plot and depend on the topographical and ecological context of the farm. It values the complementarity of agricultural and natural areas, for example, in the case of agropastoralism.

Traditional forms of integrated agriculture are found in the Mediterranean region, particularly in mountain agrosystems and oases. Their characteristics are analyzed as adaptations to local constraints, for example, to climate variability, landlockedness, or to the seasonality of resources. The systems of tiered crops in the oases, or mountain agropastoralism, promote synergies and complementarities between crops, between agriculture and livestock, or between seasonal resource areas. These systems minimize the use of chemical inputs, often for economic reasons, and favor crop diversity both for food security objectives and soil protection or biological diversity. They have a territorial and collective dimension, in particular through water management, rangeland management or because they organize the transformation of agricultural production through the action of cooperatives. Despite those multiple benefits, this integrated agriculture in North Africa is often presented as a local heritage and more rarely as a model for redesigning existing systems.

Gliessman and Rosemeyer [35] introduced a fourth level of agroecological transition to reconceptualize food systems from farm to fork. The fourth level focuses on the links between producers and consumers and the changes introduced into local value chains to encourage local producers who are part of the agroecological transition (Levels 1, 2 and 3 previously described) and to ensure the availability and accessibility of healthy and quality products to consumers. This reconceptualization objective invites us to cross-reference research works that characterize the agroecology of farms with others that focus on local value chains, territorial food systems [10] as well as on (local) consumers. At this stage, the reconceptualization extends beyond the framework of the farm and that of the territory to encompass agroecological (quality) value chains, including value chains for organic agriculture oriented towards export or national markets. Studying the sustainability of value chains as well as food consumption patterns is necessary to improve the understanding of this level.

According to Migliorini and Wezel [33], organic farming advocates agroecological production practices: substitution practices (by replacing chemical inputs with organic

products and biopesticides) and redesign practices by enhancing synergies and fostering recycling (for example, between different plants, crops, crops and animal breeding and etc.). Organic agriculture is certified [44], aiming to remunerate environmental services provided by its producers. It is now the leading benchmark for a quality food system with global reach. Its commercial dimension and development lead to placing it on Level 4 of the agroecological transition according to Gliessman.

Finally, the fifth and final level of the transition aims to achieve sustainable global food systems based on equity, participation and justice, contributing to the conservation and restoration of agrosystems. This involves a change in our value and belief systems. This level is presented as the culmination of the transition and its ideal.

This approach to transition levels ultimately makes it possible to move from the scales of the plot and the farm to those of the territory and value chains. It makes it possible to rethink the main types of sustainable agriculture according to their agroecological characteristics based on an essentially ecological analysis of their agricultural practices in the natural environment (Levels 1 to 3) and then on the analysis of the food systems in which these types of agriculture are inserted (Levels 3 and 4). The approach of the levels of agroecological transition developed by Gliessman only reintegrates social issues into the most successful forms of transition, but it does not detail these issues.

The last stage envisages renewed agricultural spaces and sectors on a global scale, as the result of a global transformation, including in its socio-political dimensions. The plot-to-farm scales correspond to Levels 1 to 3 (reduction, substitution and redesign), while the land and project scales are more relevant to Levels 3 (natural environment) and 4 (local value chains).

Conversely, the FAO and HLPE agroecological approach includes from its first step the entire food system, including agricultural production systems, in their natural, human and economic components. It allows to question at the same time the agro-greening of agricultural and food practices. It integrates knowledge and the value of agricultural employment into the principles of co-creation and justice.

Both approaches are relevant for the analysis of contextual or territorial situations as well as for an analysis of agroecology in sustainable agriculture projects. Our objective here is to understand agroecological realities through the examination of a set of projects. The study therefore proposes to apply these two frameworks to a collection of pre-identified sustainable agriculture projects in North Africa.

2. Methodology

2.1. Identification of Projects

North Africa covers a great diversity of agro-climatic zones with very different agricultural production systems. Climatic and geographical contexts, and in particular access to water, as well as demographic and cultural contexts determine the main orientations on farms, such as the choice of dominant crops, the level of diversification and cultural and organizational practices. On this basis, five main types of agroecosystems were distinguished to organize the characterization of agroecological practices in the projects reviewed: oases, mountains, rainfed plains, irrigated valleys and peri-urban agroecosystems.

The projects were reviewed through keyword searches on the websites of major development cooperation organizations and research centers known for their interest in agroecology, as well as websites of major operators such as NGOs in the beneficiary countries. As the search for the term agroecology only identified 8 projects, the list of keywords finally used was extended to include sustainable agriculture projects (in the broad sense). It is presented in Box 1. Table A1 in the Appendix A presents the list of the 88 investigated projects.

Box 1. List and combination of keywords used to identify relevant projects.

Agroecology, sustainable agriculture, conservation agriculture, organic farming, integrated agriculture, precision agriculture, agricultural adaptation to climate change, ingenious heritage systems, quality agriculture, conservation of natural resources, sustainable water management, water and soil conservation, family farming, traditional agriculture, rehabilitation of oases, fight against desertification.

Combination of keywords: Agricultural development, local, territorial, WITH mountain agriculture, oases, plains, peri-urban, irrigated valleys and agricultural development, local, territorial WITH field crops, arboriculture, agroforestry, arboricultural orchards, vegetable crops

The material that was collected about the projects encompasses the project website information, sometimes project reports and all other available related material from the internet; sometimes it includes information from the project coordinating entity. Figure 1 synthesizes the main steps and the methodology of this research.




Figure 1. Study methodology.

Two rules were applied to build our sample: (i) the necessity to obtain an equivalent panel of projects for each type of agrosystem in order to build a quantified inventory of the types of practices promoted by the agrosystem, whether those practices are introduced or strengthened; (ii) to collect relevant projects over a long period of time to identify practices and to analyze their evolution over time.

The projects were collected randomly and they are heterogeneous in terms of nature, size, volume of funding and operators. Several projects cover multiple countries and some the entire North African region, while others focus on a specific site (pilot farm, territory). Most of them are the result of international cooperation, but there are also national agricultural development projects carried out by the ministries of agriculture of each country. A number of them are led by civil society organizations. Finally, it is also worth noting the presence of national, regional and international scientific projects involving a variety of research organizations in the field of agronomy.

A set of 88 projects was finally identified over a 45-year period from 1977 to 2022. A total of 67 projects were classified by agrosystems with unequal representation (Table 2) and the original objective to have equivalent panels for each agrosystem was not reached, impeding a quantified analysis of these projects' agroecological practices. A total of 20 projects concerned oases, 13 were connected to non-irrigated cereal plains and 12 described peri-urban sites. Only 3 projects were identified for mountain agrosystems, while 19 projects focused either on irrigated valleys or agricultural areas irrigated by groundwater (outside oases) in Egypt and elsewhere.

Table 2. Projects by agrosystem.

Sustainable Agriculture Projects (Number of Projects Identified)						Total
Rainfed Cereal Plains	Mountain	Oasis	Peri-Urban	Nile Valley and Other Irrigated Areas (Excluding Oases)	Cross-Cutting Projects	
13	3	20	12	19	21	88

Of the remaining 21 cross-cutting projects that could not be related to a specific agrosystem, 8 referred to agroecology in their objectives or approach and 7 dealt with the adaptation of agriculture and rural territories to climate change. The 8 cross-cutting projects that target agroecology were among the most recent in our sample. The first dates from 2016 (a project led by civil society on seeds), the others are research and development projects implemented from 2021 and often ongoing: they test crop associations in agroforestry (e.g., olive trees, cereals, fodder and citrus fruits/aromatic plants), explicitly place themselves in a biodiversity objective or are part of agroecological approaches at territorial scale (rural development) and develop applied training for the benefit of producers (academic and vocational training). Most of these projects are implemented in Morocco. It is interesting to note that water resources issues do not appear or appear marginally in the summary and the website of these projects.

The 7 projects that entered agroecology from the point of view of adaptation to climate change mainly dealt with seeds, varieties and cultivars resistant to water stress (improvement, testing, preservation), as well as territorial vulnerability (flooding, marine submersion).

For the remaining 6 projects, 2 were interested in the development and dissemination of integrated farm models, with the aim of efficiently managing water and energy (high-tech precision agriculture and use of photovoltaic renewable energies). Finally, 2 projects targeted the development of the organic farming sector and 2 were training projects in precision agriculture.

These data finally led us to a descriptive analysis of practices by type of agrosystem, which can illustrate transition levels and principles of agroecology.

2.2. Qualitative Presentation of the Sample by Agrosystem

For the projects that could be classified by type of agrosystem, the following elements stand out.

In the rainfed cereal plains, conservation agriculture characterized by no-till and minimum tillage is at the heart of the projects identified to preserve land against erosion and desertification, sustainably manage water resources and reduce working hours.

The set of projects on irrigated crop production is divided into two: on the one hand are projects taking place in the Nile Valley and on the other are those concerning irrigated areas (outside oases) from groundwater in Tunisia, Morocco and Egypt. These projects share a common central concern around water resources: to ensure a rationalization of water use and to limit its pollution by chemical inputs. Thus, the projects identified are mainly based on precision agriculture (technical dimension) combined with institutional water management (organizational dimension): they ultimately deal in a rather marginal way with the issue of the ecology of agricultural practices.

In peri-urban areas where the challenge is to ensure food security for nearby cities, the projects first developed precision practices in irrigated areas. They have evolved and propose practices with a higher level of agroecological transition by emphasizing the development and management of plots (rotations, intercropping, agroforestry, windbreaks), the integration of livestock farming (recycling, diversification) as well as the organization and promotion of short circuits.

In the mountains and oases (24 projects), projects focus on the conservation of specific agro-biodiversity as well as the promotion and sustainable territorial development of integrated agriculture for certification purposes, particularly in organic farming. In these territories, to cope with pedoclimatic conditions and diversify economic incomes, several endogenous practices are used: under cropping, agroforestry, equitable sharing of water by seguias and integration of livestock farming with crop production [45]. It has been possible to identify projects that promote these agrosystems by strengthening local and inherited know-how, sometimes by mobilizing international labels such as the Ingenious Systems of Agriculture (FAO) or the Intangible Cultural Heritage (UNESCO).

