

PUTTING SMALL-SCALE FARMING FIRST:



Improving the National Agriculture
Investment Plans of Burkina Faso, Burundi,
Ethiopia, Rwanda and Tanzania

January 2014



First published in January 2014 by:

ACORD, the Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development

email: info@acordinternational.org

website: www.acordinternational.org

ACORD ©2014. All rights reserved

ACORD gives permission for this work to be copied, distributed, transmitted or adapted on condition that attribution to ACORD as the originator, that it is not to be used for commercial purposes and that any resulting adapted work is published with equivalent written permissions. Attributions should be given as: 'ACORD'. Further permissions can be requested by contacting: communications@acordinternational.org

Key words:

agriculture - Africa - farming - pastoralism - NAIP – CAADP – NEPAD – African Union – Burkina Faso – Ethiopia – Rwanda – Burundi – Tanzania – natural resources – national budget – women – food security – food sovereignty

Photo credits: ACORD

Author: Mark Curtis

Edited by: Tom Fry, Fatou Mbaye

ISSN: 1812-1276



Members of a small-scale farming collective in Rwanda, Credit: ACORD

CONTENTS

p12	Introduction
p16	Analysis Of The National Agricultural Investment Plans
p16	1. A Welcome Commitment to Agriculture
p17	2. Key Policies Needed in National Agriculture Strategies
p18	3. Five Areas for Improvements in the NAIPs
p18	3.1 Insufficient Prioritisation of the Real Needs of Smallholder Farmers
p18	3.1.1 Insufficient Promotion of Land Tenure Security in the Face of Large-Scale Land Acquisitions
p20	3.1.2 The Absence of Support for Labour-Saving Technologies
p21	3.1.3 Lack of Prioritisation of The Crops of Most Benefit to the Poor
p24	3.2 Poor Focus on Women Farmers
p27	3.3 Lack of Explicit Prioritisation of Sustainable Agriculture
p30	3.4 Unrealistic Funding
p34	3.5 Limited Community Participation in Implementing the NAIPs
p36	Conclusions
p38	Recommendations
p40	References

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was written by Mark Curtis.

Research coordinated by Fatou Mbaye and Tom Fry.

This is an ACORD policy brief based on a desk review by the lead author and supplemented by research reports from five ACORD Country Programmes.

Many thanks go to the country-level researchers, Hema Ardiouma in Burkina Faso, Epitace Buname in Burundi, Tamre Teka in Ethiopia, Marie Nizeyimana in Rwanda, and Epiphania Mfundo in Tanzania. Valuable insights and contributions were made by ACORD staff at country level: Moges Shiferaw, Kassech Abegaz, Prime Rupiya, Theodore Barankenyereye, Lokola Ndibalema, Francois Munyentwari, Didacienne Mukahabeshimana and Salomon Nikiema. Contributions from Salina Sanou, Ellen Bajenja, Sophie Havyarimana, Rose Aduol, Nicola Bevan and Caroline Testud from ACORD Secretariat are also appreciated.

Designed by: www.patrickfry.co.uk

Front cover image: Women pineapple farmers in Burundi, Credit: ACORD

ACRONYMS

ASIP – Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (Rwanda)

CAADP – Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme

CBO – Community Based Organisation

CSO – Civil Society Organisation

GAFFSP – Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme

IFPRI – International Food Policy Research Institute

M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation

MINAGRI – Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (Rwanda)

MINAGRIE – Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Burundi)

NAIPs – National Agriculture Investment Plans

NGOs – Non-governmental Organisation

PIF – Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (Ethiopia)

PNIA – Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (Burundi)

PNSR – Programme National du Secteur Rural (Burkina Faso)

PSTA II – Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda

SAGCOT – Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor

TAFSIP – Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan

SUMMARY

In 2003, African states pledged in the ‘Maputo Declaration’ of the African Union to spend 10 per cent of their budgets on agriculture within five years. Ten years on, despite recent spending increases in some countries, African countries still allocate an average of only 5 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture. The year 2014 could – and should – be a period of action to increase and improve African governments’ spending on agriculture. 2014 has been designated by African Heads of State and Government as a Year of Agriculture and Food Security while the UN General Assembly has declared 2014 to be the International Year of Family Farming.

This report analyses the National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs) of five countries – Ethiopia, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi and Burkina Faso – and assesses the extent to which they are likely to benefit smallholder farmers. The NAIPs are the flagship strategies of governments, outlining how they will support the agriculture sector in the coming years, and include ambitious spending plans.