2.3. Analysis of Practices

To constitute a collection of practices to be analyzed by type of agrosystem, we carried out a systematic listing of the actions and practices encountered in the projects through an Excel qualitative grid. The structure of this grid was evolutive with a systematic focus on agroecological practices: in a first stage, the projects were the entry point, classified by country, and in the second stage, the information was made available per agrosystem.

The project information made it possible to first note which principles of agroecology were present in this collection for each agrosystem.

The practices collected were then analyzed from the point of view of the levels of transition: they were classified according to (i) their efficiency, substitution or redesign meaning, (ii) their scales, plot/farm, territory and last, value chain. Territory and value chain scales were used to address the reconceptualization level (e.g., reconceptualize food systems from farm to fork or Level 4 of the transition). Finally, a chronological approach to the implementation of the different practices was also developed (Figure 1).

3. Results

3.1. Analysis of Projects by Agrosystem According to the Principles of the HLPE

The projects identified were first analyzed from the point of view of their degree of consideration of the principles of the HLPE (Table 3).

Table 3. The principles of HLPE by agrosystem, priorities in the projects studied.

	Cereal Plains	Irrigated Valleys	Mountains	Oasis	Peri-Urban
<i>Improve resource efficiency</i>					
Recycling	+	+	++	++	++
Reduction of chemical inputs	+	++	+	+	++
<i>Resilience</i>					
Soil health	++	+	++	+	+
Animal Health *					
Biodiversity		+	++	++	+
Synergies	+	+	++	++	+
Diversification	+	+	++	++	++

Table 3. Cont.

	Cereal Plains	Irrigated Valleys	Mountains	Oasis	Peri-Urban
<i>Social responsibility</i>					
Co-creation of knowledge	+	+	++	++	++
Social values and diets			+	+	+
Connectivity			+	+	+
Justice					
Land and Natural Resource Governance		+			
Participation	+	+	+	+	+

*: not dealt with in this analysis, which relates to mainly agricultural projects; +: relevant; ++: quite relevant.

The principles of resource efficiency and especially those associated with resilience (soil health, synergies and diversification criteria) are more represented in all agrosystems than the principles of social responsibility.

The criteria of justice and governance of natural resources are rarely addressed. The governance of natural resources refers to collective action allowing the proper management of these resources. Several precision agriculture projects are based on the creation and strengthening of water user associations. Feedback on these experiences remains mixed, with many governance structures not having survived the end of the project. As projects focused on livestock farming were not retained in our sample, the question of common pastures and their management, which is central to the governance of natural resources, does not appear. As for the criterion of justice, it is mainly linked to the nature of the projects: some sustainable agricultural development projects are intended to fight against rural poverty and are based on the idea of social justice (or equity), others are based on a gender approach and aimed at integrating women producers and promoting their practices and knowledge in quality value chains.

It is difficult to assess the criteria of participation and co-creation of knowledge in relation to agrosystems. Participation does indeed appear in most of the projects over the last thirty years, but it is impossible to know, from the information collected, how this principle is implemented. Many projects of the last decade consider local knowledge and the co-construction of more resilient systems are interrelated.

Finally, Table 3 below highlights those projects in oases and mountain agrosystems that apply the most complete and diversified set of principles in terms of resilience, resource efficiency, and even social responsibility. The territorial dimension, which is explicit among those projects, certainly contributes to this particularity.

3.2. Main Practices Encountered by Agrosystem, by Level of Transition and Scale

Table 4 below summarizes all the practices encountered by an agrosystem. It differentiates practices according to the three levels of transition centered on the plot and farm (Levels 1 to 3). Then, it differentiates between practices at the level of the value chain and those relating to the territory (collective development and capacity building).

From Table 4, the following conclusions can be drawn.

In cereal systems and irrigated valleys, the projects mostly introduced practices to improve input efficiency at the plot level (Level 1) mainly through the establishment of water-efficient irrigation systems and input reduction, as well as substitution practices (Level 2) to replace intensive cultivation methods (e.g., practices such as ploughing, which erode the soil), with combinations of resource-conserving practices (rotation, no-till, cover crops).

Table 4. Inventory of agroecological practices by agrosystem, according to the levels of transitions and scale-ups *.

Agrosystems	Plot/Farm		Scaling up Territory/Food System		
	Efficiency	Substitution	Redesign (Including through the Adoption/Integration of “Traditional” Practices)	Value Chains: Reconnecting with Consumers	Territory: Developments and Actors’ Networks
Rainfed cereal plains	Rational use of pesticides	<i>No-till</i> <i>Crop rotation</i> <i>Permanent Coverage</i>	Integration of crops and livestock activities Mulch, manure		<i>Creation of producer associations</i> <i>Training and extension</i> Advisory services Fertilization agreement between landless herders and cereal farmers Regional networking of project stakeholders and capitalization Efforts to build or adapt agricultural equipment locally (in particular for no-till seeding)
	Integrated pest management	Introduction (or reintroduction) of pulses into rotations			
Irrigated valleys	<i>Drip</i> <i>Supplemental irrigation</i>	Crop associations (and intercropping) <i>Crop rotation (forage species in rotations)</i>	Crop diversification: association of medicinal and aromatic plants Agroforestry	Creation of associations for the promotion of production (access to the market)	Landscaping: land levelling (raised beds, clay amendment, soil restoration) to facilitate the reuse of runoff water downstream of irrigated fields (drainage) <i>Creation and strengthening of user associations for local water management</i>
	Rational and localized use of pesticides	Manure incorporation	Dry rice		
	Integrated pest management	Biological control. Crop auxiliaries: Monitoring and account, Use of biopesticides, sulphur and microbial fungicides, Bait and insect traps.	Integration of crops and livestock activities Adaptation of the crop calendar for livestock feed	Development of short value chains and digital marketing	Introduction of water accounting Farmer field school, training and extension (good cultural practices, post-harvest conservation)
	Reuse of runoff water (drainage)				
		Cover: mulch	Beekeeping (integrated into crop production)		

Table 4. Cont.

Agrosystems	Plot/Farm		Scaling up Territory/Food System		
	Efficiency	Substitution	Redesign (Including through the Adoption/Integration of “Traditional” Practices)	Value Chains: Reconnecting with Consumers	Territory: Developments and Actors’ Networks
Peri-urban		Crop rotation Crop auxiliaries Manual weed management	<i>Crop associations</i> <i>Intercropping</i> <i>Relay cultures</i>	Short value chains: direct sales at the farm, contracts between producers and consumers, food hubs	Farmer field school, experimental farms Structuring cooperatives Participation in fairs, regional events
	<i>Drip irrigation</i> Rational use of pesticides	Use of manure Use of crop residues, liquid organic fertilizer, soil amendment	Grass strips around the plots Multi-purpose hedges Agroforestry	Local, national and international labelling: Valorization of medicinal and aromatic plants and dairy products Agrotourism	
	Integrated pest management	Biological control Manufacture of natural inputs, biopesticides	Integrated breeding Breeding/production of local varieties and seeds		
	Windbreaks	Reuse of treated non-conventional water (phyto-purification, etc.)	Crops on mounds, vegetable gardens on roofs		
Mountains	Rational and localized use of pesticides	Manufacture of natural inputs, biopesticides Crop combination: arboriculture, vegetable crops and legumes	<i>Agroforestry</i> : gardens, orchards (arboriculture and forest trees) Terraced crops	Organic labelling Valorization of aromatic and medicinal plant products	Landscaping: terraced crops, gardens, orchards Promotion and development of women associations and cooperatives Training in good practices Organization of events, festivals around local products
	Integrated pest management	Use of manure Use of auxiliary plants as natural repellents	<i>Integrated livestock farming</i> Medicinal and aromatic plants (wild and cultivated) Beekeeping Selection of local varieties and seeds	Local labelling: Valorization of dairy products Short value chains Direct sale at the farm	

Table 4. Cont.

Agrosystems	Plot/Farm		Scaling up Territory/Food System		
	Efficiency	Substitution	Redesign (Including through the Adoption/Integration of “Traditional” Practices)	Value Chains: Reconnecting with Consumers	Territory: Developments and Actors’ Networks
Oasis		No tillage		<i>Organic labelling</i>	Landscaping: construction of bunds (flood water retention basin), banks and terraces, revegetation of banks and sandy areas, management of peri oasisian rangelands
	Rational and localized use of pesticides	Biological and non-chemical pest control (coarse salt, ash, lime, forage cabbage)	<i>Multi-layer cropping</i>	<i>Local and international labelling</i>	
	Integrated pest management	Rotation: introduction of alfalfa and corn (to feed animals and enhance soil protection)	Diversification of crop varieties (palm groves) and management of local seeds	Valorization of date by-products (paste, vinegar, etc.)	Rehabilitation of traditional irrigation systems and reorganization of the water turns
	Drip irrigation		<i>Integrated livestock farming</i>	Tables d’hôte and short platforms (=digital marketing)	Reuse of non-conventional water
	Windbreak	<i>Composting, use of manure</i>	Beekeeping	Valorization of aromatic and medicinal plant products	Creation of training centres (composting, etc.).
		Cover: mulch	Fertilization by dry palms and alluvium		<i>Strengthening the socio-economic and solidarity structures of rural women</i>
			Reuse of poor-quality dates (livestock feed)	Valorization of agri-food products such as dairy products, jams (processing), etc.	Consolidation of the Oasis’ sustainable development associative networks

Key: main practices are set in grad italic font. *: Practices using solar energy (especially for pumping), but also hydroponics and aquaponics, although present in some projects, were not ultimately retained as agroecological practices.

In mountains and oases, the reviewed projects seek to maintain, disseminate, strengthen and improve traditional practices for resilient systems (Level 3). They are based on the integration of crops and livestock, the recycling of biomass, the limitation of inputs and the synergy between crop layers (protection), between productions (agricultural calendars), or through specific crops and landscaping at the edge of the plot and on slopes (crop auxiliaries, erosion control).

In peri-urban systems, practices have evolved from projects aimed mainly at improving the input efficiency (Level 1) to projects focused on the preservation of endogenous practices and their combinations (Levels 2 and 3).