If the NAIPs are to transform agriculture, and promote broader development, they must focus on the people who do most of the farming – smallholder farmers, who are usually defined as those with less than two hectares of land. Yet smallholders have often been neglected in government policy, despite comprising the majority of Africa’s population. In addition to low spending on agriculture in many countries, much spending has insufficiently prioritised the needs of smallholder farmers.

Our analysis in this report is that the NAIPs of these five countries show a significant commitment to the agricultural sector. However, this commitment is not matched by sufficient recognition of the importance of smallholder farming to reducing poverty reduction and promoting food security. Our analysis below briefly assesses several positive features of the NAIPs before focusing on five clear policy failings – these are specific, key areas for governments to address and improve. Unless these are adequately addressed, the NAIPs will likely fail in their potential to promote agriculture-led development and the livelihoods of smallholders in these countries, and elsewhere in Africa.

SUMMARY

A Welcome Commitment to Agriculture

The NAIPs of the five countries show a significant commitment to the agricultural sector. The first reason for this is the fact they have been produced at all, and outline a costed strategy for addressing holistically the needs of the agriculture sector and constraints faced by farmers. In some cases, the NAIPs signify a government's intention to prioritise agriculture, or at least to increase investments in agriculture, after years of relative neglect. Second, most NAIPs have involved a significant consultation process whereby key stakeholders – not just governments, but also donors, civil society, the private sector and farmers' organisations – have been involved, to one extent or another, in the design of the plan.

The third positive feature of the NAIPs is that they provide an often detailed statement of intent by the government. In the results framework or logical framework included in the NAIPs, most governments have committed to specific objectives and outlined indicators for achieving them along with the means of verification. Fourth, the individual NAIPs are considerably aligned to the broader CAADP programme in Africa. This provides greater opportunities for cross-country collaboration, strategic investments and the development of regional markets.

Five Areas for Improvements in the NAIPs

Yet our analysis is that the NAIPs of the five countries suffer from five key policy failings and that these are critical to address if smallholder farmers are to benefit optimally from agriculture strategies.

SUMMARY

Insufficient Prioritisation of The Real Needs of Smallholder Farmers

Most of the NAIPs under review specifically identify smallholder farmers as the principal intended beneficiaries of the investments. However, there are reasons to question whether the major needs of smallholders will actually be the overriding priority of the government. Other policies outlined in the NAIPs are likely to undermine smallholders while some key policies that could help smallholders are absent. For example, land tenure security is being undermined by a wave of large-scale land acquisitions (often termed 'land grabs'). Absent from most of the NAIPs is support for promoting labour-saving technologies, which can be of particular importance for the majority of farmers (ie, women). In addition, most of the NAIPs are insufficiently prioritising crops, especially staple crops, likely to be of most benefit to reducing poverty and promoting pro-poor economic growth.

Poor Focus on Women Farmers

All the NAIPs under review mention women farmers and call for policies promoting gender equality, in one way or another. Yet in all cases except Rwanda, few details are provided as to how women farmers will actually be supported. Women figure little if at all in the results frameworks of the NAIPs and so it is unclear how, if at all, policies that support them will be measured. Women farmers also figure little in the actual budgets of the NAIPs, meaning that it is unclear if actual spending will specifically target women.

Lack of Explicit Prioritisation of Sustainable Agriculture

Sustainable agriculture (or agro-ecological farming) encompasses approaches such as agro-forestry, low external input farming, organic agriculture, and water harvesting in dry land areas. While all five NAIPs under review emphasise the importance of natural resources management, none explicitly prioritises sustainable agriculture over 'conventional' farming that uses often large quantities of chemicals. In addition, the NAIPs are largely silent on the environmental, human and financial risks of increased use of chemicals.

Unrealistic Funding

Most of the governments under review are simply not spending enough on agriculture to reach the expenditure levels outlined in the NAIPs. All of the NAIPs under review include spending plans that are unrealistic – and often appear more as wishful thinking - in light of the actual budgets being allocated by governments to agriculture. Yet none of the NAIPs make clear which spending areas would be cut back, and how, if all the funds are not forthcoming.

SUMMARY

Summary of Financing Gaps

	The funding gap compared to needs costed in the NAIP
Burkina Faso	CFA 529 billion, or 38 per cent.
Burundi	Bf 875 billion, or 60 per cent.
Ethiopia	Unclear
Rwanda	\$325 million, or 28 per cent.
Tanzania	TShs 4.7 trillion or 54 per cent.

Limited Community Participation in Implementing the NAIPs

Farmers' organisations, community-based organisations and civil society organisations can be critical to the effective implementation of the NAIPs and to the design of agriculture policy. Yet the NAIPs strongly vary in the role envisaged for community based organisations in the implementation of policies. Farmer organisations should be championed and empowered to have an effective voice in decision-making. CSOs are increasingly delivering services, and providing technical support, to farmers, within frameworks set by government, and our analysis here focuses on the role foreseen for CSOs.

SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the five governments should:

Land Tenure Security

- Take greater steps, including promoting land reform programmes, to ensure that smallholder farmers have increased land tenure security
- Stop large scale land acquisitions by adhering to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure, which ensure that land investments are transparently negotiated and protect the rights of smallholders

Labour Saving Technologies

- Review the needs of smallholder farmers in this area and increase access of farmers, especially women farmers, to labour saving technologies through government support programmes and by enabling private sector delivery

Crops of Most Benefit to The Poor

- Ensure that NAIPs are strategic in prioritising investments that are most likely to reduce poverty and promote agricultural development; this is likely to mean a focus on staple crops

Women Farmers

- Review agriculture strategy to understand how best to support women farmers
- Explicitly target women farmers in NAIP policies and budgets and ensure that objectives are gender-disaggregated, monitored and included in the results framework
- Reorient agriculture spending and policy to better target women farmers in key services (such as extension, rural credit programmes and agricultural research)
- Take greater steps to ensure that women are treated equally under the law and in practice, especially on land ownership

SUMMARY

Sustainable Agriculture

- Step up investments in sustainable agriculture and develop a national strategy for encouraging larger numbers of farmers to practice farming approaches that reduce dependence on chemical inputs

Funding

- Review NAIP budgets to ensure that they are realistic, and revise NAIP plans in this light
- In those cases where the 10 per cent budget target has not been met, spend at least 10 per cent of national budgets on agriculture
- Establish a timetable for reaching this commitment. The African Union should work with states to adopt a timeline for reaching this commitment during the 2014 Year of Agriculture and Food Security
- Examine ways to find the extra resources needed for agriculture (by, for example, reducing military spending, increasing taxes on corporations and reducing illegal capital flight)
- International donors should also ensure that their aid to agriculture is aligned to the NAIPs and to the improvements in the NAIPs outlined in this report, to ensure that aid is focused on the real needs of smallholder farmers

Involvement of Civil Society Organisations

- Review the NAIPs to ensure that CSOs are seen as partners involved in implementation and monitoring as well as being independent of government

Coordination

- Increase capacity and management support for more effective cross-ministry and cross-departmental coordination of policies

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, African states pledged in the ‘Maputo Declaration’ of the African Union to spend 10 per cent of their budgets on agriculture within five years. Ten years on, despite recent spending increases in some countries, African countries still allocate an average of only 5 per cent of their national budgets to agriculture.¹ The year 2014 could – and should – be a period of action to increase and improve African governments’ spending on agriculture. 2014 has been designated by African Heads of State and Government as a Year of Agriculture and Food Security while the UN General Assembly has declared 2014 to be the International Year of Family Farming.²

This report analyses the National Agriculture Investment Plans (NAIPs) of five countries – Ethiopia, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi and Burkina Faso – and assesses the extent to which they are likely to benefit smallholder farmers. The NAIPs are the flagship strategies of governments, outlining how they will support the agriculture sector in the coming years, and include ambitious spending plans. They have been drawn up under the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) to improve and align agriculture strategies across Africa.³ CAADP aims to eradicate hunger and reduce poverty through agriculture-led development and commits governments to spend a minimum of 10 per cent of their national budgets on agriculture and to raise agricultural productivity by at least 6 per cent a year.⁴

If the NAIPs are to transform agriculture, and promote broader development, they must focus on the people who do most of the farming – smallholder farmers, who are usually defined as those with less than two hectares of land. In Africa, up to 90 per cent of agricultural production comes from small farms.⁵ On average, smallholder farms in developing countries generate 40-60 per cent of total rural income by engaging in both farm and non-farm activities, underlining the importance of smallholder agriculture in the rural economy and in driving growth.⁶ But the importance of small farmers goes beyond this since they also provide stewardship over much of the world’s natural resources like land and forests, thus protecting vital eco-systems services.⁷ There is considerable evidence that smallholder farmers can not only be more productive than larger-scale farmers or plantations but also reduce poverty more than large farms.⁸

Yet smallholders have often been neglected in government policy, despite comprising the majority of Africa’s population. In addition to low spending on agriculture in many countries, much spending has insufficiently prioritised the needs of smallholder farmers. In particular, key services such as extension (ie, advice and training) and agricultural research have often reached only small numbers of farmers, and usually the better-off, while cash crops for export have often been prioritised over food staples. In addition, insufficient attention has often been given to increasing smallholders’ security over the land they farm. Even more serious is that women, who comprise most farmers in most African countries and who produce most of the continent’s food, have long been neglected. These are among the most important issues that the NAIPs should be addressing.