Finally, in mountain areas, oases and more recently peri-urban systems, projects include many practices for structuring local value chains. These value chains are also national and export-oriented in the case of oases and mountains, with organic farming labels (Level 4).

The changes observed over 40 years can be detailed by an agrosystem and at different scales, highlighting both the practices observed and improved; agronomic practices, but also other regarding landscaping (the edges of plots in particular) were recorded, as well as practices related to the development of agroecological value chains.

3.3. Evolution of Practices in the Identified Projects and Levels of Transition

The agroecological practices were identified in chronological order in relation to the project implementation periods. Several phases of introduction and strengthening of agroecological practices can be distinguished, indicating different levels of transition and different scales of intervention and dissemination.

3.3.1. In the Rainfed Cereal Plains

As mentioned above, conservation agriculture (CA) with the combination of “no-till, rotation, permanent cover crops” practices were introduced in the 1980s by public policies supported by ICARDA on large farms. The development of these practices encountered several obstacles: at the plot level, weed management led to a significant use of chemical herbicides, and at the territorial level to the exclusion and marginalization of the majority of small and medium-sized farmers that make up for most of the agrarian landscape of the region. Indeed, for farmers with an area of less than 100 hectares, these practices (especially no-till) remained costly given the high price of the planter. As a result, small producers did not have access to this critical equipment. The complicated use and settings of these planters also pose a problem of adoption. Finally, this first generation of direct seeders is generally not adapted to the size of the farms and the organization of small-farm production, which involves, for example, cultivating between olive trees.

During the 2000s, associations were developed for the collective management of seeders made available by public agricultural structures (participation). Alternative practices to direct seeding were also introduced, through simplified cultivation technique not involving turning the soil.

After 2010, CA actors increased their initiatives with smallholder farmers and integrated new complementary practices to address some of the recurring barriers such as overgrazing and unsuccessful grazing. Precision seed drills are also appearing in the region. The new CA guidelines are based on the promotion of the following practices, some of which pre-existed in family cereal systems and are part of the redesign (Level 3): in particular the principles of synergy and diversification.

- Integration of livestock and crop production: synergy, diversification;
- Permanent living vegetation cover, e.g., alfalfa: synergy, diversification;
- Introduction of forage mixtures in rotations: diversification;
- Adaptation of direct seeders to small areas.

At the research level, in 2018 and 2019, three scientific projects funded by the PRIMA program specify these improvements through

- The introduction of new permanent plant cover such as camelina as a “cash crop” (trials by ICARDA, ARVALIS, INRAT, CAMELINA, etc.) synergy (Level 3);
- Stubble Pasture Management for Integrated Livestock Management: diversification (Level 3);
- Management of low-input weeds in response to the massive use of herbicides such as glyphosate through the integration of integrated agriculture practices: selection of legume varieties (vetches, balansa clover, field peas, pea and fava beans), mixture of legumes and cereals, replacement of weed shoots by annual forage legumes and annual legumes (summer grazing) (testing techniques by ICARDA, INGC INAT [Tunisia], IAV HASSAN II [Morocco], Justus Liebig Giessen University [Germany]: efficiency (Level 1);
- The development of innovative methods related to precision agriculture to carry out a “diagchamp” diagnosis in order to analyze the nitrogen residue, model the maximum potential of the plot and propose appropriate technical itinerary [ARVALIS] efficiency (Level 1).

Some of these experimentations are hampered by recent recurrent droughts and heat waves, which make it difficult to maintain permanent vegetation cover. Climatic conditions therefore delay or compromise certain project trials.

3.3.2. In the Irrigated Valleys and the New Irrigated Perimeters of the Arid Zones

As early as the 1970s, some agricultural projects supported targeted practices:

- Agricultural Household Economic Development and Diversification Projects (1970–2010).

These projects promoted an integrated agriculture approach (FAO, MTT Agrifood Research Finland) corresponding to Level 3 of the agroecological transition. These projects, which remained pilot, presented a model of support for small-scale agriculture through research. The practices supported combined crop diversification, particularly through cash crops, and the association of livestock in production systems. These projects also introduced a territorial dimension of collective animation of innovative farmers in a network by developing the approach of farmer field schools, particularly in Egypt (Ismalia, Kafr el Cheikh).

- Projects to modernize and rationalize irrigation in the valleys (1977–2014).

The management of the Nile’s water resources occupies a prominent place in the projects because of the alarming situation (sea level rise, pollution of the Nile and conflicts of use). These projects aim to introduce new practices that consume less water. These practices replace flood irrigation, which consists of pumping water in the Nile and distributing large quantities of water through canals to flood the land, without assessing losses through infiltration and evapotranspiration [46]. In addition to overconsumption, flood irrigation has led to social conflicts linked to the inequitable supply of water between the head and tail of a mesqa (tertiary canal). Issues are also associated to lack of maintenance of collective irrigation infrastructure [46].

Public authorities have clearly identified the need for improvement. This is evidenced by several national strategies, including the Egyptian Water Use and Management Project (EWUMP) (1977), the National Strategy for the Multiple Reuse of Drainage Water (1993) and the Irrigation Improvement Programme (1993). Policymakers since the time of Nasser have also shown their willingness to conquer the desert and develop agriculture in arid regions. This desire has given rise to the spread of new techniques, sometimes described as modern or hybrid, such as drip irrigation or sprinkling, made possible by land development and drilling equipment, often exploiting deep or fossil aquifers.

Several projects have been developed by international cooperation actors—FAO, French Agency for Development, World Bank, etc.)—to support these political orientations. The practices introduced at the plot and territory levels belong to precision agriculture (Beheira Governorate in Egypt) and apply technological innovations to increase the efficiency of inputs and water management (Level 1 of the agroecological transition).

In addition to these practices, the projects introduced several interventions at the territorial level for capacity building through the training of farmers.

- Projects to reduce agricultural pollution (2004–2018).

The intensification of irrigated agriculture in the Nile Valley has led to the massive use of pesticides, which is the leading cause of pollution of the Nile waters [47]. Several international actors, such as FAO with the project “Regional Integrated Pest Management programme in the Near East” (Kafr El-Zaya, Ismailia), the Agricultural Research Center of Egypt and the MTT Agrifood Research of Finland, have developed integrated pest management practices, both in precision agriculture and in the substitution of chemical control methods by biological or mechanical approaches [48].

“For FAO 2020, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is defined as the consideration of all available control techniques and the integration of appropriate measures that discourage the development of pest populations and keep pesticides and other interventions at economically justified levels and reduce or minimize risks to human health and the environment” (ref. [49] cited in Deguine et al., 2021, p. 3, [50]). The techniques are usually tailored to specific pests. For example, Egypt has been part of FAO’s programme to control Fall armyworm through integrated pest management methods since 2021. In this particular case, approaches aim at testing pheromone-based traps and baits and supporting research (particularly in entomology) to identify natural enemies. These practices use agroecological principles such as synergy (resilience principle), efficiency and substitution, positioning themselves near Level 3 of agroecological transition (redesign).

Other practices are being introduced to reduce pollution from burning straw from rice cultivation, for example, by incorporating stubble and straw into the soil, using it in the form of mulch, recycling it into agrofuel, composting it or using it in animal feed. These recycling practices (circularity principle) and synergies correspond to Level 3 of the agroecological transition (redesign).

- Projects developed between 2016 and 2021.

During this period, 10 new projects were identified, including 3 scientific projects funded by the European Union’s PRIMA and Horizon 2020 programmes. These projects have pursued the objectives of previous projects, namely to reduce the use of pesticides, to develop integrated pest management, to modernize irrigation systems, to improve water efficiency and to promote the economic development of agriculture [51]. However, the approach has changed towards greater multidisciplinary and multidimensionality through the development of practices at the level of value chains and territories, including certification and the development of short value chains, at Level 4 of the agroecological transition (reconceptualization).

3.3.3. In Peri-Urban Areas

In North Africa, rural society has rapidly evolved into an urban society, with the expansion of cities and urbanized areas. This urbanization led to a considerable decrease in the agricultural land that supplied city dwellers. In the countries of the region, agriculture is mainly considered by politicians as a rural issue and the place of agriculture in urban planning (urban agriculture) is not a subject of attention.

According to Chattou and Abdellaoui [52] (p. 22), peri-urban agriculture “... is found on the outskirts of the city, regardless of the nature of these production systems. This agriculture may just be adjunct to the city, or it may maintain reciprocal functional links”. According to the FAO, peri-urban agriculture remains a solution to ensure food security and the resilience of urban food systems [53]. Peri-urban agriculture often focuses on the production of fruits and vegetables, as well as aromatic and medicinal plants. It also produces a wide variety of crops and animals, as well as non-food plants. Alongside the critical question of access to land in a context of urban pressure, access to water is also a strategic factor for the development of this agriculture on the outskirts of cities.

In the Maghreb, peri-urban agriculture has therefore been the subject of several programmes to rationalize water resources and modernize irrigation. Drip irrigation (ILvel 1) was introduced in the 1980s and 1990s [20,54].

Some peri-urban areas of intensive monoculture exist (e.g., with onion cultivation around Meknes). Other peri-urban systems rely on integrated agriculture with crop associations combining arboriculture, cereal production and market gardening. Although these systems have sometimes recently introduced drip irrigation, lots of them are also based on endogenous agroecological practices such as developing and maintaining green belts, combining orchards (olive, almond, lemon, etc.) and cereal fields (Arianna, Monastir, Fez, Meknes, Algiers, Oran, etc.), supported by the VIANA project (CIRAD). The strategies currently developed by some peri-urban farmers combine the practices of integrated agriculture (intercropping, use of windbreaks, integrated livestock farming) and more precise agriculture based on observation: diversification of phytosanitary products to limit the appearance of resistance, use of manual weeding as a substitute for chemical treatments to limit the reappearance of weeds [19]. These practices correspond to the three levels of agroecological transition: efficiency, substitution, redesign.

After the 2000s, practices went beyond the scale of the plot and the farm. Recent projects attach great importance to the territorial level through the development of agri-tourism activities (Fez, Meknes), support to associations of farmers, environment and sustainable development awareness raising, etc.