INTRODUCTION

Public agriculture spending is critical to promoting development and the reduction of poverty in Africa. GDP growth originating in agriculture is up to 11 times more effective in reducing poverty in sub-Saharan Africa than growth in other sectors.⁹ Public investment in agriculture can play a key role in reducing hunger, alongside other investments. The FAO notes that hunger is more prevalent in countries where public agricultural expenditure per worker is lower.¹⁰ Although agriculture spending does not automatically reduce hunger, countries spending more on agriculture tend to reduce hunger more. For example, all 7 African countries that spent more than 10 per cent of their national budgets on agriculture in 2004-07 achieved reductions in the proportion of hungry people over the previous decade.¹¹

Our analysis in this report is that the NAIPs of these five countries show a significant commitment to the agricultural sector. However, this commitment is not matched by sufficient recognition of the importance of smallholder farming to reducing poverty reduction and promoting food security. Our analysis below briefly assesses several positive features of the NAIPs before focusing on five clear policy failings – these are specific, key areas for governments to address and improve. Unless these are adequately addressed, the NAIPs will likely fail in their potential to promote agriculture-led development and improve the livelihoods of smallholders in these countries, and elsewhere in Africa.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a desk review of the NAIPs and associated planning documents, which draws on researched commissioned by ACORD in each of the five countries. Official documents analysed include flagship national agriculture strategy documents and project proposals to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP), a multilateral aid mechanism managed by the World Bank. The analysis has also included consultations with various informants (from government, academia and civil society organisations) in each country. The key documents under analysis are:

BURKINA FASO

- Burkina Faso, Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15, July 2012
- Burkina Faso, Programme Mondial pour l'Agriculture et la Sécurité Alimentaire 2011-15, September 2010

BURUNDI

- Republique du Burundi, Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17, June 2011
- Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi, March 2012

ETHIOPIA

- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020, September 2010
- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Agricultural Growth Program, September 2010

RWANDA

- Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012 (ASIP), undated
- Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II), Final Report, February 2009
- Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Rwanda GAFSP Proposal: LWH scale-up, June 2010

TANZANIA

- United Republic of Tanzania, Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21, October 2011
- United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Finance, Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Request for funding – Public sector window, March 2012



Farmer in Burundi, Credit: ACORD

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

1. A WELCOME COMMITMENT TO AGRICULTURE

The National Agriculture Investment Plans of the five countries show a significant commitment to the agricultural sector. The first reason for this is the fact they have been produced at all, and outline a costed strategy for addressing holistically the needs of the agriculture sector and constraints faced by farmers. In some cases, the NAIPs signify a government's intention to prioritise agriculture, or at least to increase investments in agriculture, after years of relative neglect.

Second, most NAIPs have involved a significant consultation process whereby key stakeholders – not just governments, but also donors, civil society, the private sector and farmers' organisations – have been involved, to one extent or another, in the design of the plan. In some (but not all) cases this has led to the involvement of a broader group of stakeholders in the actual implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the national agriculture strategy.

The third positive feature of the NAIPs is that they provide an often detailed statement of intent by the government. In the results framework or logical framework included in the NAIPs, most governments have committed to specific objectives and outlined indicators for achieving them along with the means of verification. This not only aids planning and coordination within the agriculture sector but also provides a mechanism for stakeholders to hold the government to account for its commitments. In turn, this should mean greater democratic scrutiny over government policy-making, and thus better policy.

Fourth, the individual NAIPs are considerably aligned to the broader CAADP programme in Africa. This provides greater opportunities for cross-country collaboration, strategic investments and the development of regional markets.

In addition, the individual NAIPs have a strong focus on particular areas. For example, **Rwanda's** strategy documents – the Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture, Phase II (known as PSTA II) and the Agriculture Sector Investment Plan (ASIP) - both have a strong focus on supporting women farmers, to a greater degree than in most other agriculture strategies in Africa. (We analyse this further in section 3.2). Both Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) and **Tanzania's** Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) have a relatively strong focus on promoting food security and nutrition. **Burundi's** NAIP (the *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole* or PNIA) has a strong focus on promoting sustainable agriculture techniques such as agro-forestry and animal fodder crops that tackle declining soil fertility and land degradation – an increasingly vital issue in Africa (see section 3.3). **Burkina Faso's** NAIP (the *Programme National du Secteur Rural* or PNSR) has a relatively strong focus on pastoralists, and the protection of natural resources and livelihoods in pastoralist areas – issues often neglected by some governments.