At the level of the value chain, an effort to develop and enhance the value chains through labelling appeared in the early 2000s with the development of short value chains, processing and direct sales on farms after 2010(level 4 reconceptualization). These agroecological practices were mainly introduced by donors (European Union, FAO) in support of civil society.

3.3.4. In the Mountains

The mountains on the southern Mediterranean shore are mainly mountains of low and medium altitude (500–1500 m), with some massifs reaching 4000 m. These areas with a forest vocation are mainly covered of matorrals (scrubland) and degraded forest formations. The clearings and meadows are agrosilvopastoral areas combining the cultivation of cereals, fruit trees, livestock farming and forest species. Mountain agriculture is an example of integrated agriculture combining agriculture, livestock and forestry, although these activities sometimes compete with each other.

These areas have a specific local, territorial and peasant agricultural richness and bear witness to local ingenuity and know-how that consist in adapting family farming to difficult pedoclimatic conditions. A key agroecological practice is terraced cultivation, which protect the slopes, retains the soil and facilitates the infiltration of rainwater. It is associated with agroforestry, integrated livestock farming and traditional beekeeping. We identified few projects (three) operating in these areas. They are based on practices stemming from local farmers' know-how and seek to strengthen them, particularly from a territorial and value chain perspective with the objectives of promoting agricultural products originated from the mountains since the 2000s. The promotion of agricultural products from mountain areas involves organic labelling, improved processing, as well as the organization of collective events aimed at mobilizing associative actors and small farmers. At the plot level, the

projects identified aim to develop and manage terraces sustainably as well as to promote wild plants in integrated pest management (a fairly recent practice). All three projects show the existence of type 3 and 4 transition levels (redesign and reconceptualization).

3.3.5. In the Oases

The oases are agro-socio-cultural entities that bear witness to ancestral know-how and local ingenuity to overcome difficulties associated to the harshness of the climate and environment. Agriculture in the desertic areas is made possible by local water sources and the knowledge of local communities. These human-shaped landscapes bear witness to the interaction between humans, the desert and their environment, they are cultivated spaces and domesticated ecosystems [55]. Agricultural practices are based on the mobilization and sharing of water (gravity and groundwater) and on a highly integrated agriculture with a system of mixed multilayer cropping integrated into livestock farming [56].

For several scientists, institutions or networks such as RADDO (Network of Associations for the Sustainable Development of Oases), these spaces represent a true agroecological example that meets agroecological several principles: biodiversity, synergy, efficiency and recycling. Several combinations of ancestral practices are considered agroecological: with the addition of organic amendment for soil fertility, rational water management, the association of multiple layer cropping, the selection of local seeds, etc. Traditionally, farmers use little chemical inputs, which are very expensive for small-scale family farmers. Given their territorial and ecological importance, oases have been at the heart of several initiatives, involving public institutions, civil society and international organizations to preserve these territories facing anthropogenic and climatic threats, to ensure their economic, social and food sustainability and improvement. These projects aim in particular to remedy unsustainable agricultural intensification, combining monoculture, excessive ploughing, massive use of chemical inputs, etc., through actions to rehabilitate traditional irrigation systems, combat soil degradation and desertification, as well as some actions to strengthen integrated agricultural practices based on local know-how and enhance the value of oasis products. Combinations of practices associating the scales of the plot, the territory and the value chain can be identified in oases doing organic farming. Since the early 2000s, organic farming has been at the heart of projects to promote oasis agricultural products, particularly dates, carried out by public, private and international institutions.

The rehabilitation of irrigation systems has also evolved, with the introduction of drip irrigation for crops that are grown in palm groves and the promotion of the use of solar energy by several NGOs and associations, such as the association “Les Amis du Palmier” for the development and strengthening of capacities and adaptation to climate change, ASOC in Tunisia, or CARI in several North African countries. These projects highlight the strengthening of innovative or ancestral biological control practices, with the use of fodder cabbage, coarse salt and ash.

Over the period of 2000–2010, several practices at the territorial level were developed to strengthen the value of oases, including practices that bring farmers closer to consumers and diversify activities associated with agriculture, such as agritourism and “table d’hôtes”. These practices are developed by local associations in the Maghreb countries. The development of specialized value chains is also supported by cooperatives: cheese, honey, aromatic and medicinal plants (PAMs) and even vinegar to promote poor quality dates impacted by severe droughts.

Finally, over the period of 2010–2020, actions at the territorial level were developed to conserve and preserve these territories for and with the local population: raising awareness among farmers to strengthen their knowledge and technicalities, but also among the inhabitants, through environmental and sustainable development education, particularly for school children. This awareness-raising effort emphasizes the importance of oases and illustrates it.

Thanks to the development of associative networks, a real dynamic was established in these territories where we can also observe regional and interregional exchange projects

at the scale of North Africa (Associative Network for the Sustainable Development of Oases, RADD0). Finally, the diversity of the projects studied shows that the transition levels sought out are variable, from the search for efficiency and synergy (Level 2) to the integration of phoenicicultural products into value chains (Level 4)

4. Discussion and Limitations

This systematic exploration of agroecological practices implemented through projects in different agrosystems in North Africa shows that there is great diversity as well as different levels of transition depending on the project. The territorial dimension and that of collective value chains also emerge from this inventory of practices. However, the exploration of these 88 projects provides insight on only a very limited portion of agricultural land in North Africa and ignores major trends such as Saharan agriculture (in Egypt and Algeria), which is not very economical in inputs.

The methodological choice to study agroecology from project perspective is a constraint for the analysis because this survey, based only on projects that are often pilot, concern restricted areas of implementation. It does not inform on the importance nor on the wider dissemination of identified practices. It is then difficult to conclude on the relative importance of these practices in the region.

However, many practices are common to all agrosystems: diversification in particular, but also rotations, integration of agriculture and livestock, and to a lesser extent agroforestry. It is then all the more reasonable to believe that these are the practices that are most common in the region as they are also traditional.

Thanks to the combination of the transition model (Gliessman) and the principles of agroecology (HLPE, FAO), we were able to work both on practices that are broadly related to landscaping and sustainable land management (SLM) and on agroecological practices that concern plot and farm scales and irrigation. This interlocking of practices throughout different scales introduces the need for a geographical, territorial and collective joint interpretation of these practices.

The collective and organizational dimension of practices is present in each agrosystem, for example, though the management of seeders in conservation agriculture, water management in valleys and irrigated areas of arid zones and oases, but also, in some cases, with processing, certification and marketing.

Water has a central dimension: as a scarce resource, it is systematically the subject of resource-saving practices in projects on irrigated systems. It is also present in rainwater and mixed system projects, where the challenge is to maintain the soil (against erosion) and its moisture (through biodiversity), or even to retain water (collection systems). The diversity of projects and agrosystems does not allow for a clearer typology of water-related issues and practices in agroecology.

Irrigation systems remain diversified, in particular because of the geographical particularities of the agrosystems, even if the use of drip irrigation is mentioned quite systematically. Collective land developments at the farm level and more broadly at the territorial level are present, particularly in oases, mountains and irrigated valleys with water and soil conservation actions, such as the construction of bunds, terraces or the levelling of cropland. At the family and farm level, the vegetation of the edges of plots is mainly mentioned for oasis projects, peri-urban projects and in irrigated valleys (hedges, windbreaks or crops on the edge of plots intended to promote auxiliaries or edibles).

The analysis entry by practices and levels of transition (Gliessman) emphasizes, above all, agronomic dimensions, and finally, apart from participation, which is a principle and an omnipresent mode of action of the projects studied, few social principles of agroecology (HLPE) are present: social and food values and connectivity are nevertheless noted in Level 4 projects, as well as the co-creation of innovations and knowledge, particularly in demonstration projects such as farmer field schools. The case of mountain and oasis systems, which best meet these principles, shows that the economic valorization of these inherited integrated practices, via certification, is possible and requires a collective recog-

inition of these practices as local heritage. Peri-urban agrosystem projects that combine agroecology and agrotourism are also close to the idea of a natural and cultural heritage to be valued as a green belt around cities. This development of recreational agrotourism on the outskirts of certain cities invites politicians to take agricultural heritage into account in urban land development.

In our sample, the practices inventoried are both inherited or improved practices and practices introduced or disseminated by the projects. The fact that many of these practices are rooted in local history leads, based on the model of the levels of transition, to the conclusion that an agroecology redesigning conventional agriculture is based on the local agricultural heritage, involving the cultural dimensions of the principles and elements of agroecology (HLPE, FAO).

Collective recognition of agroecology, whether political or social, remains in an embryonic state [51]. In agricultural circles and among the majority of farmers, the use of chemical inputs is socially valued compared to the use of alternative practices [19]. However, the systematic minimization of production costs in the majority of cases leads *de facto* to moderate use, due to a lack of resources, thus responding to the principle of efficiency, by default. Consumers are poorly informed about the benefits of agroecological products, political administrations are unfamiliar with this notion, and national research and education institutes lack incentives to explore agroecological models that are adapted or adaptable locally [51].

The participation of women in the projects is not visible at the scale of our sample. Many projects have an inclusive approach, but few projects, apart from some located in oasis and mountain agrosystems, target female beneficiaries. Similarly, the pluriactive dimension of agroecological farms is never mentioned in the projects (principle of diversification).

In the sample studied, it is civil society actors who appear to be the most advanced in their knowledge of the agroecological transition, as they are often the driving force behind the Level 4 (reconceptualization) projects in the sample.

When applied to the North African region, the transition model questions the issue of food security at the redesign stage (Level 3), but invites also to review this point in the reconceptualization stage (Level 4) especially when taking into account the importance of self-consumption in the majority of agricultural households [57]. This dimension of self-consumption responds to several principles of the HLPE: synergy, diversification, biodiversity, social and food values. It also invites to mobilize the notions of autonomy and health (nutrition, human well-being). Finally, it highlights an importance of agroecology in North Africa to face the fast-rising challenges of food security in terms of nutritional balance in the region, with diseases associated to dietary imbalance becoming a major public health concern.

The reconceptualization stage (Level 4) questions the territorial or even national dimension of exchanges through agroecological value chains and their contribution to food sovereignty objectives. This is a crucial issue for countries that import nearly half or more of their cereal needs.

Finally, reviewing the social issues addressed in the two analytical grids, labor, a major factor, appears to be missing. The issue of employment and work in agroecology is never mentioned in the projects. It does not appear directly in the agroecological transition model. From the point of view of principles, this point refers mainly to justice, a principle that is largely absent from the data available on the projects studied. It also refers to the principle of co-creation. Agroecology is skills-intensive; it also requires, at least in some cases, a stronger manpower and a way of organizing work different from conventional systems. In the studied region, literature and mobilization dedicated to agroecology does not, for the moment, shed light on this labor dimension, which is only addressed in projects at the scales of territories and value chains (development, governance).

5. Conclusions

Following the identification and cross-analysis of projects that have introduced new agroecological practices (in rainfed cereal plains, irrigated valleys, peri-urban areas) or strengthened pre-existing agroecological practices (in mountains, oases, peri-urban areas), we conclude that occasional situations of agroecological transitions exist in all agrosystems, even if the dominant production system and the one that attracts the majority of public efforts remains intensive agriculture. The two analytical grids used are complementary to understand the evolution of agroecological practices resulting from sustainable agriculture projects in North Africa.

In the region, agroecological practices are very active in agrosystems characterized by aridity or natural vulnerability. The main common practices are diversification practices, but also rotations, the integration of agriculture and livestock, and to a lesser extent agroforestry. These practices were introduced or strengthened by sustainable agriculture projects and correspond to Gliessman Levels 1 to 4 of the agroecological transition. The analysis clearly highlights that there have been significant changes in the practices and approaches promoted by projects over time. Projects are moving towards supporting diversified combinations of practices related to agroecology, but also to the fight against desertification, practices that are both technical and organizational, sometimes combining traditional knowledge, local innovation and advanced technologies, indicating locally high potentials for agroecological transition (Levels 3 and 4 of the transition model). These practices are anchored not only at plot and farm scales but increasingly at territorial scale and value chain level through collective action.

This regional particularity has so far aroused little interest from politicians. This richness and potential are not socially recognized either, beyond associative circles present in several countries, often driven by urban consumers. Indeed, the mobilization of civil society organizations, their actions on the field and advocacy highlight the social and societal aspects of the transition (the notions of equity, social justice and participation) and defend the place and recognition of family farming in the implementation of the transition. This recognition of a North African agroecological heritage (or capital) necessarily require consumer awareness, but also that of decision-makers.

Finally, field evaluation work is needed to measure the degree and conditions of adoption of agroecological practices by farmers and, above all, to assess their multi-scalar impacts, mainly in socio-economic and socio-environmental terms. Such objectives are those of the Horizon Europe NATAE project funded by the European Union. NATAE project was developed based in the analysis presented in this paper.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization and methodology: M.R.-D. and E.L.-C.; Investigation (projects collection): O.B.; Formal analysis: O.B. and M.R.-D.; Validation: M.R.-D. and E.L.-C.; Original draft preparation: O.B.; Writing: M.R.-D.; Review and editing: M.R.-D., E.L.-C. and O.B.; Research supervision: M.R.-D.; Funding acquisition: E.L.-C., M.R.-D. and O.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF-EO) under the INTENSICIF programme DREO 6460 and by the European Union under the Grant Agreement No. 101084647.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: The authors acknowledge all partners involved in NATAE project, and locally in the project Living Labs, they share their thanks for their contribution, efforts and knowledge in the process of this reflection. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or of the AUF-EO.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. List of studied projects.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
1.	Projet SIPAM: Systèmes oasiens des Ghout de Oued Souf	2011–Now	Algeria	FAO	https://www.fao.org/giahs/giahsaroundtheworld/designated-sites/near-east-and-north-africa/ghout-system/fr/ Consultedonline 15 August 2021	Oasis
2.	Pour un développement local durable des oasis du sud algérien	2016–2019	Algeria	EU	https://www.eeas.europa.eu/node/42677_en Consulted online 6 September 2021	Oasis
3.	Installation d’une ferme pilote de Sersour pour le semis direct	2006–2009	Algeria	ITGC	https://om.ciheam.org/om/pdf/a96/00801427.pdf Consultedonline 11 September 2021	Cereal Plain
4.	Conservation agriculture in north Africa CANA	2012–2015	Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia	ACIAR	https://agrinatura-eu.eu/news/the-conservation-agriculture-for-north-africa-cana-project/ Consultedonline 5 October 2021	Cereal Plain
5.	Integrated crop livestock conservation agriculture for sustainable intensification of cereal based systems CLCA	2013–2015	Algeria, Tunisia	IFAD CIMMYTICARDA	https://mel.cgiar.org/uploads/reporting/T6cd9veKcy-IFAD%20CLCA%20Progress%20report-2013%20to%202014.pdf Consultedonline 5 September 2021	Cereal Plain
6.	Reconversion vers l’agriculture biologique dans la région de Ziban		Algeria	Algerian state	https://www.cahiersagricultures.fr/articles/cagri/pdf/2017/03/cagri160183.pdf Consultedonline 20 October 2021	Oasis
7.	New Curricula in Precision Agriculture Using GIS Technologies and Sensing Data CUPAGIS	2018–2021	Algeria	EU	https://www.univ-mosta.dz/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Invitation-to-Tender_CUPAGIS_12.10.2020.pdf Consultedonline 26 October 2021	Transversal
8.	Integrated agri-aquaculture in desert and arid lands: FAO Regional Initiative on Water Scarcity	2015–2019 and 2010–2019	Algeria, Egypt	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/67ca9d4a-83cc-4e9b-aa09-fefbccf904f7/content Consultedonline 8 September 2021	Irrigated

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
9.	Renforcer les systèmes d'innovation agricole et rurale dans les zones oasiennes et arides du Maghreb MASSIRE	2019–2022	Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia	IFAD	https://massire.net/ Consultedonline 8 September 2021	Oasis
10.	A sustainable mixed cropping-beekeeping system in the Mediterranean basin	2019–2021	Algeria Egypt, Morocco	EU PRIMA	https://www.plant-b.net/ Consultedonline 15 October 2021	Transversal
11.	Fruit crops adaptation to climate change in the Mediterranean basin FREECLIMB	2019–2021	Algeria, Morocco	EU PRIMA	https://www.plant-b.net/ Consulted online 15 October 2021	Transversal
12.	Aménagement d'une Ferme agroécologique à Douera	Since 2020	Algeria	Torba	Personal communication	Peri-urban
13.	Regional integrated pest management IPM program in the near east	2004–2011	Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/d8016120-6dd3-4f08-944e-3b9c574c7059/content Consultedonline 25 October 2021	Irrigated
14.	Plateformes multi acteurs: comité Scientifique et Technique Eau Agricole COSTEA	2013–2022	Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia	AFD	https://www.comite-costea.fr/ Consultedonline 15 September 2021	Peri-urban
15.	Conserveterra towards conservation agriculture in the Mediterranean area	2020–2024	Morocco, Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://conserveterra.org/ Consulted online 6 September 2021	Cereal plain
16.	Boost ecosystem services through high Biodiversity-based Mediterranean Farming Systems: Biodiversity	2020–2023	Algeria, Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://www1.montpellier.inra.fr/wp-inra/biodiversify/ Consultedonline 8 November 2021	Transversal
17.	Regional project on water efficiency, productivity and sustainability (WEP SERNE)	2017–2020	Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia	FAO	https://www.fao.org/in-action/water-efficiency-rena/overview/en/ Consultedonline 4 November 2021	Irrigated
18.	HubIS Open innovation Hub for Irrigation Systems in Mediterranean agriculture	2019–2020	Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://prima-hubis.org/ Consultedonline 8 November 2021	Irrigated

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
19.	Gestion durable des agro-écosystèmes de l'oasis de Kharga	2019–2021	Egypt	GEF	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/a55cf175-434c-4d26-8f0d-9db3c26cd4d6/content Consultedonline 28 August 2021	Oasis
20.	Dynamic conservation plan for Siwa as an agricultural heritage site	2016–Now	Egypt	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/bdbb8b53-a477-4326-b603-ae98bf184d4e/content Consultedonline 5 November 2021	Oasis
21.	Sustainable Transformation for Agricultural Resilience in Upper Egypt	2019–2023	Egypt	IFAD	https://www.ifad.org/documents/38711624/41463031/Egypt+2000002202+STAR+Project+Design+MissionJune+-+July+2019.pdf/54852255-d8bf-0204-c13e-f3d6af8c2f52?t=1588264253000 Consultedonline 5 November 2021	Irrigated
22.	Sustainable Agriculture Investments and Livelihoods Project (SAIL)	2014–2023	Egypt	IFAD	https://www.ifad.org/documents/38711624/40089492/Design+completion+report.pdf/4b0ad8e2-56da-ca91-9119-434a8bc143b4?t=1590773407000 Consultedonline 5 November 2021	Irrigated
23.	Sustainable intensification of food production through resilient farming systems in West and North Africa SustInAfrica	2018–2021	Egypt, Tunisia	UE H2020	https://sustinafrica.com/ Consultedonline 6 September 2021	Irrigated
24.	Towards a sustainable water use in Mediterranean rice-based agro-ecosystems MEDAWATERICE	2019–2023	Egypt	EU Prima	https://www.medwaterice.org/ Consultedonline 9 November 2021	Irrigated
25.	Capacity building in Land Management and Soil Productivity (Fertility through Farmers Field Schools, FFS)	2004–2005	Egypt	FAO	https://www.fao.org/egypt/programmes-and-projects/ffs-sail Consultedonline 25 November 2021	Transversal

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
26.	Intensification and diversification of agricultural systems	2006–2009	Egypt	FAO		Transversal
27.	Bonnes pratiques agricoles pour l'amélioration durable de la qualité et de la quantité de la production horticole des petits agriculteurs du Fayoum	2017–2019	Egypt	EU	https://www.iamm.ciheam.org/ress_doc/opac_css/doc_num.php?explnum_id=18175 Consulted online 5 September 2021	Irrigated
28.	Scaling up Good Agricultural Practices in the Governorate of Fayoum	2017–2020	Egypt	EU	https://www.fao.org/egypt/programmes-and-projects/gap-fayoum/en/ Consulted online 5 September 2021	Irrigated
29	Real-time smart irrigation management at multiple stakeholders' levels SMARTIES	2020–2023	Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://www.smarties.polimi.it/#~:text=The%20SMARTIES%20system%20will%20be,under%20seasonal%20forecast%20conditions%20supporting Consulted online 9 November 2021	Irrigated
30.	Conservation de la biodiversité et la gestion adaptative des systèmes ingénieurs du patrimoine agricole au Maroc	2017–2019	Morocco, Tunisia	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/3578 Consulted online 15 August 2021	Oasis
31.	Observatoire de l'agroécologie au Maroc	2018–now	Morocco, Tunisia	AFD	https://www.ird.fr/observatoire-de-lagroecologie-au-maroc Consulted online 20 September 2021	Peri-urban
32.	Projet pilote: développement d'un système participatif de garantie (SPG)	2018–2019	Morocco	AFD	https://reseauriam.org/systeme-participatif-de-garantie-spg/ Consulted online 20 September 2021	Peri-urban
33.	Installation d'une ferme expérimentale en agroforesterie	2006–2015	Morocco	Initiatives climat	http://www.initiativesclimat.org/Toutes-les-initiatives/Ferme-experimentale-en-agroforesterie Consulted online 6 August 2021	Oasis

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
34.	Food for change “KERZ AYEDANEK”	2018–2019	Morocco	Initiatives climat	http://www.initiativesclimat.org/Toutes-les-initiatives/Food-For-Change Consulted online 6 August 2021	Mountains
35.	Barachoua un village durable et résilient grâce à la permaculture	2013–2017	Morocco	PNUD	http://www.initiativesclimat.org/Toutes-les-initiatives/Un-village-durable-et-resilient-grace-a-la-permaculture?uri=/Toutes-les-initiatives?tags=0&dates=0&query=%252Foffset%252F0&offset=10 Consulted online 6 August 2021	Mountains
36.	Projet de Gestion conservatoire des eaux et des sols dans les oasis	2014–2017	Morocco	(PMF/FEM)	http://www.initiativesclimat.org/Les-laureats/Gestion-conservatoire-des-eaux-et-des-sols-et-reboisement Consulted online 6 August 2021	Oasis
37.	Femme semencière MOUAMAR NOURELHOUDA	2010–2020	Morocco	ONU Femmes	http://www.initiativesclimat.org/Porteurs-d-initiatives/MOUAMAR-Nourelhouda Consulted online 7 August 2021	Peri-urban
38.	Conservation des Sols et Sécurité Alimentaire: une préoccupation commune pour les agricultures paysannes du Mali et du Maroc	2010–2013	Morocco	AFD	https://act-africa.org/assets/file/0169_20141103_agriculture_de_conservation_au_maroc_et_au_mali.pdf Consulted online 17 September 2021	Cereal plain
39.	Projet de multiplication des semences locales (Ouriaguel)	2016–now	Morocco	Private	Personal communication	Transversal
40.	Lutte contre la désertification et lutte contre la pauvreté par la sauvegarde et la valorisation des oasis	2006–2011	Morocco	PNUD	https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/MAR/ProDoc_POT.pdf Consulted online 4 August 2021	Oasis
41.	Swani Tiqa		Morocco		https://www.cariassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/13_Avaclim-Factsheet_Maroc_Swani-Tiqa_VVF_CARI.pdf Consulted online 8 October 2021	Peri-urban

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
42.	Dar Bouazza		Morocco		https://www.cariassociation.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/14_Avaclim-Factsheet_Maroc_THLe-jardin-pedagogique-de-Dar-Bouazza-V01_CARI.pdf Consulted online 8 October 2021	Peri-urban
43.	Flahty bla dwa		Morocco		https://www.hellorganic.com/listing/flahti-bla-dwa/ Consulted online 4 August 2021	Peri-urban
44.	Expérimentation et sensibilisation à l'agroécologie pour les étudiants et les producteurs de la région (équipe de recherche AGREE)	2017–2019	Morocco	Milan Pact	https://letsfoodideas.com/fr/initiative/ecole-nationale-dagriculture-de-meknes-experimentation-et-sensibilisation-a-lagroecologie-pour-les-etudiants-et-les-producteurs-de-la-region-equipe-de-recherche-agree/ Consultedonline 18 October 2021	Transversal
45.	Forêt comestible: aménagement des oasis		Morocco		Personal communication	Oasis
46.	AgricultuRE urbaine: végétalisation de la ville de Fes en potager		Morocco		https://letsfoodideas.com/fr/initiative/un-potager-sur-le-toit-de-la-medina-de-fes-lexemple-de-bonnie-kaplan/ Consultedonline 5 August 2021	Peri-urban
47.	Programme de revitalisation des territoires ruraux marocains par l'emploi des initiatives économiques locales dans le secteur agricole au Maroc (TREEA)	2020–2025	Morocco	AFD UE	https://www.agriculture.gov.ma/index.php/fr/focus/programme-mapmdrefafd-ue-dappui-la-strategie-agricole-marocaine-generation-green Consultedonline 5 August 2021	Transversal
48.	FOODLAND: Alimentation et Diversité Locale, Agricole et Nutritionnelle	2020–2024	Morocco, Tunisia	EU H2020	https://foodland-africa.eu/ Consultedonline 2 December 2021	Peri-urban
49.	Réhabilitation des oasis de Taldnounte	2002–2004	Morocco	ALCESDAM	https://revue-sesame-inrae.fr/meme-les-oiseaux-sont-de-retour/ Consultedonline 11 August 2021	Oasis

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
50.	Avacim value agroecology for drylands	2020–2022	Morocco	GEF and FFEM	https://avaclim.org/en/home/ Consultedonline 8 October 2021	Transversal
51.	Novel approaches to promote the SUSTAINability of OLIVE groves in theMediterranean	2018–2021	Morocco, Tunisia	EU Prima	https://sustainolive.eu/ Consultedonline 10 November 2021	Transversal
52.	Adapting Mediterranean Vegetable Cops to Climate Change-induced Multiple Stress/VEG-ADAPT	2019–2023	Morocco	EU Prima	https://www.veg-adapt.unito.it/ Consultedonline 10 November 2021	Transversal
53.	Optimising Subsidiary Crop Applications in Rotations OSCARS	2012–2016	Morocco	EU H2020	https://cordis.europa.eu/docs/results/289/289277/final1-final-report-complete.pdf Consulted online 10 November 2021	Cereal plain
54.	Adapting Mediterranean Orchards—science-based design of resilient fruit tree portfolios for the Mediterranean region Adamedor	2020–2023	Morocco, Tunisia	EU Prima	https://mel.cgiar.org/projects/adamedor Consultedonline 15 November 2021	Transversal
55.	Programme d’actions concertées des oasis (PACO) au Maghreb et en zone saharienne	2008–2020	Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Mauritania	AFD	https://www.raddo.org/content/download/21424/457392/version/2/file/PACO4%202.pdf Consultedonline 10 November 2021	Oasis
56.	Projet d’initiative locale concertée pour le développement durable des oasis des communes d’Atar et de Tawaz (PICODEV)	2018–2022	Mauritania	EU and AFD	https://www.raddo.org/content/download/21354/456624/version/4/file/PICODEV%202.pdf Consulted online 8 October 2021	Oasis
57.	Gestion Adaptative et Suivi des systèmes oasiens au Maghreb (GASSOM)	2017–2019	Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia	GEF	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/7ac977c5-9260-4672-8851-a6285cc4690d/content Consultedonline 4 August 2021	Oasis
58.	Territoires Engagés pour la Résilience des Oasis (TERO)	2018–2020	Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia	EU	https://www.raddo.org/content/download/21355/456649/version/3/file/TERO%202.pdf Consultedonline 9 October 2021	Oasis

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
59.	Mauritanie: les défis d'une production agricole locale	2012–now	Mauritania	CSFI	https://www.cfsi.asso.fr/projet/mauritanie-defis-dune-production-agricole-locale/#presentation Consultedonline 17 October 2021	Irrigated
60.	projet de développement durable des oasis: Aménagement d'une palmeraie	2007	Mauritania	FADES	https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/documents/projects/tes/3379-terminal-evaluation.pdf Consultedonline 18 October 2021	Oasis
61.	Réduction des polluants organiques persistants (POP) dans les fleuves Niger et Sénégal	2009	Mauritania	FEM and PNUE	https://www.fao.org/agriculture/ippm/projects/mauritania/fr/ Consultedonline 17 October 2021	Irrigated
62.	Initiative pour l'amélioration de la production de riz en Afrique de l'Ouest	2010–2013	Mauritania	FAO	https://www.fao.org/agriculture/ippm/projects/regional/gcp-raf-453-spa/fr/#:~:text=L%E2%80%99initiative%20s%E2%80%99est%20concentr%C3%A9e,un%20riz%20de%20haute%20qualit%C3%A9. Consulted online 18 October 2021	Irrigated
63.	Appui à la culture maraîchère en Mauritanie	2015–2017	Mauritania	FAO	ms/106ec63c-5f14-4ad6-a3cb-03774bc525d0/content Consulted online 17 October 2021	Peri-urban
64.	Programme de renforcement de la résilience des communautés urbaines et rurales vulnérables en Mauritanie SAFIRE	2019–2023	Mauritania	EU	https://procasur.org/fr/projet-safire-securite-alimentaire-formation-insertion-resilience-emploi-mauritanie-2/#:~:text=Route%20R%C3%A9gionale%20d%E2%80%99apprentissage%20G5,au%20changement%20climatique%20en%20Mauritanie. Consulted online 18 October 2021	Peri-urban
65.	Conservation et Gestion Adaptative des Systèmes Ingénieux du Patrimoine Agricole Mondial: système pilote: oasis historique de Gafsa	2012–2014	Tunisia	FAO and GEF and PNUD	https://openknowledge.fao.org/bitstreams/1d9f5775-b860-4c24-a612-777bbe6192fd/download Consultedonline 15 August 2021	Oasis

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
66.	Le système ingénieux des jardins suspendus de “Djebba el Olia”: Un système agroforestier de montagne	2020	Tunisia	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/43868eb6-2186-475f-8cf7-3bcfc09f57df/content Consulted online 15 August 2021	Mountains
67.	« Systèmes cultureux en ramli dans les lagunes de Ghar El Melh, Tunisie »	2020	Tunisia	FAO	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/e36634b2-110a-45ee-aa53-8518e211c9a4/content Consulted online 15 August 2021	Transversal
68.	Réhabilitation des oasis de Chenini (1997–1998); (2000–2001); (2009–2011); (2012–2014)	1997–2014	Tunisia	GEF PNUD	https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/7ac977c5-9260-4672-8851-a6285cc4690d/content Consulted online 3 August 2021	Oasis
69.	Projet d’Appui au Développement de l’Agriculture de Conservation PADAC	2002–2004	Tunisia	FFEM, then AFD	https://www.fert.fr/v2/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/ETUDE-SD-TUNISIE_Fert_Oct-2016-.pdf Consulted online 5 September 2021	Cereal plain
70.	Projet de développement agricole intégré dans le gouvernorat de Siliana	1995–2005	Tunisia	IFAD	https://www.ifad.org/fr/-/document/president-s-report-projet-de-developpement-agricole-integre-dans-le-gouvernorat-de-siliana Consulted online 5 September 2021	Cereal plain
71.	Organic Ecosystem « Renforcement de l’écosystème biologique transfrontalier en renforçant les alliances agro-alimentaires »	2019–2022	Tunisia	EU	http://www.enicbcmmed.eu/projects/organic-ecosystem Consulted online 5 September 2021	Transversal
72.	Research-based participatory approaches for adopting Conservation Agriculture in the Mediterranean Area (CAMA)	2019–2023	Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco	EU PRIMA	http://www.camamed.eu/ Consulted online 15 October 2021	Cereal plain

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
73.	Camelina: a Cash Cover Crop Enhancing water and soil conservation in MEDiterranean dry-farming systems	2020–2023	Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco	EU PRIMA	https://www.4cemed.eu/accueil/ Consulted online 15 October 2021	Cereal plain
74.	PAPS—Eau, Agriculture de Conservation en pluvial	2015–2018	Tunisia	EU	EU report—personal communication	Cereal plain
75.	PAPS—Eau, Itinéraire technique pour une céréaliculture biosaline durable au Sud-Est tunisien	2016–2018	Tunisia	EU	EU report—personal communication	Cereal plain
76.	PAPS—Eau, Renforcement de l’agriculture pluviale au travers les techniques et les ouvrages de CES	2016–2018	Tunisia	EU	EU report—personal communication	Cereal plain
77.	GreenPalm: Development of sustainable date palm-based agro systems by preserving their biodiversity	2020–2023	Tunisia	EU H2020	https://www.era-learn.eu/network-information/networks/prima/section-2-call-2019-multi-topic/development-of-sustainable-date-palm-based-agro-systems-by-preserving-their-biodiversity Consultedonline 15 November 2021	Oasis
78.	Vulnerabilities and adaptive capacities of Irrigated Agriculture in North Africa VIANA	2018–2021	Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco	ERA-Net ARIMNet	https://viana.cirad.fr/en/presentation Consultedonline 23 September 2021	Irrigated
79.	Programme d’adaptation au changement climatique des territoires ruraux	2018–2024	Tunisia	AFD FFEM	https://sites.google.com/site/pactegrntrvcctunisie/ Consultedonline 23 September 2021	Transversal
80.	SUPROMED: Sustainable production in water limited environments of mediterranean agro-ecosystem	2019–2022	Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://www.supromed.eu/ Consulted online 15 October 2021	Irrigated
81.	Boomerang: Healthier bio-fortified Mediterranean grains	2019–2022	Algeria, Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://library.wur.nl/WebQuery/leap4fnssa-projects/178 Consultedonline 15 October 2021	Transversal

Table A1. Cont.

-	Projects Name	Period	Countries Beneficiaries	Donors	Reference: Website/Project Report/Scientific Paper	Agrosystem
82.	Milk quality all along the dairy chain for a sustainable milk	2019–2022	Tunisia	EU PRIMA	https://milkqua.e Consultedonline 15 October 2021	Transversal
83.	Developing and managing floodplains in a context of global change	2019–2022	Morocco	AFD COSTEA	Personal communication	Transversal
84.	Knowledge Hub for Organic Agriculture in North Africa	2019–2023	Egypt, Tunisia	BMZ	https://sekem.com/en/about/international-projects/knowledge-hub-for-organic-agriculture-north-africa/ Consultedonline 11 September 2021	Transversal
85.	Water Policy Reform Project (WPRP)	1997–2002	Egypt	USAID	https://om.ciheam.org/om/pdf/b48/05002288.pdf Consultedonline 11 December 2021	Irrigated
86.	Irrigation improvement project	1985–1988	Egypt	USAID	https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDAAS672.pdf Consultedonline 2 October 2021	Irrigated
87.	Water use and management project	1977–1984	Egypt	USAID	https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnaas853.pdf Consultedonline 2 October 2021	Irrigated
88.	Efficient use and management of conventional and non-conventional water resources through smart technologies applied to improve the quality and safety of Mediterranean agriculture in semi-arid areas WATERMED 4.0	2019–2022	Algeria	EU PRIMA	https://www.watermed-project.eu/ Consultedonline 17 October 2021	Transversal

References

1. Akesbi, N. L'agriculture marocaine, entre les contraintes de la dépendance alimentaire et les exigences de la régulation sociale. *Maghreb Machrek* **2013**, *215*, 31–56. [CrossRef]
2. Aboul-Naga, A.; Siddik, I.; Megahed, W.; Salah, E.; Ahmed, S.; Nageeb, R.; Yassin, D.; Abdelzaher, M.; Marzin, J.; Bonnet, P.; et al. *Study on Small-Scale Family Farming in the Near East and North Africa Region. Focus Country: Egypt*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2017; p. 132. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/fr/c/471489/> (accessed on 3 November 2021).
3. FAO. AQUASTAT—Système D'Information Mondial de la FAO Sur L'Eau et L'Agriculture; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2021. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/aquastat/> (accessed on 22 August 2021).
4. World Bank. *Les Données Ouvertes de la Banque Mondiale*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2022. Available online: <https://donnees.banquemondiale.org/> (accessed on 8 January 2022).
5. Bessaoud, O.; Ton Nu, C.; Jouili, M.; Mkacher, S.; Guesmi, A.; Impiglia, A. *Étude Sur L'Agriculture Familiale à Petite Echelle au Proche-Orient et Afrique du Nord. Pays Focus: Tunisie*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2017; p. 58. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/471939/> (accessed on 15 December 2021).
6. Jouili, M.; Kahouli, I.; Elloumi, M. Appropriation des ressources hydrauliques et processus d'exclusion dans la région de Sidi Bouzid (Tunisie centrale). *Études Rural.* **2013**, *192*, 117–134. [CrossRef]
7. Ameur, F.; Kuper, M.; Dugué, P. L'exploitation des eaux souterraines dans le Saiss: La course que certains abandonnent. *Altern. Rural.* **2018**, 1–13. [CrossRef]
8. Marzin, J.; Bonnet, P.; Bessaoud, O.; Ton Nu, C. *Etude sur L'Agriculture Familiale à Petite Echelle au Proche-Orient et Afrique du Nord: Synthèse*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2016; p. 157. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/fr/c/471479/> (accessed on 5 April 2024).
9. Chohin Kuper, A.; Aloui, O.; Daoudi, A.; Elloumi, M.; Gharbi, I. Hybridation des modes d'accès à la terre et à l'eau au Maghreb: Une perspective historique. In *Rapport COSTEA—Action Structurante Foncier Irrigué au Maghreb*; AFEID: Montpellier, France, 2023; p. 29. Available online: <https://www.comite-costea.fr/production/rapport-final-foncier-irrigue-maghreb/> (accessed on 15 April 2024).
10. Rastoin, J.-L. Les systèmes alimentaires territorialisés: Considérations théoriques et justifications empiriques. *Econ. Sociétés*, 2015; 1155–1164.
11. Marty, P.; Manceron, S.; Le Mouël, C.; Schmitt, B. *Le Système Agricole et Alimentaire de la Région Afrique du Nord—Moyen-Orient: Une Analyse Retrospective (1961–2012): Synthèse*; INRA: Paris, France, 2015; p. 33. Available online: <https://www.inrae.fr/sites/default/files/pdf/systeme-agri-et-alimentaire-afriqen-moyen-orient-synthese-fr.pdf> (accessed on 23 September 2021).
12. Croitoru, L.; Sarraf, M. (Eds.) *The Cost of Environmental Degradation: Case Studies from the Middle East and North Africa*; Directions in Development: Environment, n. 56295; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2010; p. 192. Available online: <https://documents.worldbank.org/pt/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/896881468278941796/the-cost-of-environmental-degradation-case-studies-from-the-middle-east-and-north-africa> (accessed on 8 April 2024).
13. Croitoru, L.; Sarraf, M. *Le Coût de la Dégradation de L'environnement au Maroc*; Environment and Natural Resources Global Practice Discussion Paper, n. 5; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2017; p. 123. Available online: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/741961485508255907/pdf/105633-WP-P153448-FRENCH-PUBLIC-Maroc-Etude-CDE-Final-logo-Janv-2017.pdf> (accessed on 8 April 2024).
14. Hervieu, B.; Thibault, H.-L.; Abis, S. (Eds.) *Mediterra 2009: Repenser le Développement Rural en Méditerranée*; Mediterra, n. 11; Presses de Sciences Po: Paris, France, 2009; p. 387. Available online: http://www.iamm.ciheam.org/ress_doc/opac_css/index.php?lvl=notice_display&id=26791 (accessed on 5 May 2024).
15. Requier-Desjardins, M.; Jauffret, S.; Ben Khadra, N. Lutter contre la désertification. In *Mediterra 2009: Repenser le Développement Rural en Méditerranée*; Mediterra, n. 11; Hervieu, B., Thibault, H.-L., Abis, S., Eds.; Presses de Sciences Po: Paris, France, 2009; pp. 137–182.
16. Tibi, A.; Therond, O. *Services Écosystémiques Fournis par les Espaces agricoles: Une Contribution au Programme EFESÉ*; INRA: Paris, France, 2017; p. 118. Available online: <https://www.inrae.fr/sites/default/files/pdf/efese-services-ecosystemiques-rendus-par-les-ecosystemes-agricoles-synthese-2.pdf> (accessed on 23 September 2021).
17. Brym, Z.T.; Reeve, J.R. Agroecological principles from a bibliographic analysis of the term agroecology. In *Sustainable Agriculture Reviews*; Lichtfouse, E., Ed.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland, 2016; Volume 19, pp. 203–231. [CrossRef]
18. de Lattre-Gasquet, M.; Moreau, C.; Elloumi, M.; Ben Becher, L. Vers un scénario «Des usages agro-écologiques des terres pour une alimentation diversifiée et de qualité et un système alimentaire territorialisé» en Tunisie en 205. *OCL Oléagineux Corps Gras Lipides Oilseeds Fats Crops Lipids* **2017**, *24*, 1–20. [CrossRef]
19. Ameur, F.; Amichi, H.; Leauthaud, C. Agroecology in North African irrigated plains? Mapping promising practices and characterizing farmers' underlying logics. *Reg. Environ. Chang.* **2020**, *20*, 133. [CrossRef]
20. Akakpo, K.; Bouarfa, S.; Benoît, M.; Leauthaud, C. Challenging agroecology through the characterization of farming practices' diversity in Mediterranean irrigated areas. *Eur. J. Agron.* **2021**, *128*, 126284. [CrossRef]
21. Dufumier, M. Quels enjeux pour les agronomes de demain ? *Pour* **2009**, 227–233. [CrossRef]
22. Wezel, A.; Bellon, S.; Doré, T.; Francis, C.; Vallod, D.; David, C. Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2009**, *29*, 503–515. [CrossRef]
23. Gliessman, S. Defining agroecology. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2018**, *42*, 599–600. [CrossRef]

24. HLPE. Agroecological and Other Innovative Approaches for Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems that Enhance Food Security and Nutrition. In *HLPE Report, n. 14*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2019; p. 162. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/1263887/> (accessed on 24 August 2021).
25. Duru, M.; Therond, O.; Fares, M. Designing agroecological transitions; a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2015**, *35*, 1237–1257. [CrossRef]
26. Le Velly, R. *Sociologie des Systèmes Alimentaires Alternatifs: Une Promesse de Différence*; Sciences Sociales; Presses des Mines: Paris, France, 2017; p. 197. Available online: <https://books.openedition.org/pressesmines/3715> (accessed on 5 June 2024).
27. Hubert, B.; Couvet, D. (Eds.) *La Transition Agroécologique—Tome I: Quelles Perspectives en France et Ailleurs dans le Monde?* Académie d'Agriculture de France; Presses des Mines: Paris, France, 2021; p. 260.
28. Gliessman, S. Transforming food systems with agroecology. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2016**, *40*, 187–189. [CrossRef]
29. FAO. *The 10 Elements of Agroecology: Guiding the Transition to Sustainable Food and Agricultural Systems*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2018; p. 87. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/agroecology/overview/overview10elements/en/> (accessed on 24 August 2021).
30. Nicholls, C.I.; Altieri, M.A.; Vazquez, L. Agroecology: Principles for the conversion and redesign of farming systems. *J. Ecosyst. Ecography* **2016**, *S5*, 1–8. [CrossRef]
31. Gliessman, S.R. Transforming food and agriculture systems with agroecology. *Agric. Hum. Values* **2020**, *37*, 547–548. [CrossRef]
32. Malassis, L. *Nourrir les Hommes*; Flammarion: Paris, France, 1994; p. 126.
33. Migliorini, P.; Wezel, A. Converging and diverging principles and practices of organic agriculture regulations and agroecology. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2017**, *37*, 63. [CrossRef]
34. Wezel, A.; Herren, B.G.; Kerr, R.B.; Barrios, E.; Gonçalves, A.L.R.; Sinclair, F. Agroecological principles and elements and their implications for transitioning to sustainable food systems. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2020**, *40*, 40. [CrossRef]
35. Gliessman, S.R. *Agroecology: The Ecology of Sustainable Food Systems*, 2nd ed.; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2007; p. 384.
36. Gliessman, S.R. Agroecology: Researching the ecological basis for sustainable agriculture. In *Ecological Studies. Analysis and Synthesis*; Gliessman, S.R., Ed.; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 1990; Volume 78, pp. 3–10. [CrossRef]
37. Hill, S.B.; MacRae, R.J. Conceptual framework for the transition from conventional to sustainable agriculture. *J. Sustain. Agric.* **1996**, *7*, 81–87. [CrossRef]
38. Gliessman, S.R.; Rosemeyer, M. *The Conversion to Sustainable Agriculture: Principles, Processes, and Practices*; CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2010; p. 380. [CrossRef]
39. FAO. Agroecology for Food security and nutrition. In Proceedings of the FAO International Symposium Agroecology for Food Security and Nutrition, Rome, Italy, 18–19 September 2014; p. 406. Available online: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/i4729e>. (accessed on 8 September 2021).
40. Jullien, A.; Huet, P. Agriculture de précision. In *Agricultures et Territoires*; Hermès Science Publications: Paris, France, 2005; pp. 223–238.
41. Titttonell, P. Ecological intensification of agriculture—Sustainable by nature. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2014**, *8*, 53–61. [CrossRef]
42. Girardin, P.; Bockstaller, C.; Van der Werf, H. Assessment of potential impacts of agricultural practices on the environment: The AGRO*ECO method. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* **2000**, *20*, 227–239. [CrossRef]
43. Bonny, S. L'agriculture raisonnée, l'agriculture intégrée et Farre—Forum de l'agriculture raisonnée respectueuse de l'environnement. *Nat. Sci. Sociétés*, 1997; *5*, 64–71. [CrossRef]
44. IFOAM. *Le Guide des SPG—Comment Développer et Gérer les Systèmes Participatifs de Garantie Pour L'agriculture Biologique*; IFOAM-Organics International: Bonn, Germany, 2019; p. 47. Available online: <https://www.ifoam.bio/pgs-guidelines> (accessed on 1 September 2024).
45. Clouet, Y. Les oasis. *Mappemonde* **1995**, *86*, 44–48. [CrossRef]
46. Ferraton, N. *Etude d'un Périmètre Irrigué en Voie de Réhabilitation, Dans la Province de Beheira, Delta du Nil, Egypte. Formation aux Approches Socio-Institutionnelles de la Gestion Locale de L'eau*; CNEARC-GSE-ISIIMM: Montpellier, France, 2004; p. 50.
47. Dahshan, H.; Megahed, A.M.; Abd-Elall, A.M.M.; Abd-El-Kader, M.A.-G.; Nabawy, E.; Elbana, M.H. Monitoring of pesticides water pollution-The Egyptian River Nile. *J. Environ. Health Sci. Eng.* **2016**, *14*, 15. [CrossRef]
48. Romeh, A.A. Integrated Pest Management for Sustainable Agriculture. In *Sustainability of Agricultural Environment in Egypt: Part II. The Handbook of Environmental Chemistry*; Negm, A., Abu-hashim, M., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2018; Volume 77. [CrossRef]
49. FAO. NSP—Integrated Pest Management, FAO Definition. 2020. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/thematic-sitemap/theme/pests/ipm/en/> (accessed on 15 September 2021).
50. Deguine, J.P.; Aubertot, J.N.; Flor, R.J.; Lescouret, F.; Wyckhuys Kris, A.G.; Ratnadass, A. Integrated pest management: Good intentions, hard realities. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2021**, *41*, 1007–1042. [CrossRef]
51. Jalkh, R.; Bouzid, A.; Siam, G.; Lahrech, T.; Sidya-Fall, C.; Zouari, I.; Pollicino, D.; Lemaitre-Curri, E.; Bessaoud, O.; Abdelhakim, T.; et al. *Analysis of Agroecological Perspectives in North African Intersectoral Public Policies. A Review of Trends, Strengths and Weaknesses*; NATAE project report, EU Horizon Grant Agreement no. 101084647; International Center for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies: Montpellier, France, 2024. [CrossRef]
52. Chattou, Z.; Abdellaoui, E.H. *L'agriculture Périurbaine Face à la Dégradation de L'environnement. Vallée de L'oued Khoumane Moulay Idriss Volubilis—Massif du Zerhoun*; Babel.com: Rabat, Morocco, 2022; p. 120.

53. FAO. *Pour des Villes plus Vertes en Afrique: Premier Rapport D'étape sur L'horticulture Urbaine et Periurbaine*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2012; p. 111. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/4/i3002f/i3002f.pdf> (accessed on 12 November 2021).
54. Kuper, M.; Benouniche, M. Le goutte à goutte comme innovation locale dans le domaine de l'irrigation. In *Étude sur L'agriculture Familiale à Petite Echelle au Proche-Orient et Afrique du Nord. Pays focus: Maroc*; Errahj, M., Lejars, C., Sellika, I.E., Kuper, M., Faysse, N., Dugué, P., Bekkar, Y., El Ghassem, Z., Impiglia, A., Eds.; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2017; pp. 67–72. Available online: <http://www.fao.org/family-farming/detail/en/c/471943/> (accessed on 15 October 2021).
55. Bouaziz, A.; Hammani, A.; Kuper, M. Les oasis en Afrique du Nord: Dynamiques territoriales et durabilité des systèmes de production agricole. *Cah. Agric.* **2018**, *27*, 1–5. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Toutain, G. Approche globale d'un milieu oasien et préhension des problèmes de mise en valeur agricole (Sud Marocain). In *Le Développement Rural: Comprendre pour Agir*; Antheaume, B., Blanc Pamard, C., Yveline, D., Lassailly Jacob, V., Eds.; ORSTOM: Paris, France, 1987; pp. 239–307.
57. Paas, W.; Klefodimos, G.; Van de Ven, G.W.J.; Reinhard-Kolempas, M.; Galanis, C.; Belhouchette, H.; Sidya Fall, C.; Echchgadda, G.; Comptour, M.; Ben Mimoun, M. *Farm Household Typologies in NATAE Living Labs*; NATAE project report, EU Horizon Grant Agreement no. 101084647; International center for Advanced Mediterranean Agronomic Studies: Montpellier, France, 2024. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.