2. KEY POLICIES NEEDED IN NATIONAL AGRICULTURE STRATEGIES

For national agriculture strategies to play a major role in transforming agriculture in the five countries, our analysis is that five key policies are among the most vital. The key is whether the NAIPs are comprehensively promoting these policies.

First, the overriding focus must be on **supporting the real needs of smallholder farmers** in recognition of the reality that agriculture in Africa is indeed dominated by farmers with very small plots of land. Ethiopia's PIF, for example, notes that nearly 55 per cent of farmers farm one hectare or less and that a third farm less than 0.5 hectares.¹⁴ In Tanzania, the small-scale farmers who predominate in the country have an average of 0.2 – 2 ha.¹⁵ In Rwanda, the average household owns less than 0.7 hectares.¹⁶ In Burundi, 1.2 million small farm household work an average 0.5 hectare plot.¹⁷

A second key need is to prioritise support to **women smallholder farmers**. This is vital since women comprise most farmers and produce and manage most of the continent's food. In Burundi, for example, women account for 55 per cent of the workforce¹⁸ and do 70 per cent of the farm work¹⁹. Similar proportions are repeated in most other African countries.²⁰ Yet despite their contribution, women farmers have hitherto been largely ignored by governments. In agriculture budgets, women are largely invisible; some projects benefit women farmers but there are almost no budget lines specifically targeting them.²¹ Major investments are needed in women farmers, but not only for equity reasons. It is estimated that even if women simply had the *same* access to productive resources such as land and seed as men, they could increase yields on their farms by 25-30 per cent; this would raise agricultural output in developing countries by 2.5-4 per cent and reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 12-17 per cent.²²

Third, agriculture strategies must, in our view, prioritise support to **sustainable agriculture**. This refers to the ability of farms to produce nutritious food without damaging soils, ecosystems or people, and that reduces (or eliminates) reliance on external inputs such as chemical fertilizers and pesticides. Conventional farming, by contrast, tends to promote increased use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, often combined with hybrid (or genetically-modified) seeds in high-technology packages that are expensive for farmers, and often only affordable under government subsidy programmes.

Fourth, it is vital that an increased focus on agriculture is matched by **increasing public investments** in agriculture. This means that countries should meet or exceed the 10 per cent 'Maputo' budget allocation target, and ensure that budget allocations are effectively disbursed. Yet only seven African countries have reached this target, of which two – Ethiopia and Burkina Faso – are analysed here (the others are Niger, Mali, Malawi, Senegal and Guinea).²³

Fifth, it is also vital for **community based organisations** (understood as including farmers' organisations and civil society organisations) to be involved in agriculture strategy. Farmer organisations should be championed and empowered to have an effective voice in decision-making. CSOs, being independent of government, can provide important external inputs into government policy and also help to hold government to account for their pledges and policies.

These five policies are not the only ones that are vital: others, such as how agriculture promotes nutrition, can also be fundamental to reducing poverty. But nutrition policy also goes well beyond the NAIPs, and therefore has not been assessed here.

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

3. FIVE AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE NAIPS

How well do the NAIPs of the five countries perform against these five critical policies? Our analysis is that there are many policy failings in these areas and that these are critical to address if smallholder farmers are to benefit optimally from agriculture strategies.

3.1 – INSUFFICIENT PRIORITISATION OF THE REAL NEEDS OF SMALLHOLDER FARMERS

Most of the NAIPs under review specifically identify smallholder farmers as the principal intended beneficiaries of the investments.²⁴ However, there are reasons to question whether the major needs of smallholders will actually be the overriding priority of the government. The reason is that other policies outlined in the NAIPs are likely to undermine smallholders or that key policies that could help smallholders are absent. We identify four such policies, concerning land tenure security, the prioritisation of crops, pastoralism (in some cases) and labour-saving technologies.

3.1.1 – INSUFFICIENT PROMOTION OF LAND TENURE SECURITY IN THE FACE OF LARGE-SCALE LAND ACQUISITIONS

The five NAIPs under review all emphasise the importance of increasing land tenure security for smallholders. Having such security is vital for smallholders to invest in the land but also to protect smallholders from evictions. Yet there is currently a wave of large-scale land acquisitions (often termed ‘land grabs’) taking place in Africa and other developing countries by both foreign and domestic investors. Between 2001 and 2010, 203 million hectares of land around the world have been under consideration or negotiation in large-scale land acquisitions.²⁵ Oxfam estimates that the land area sold off in the past decade amounts to eight times the size of the UK – this is enough to feed a billion people.²⁶ These large-scale land acquisitions, supported by the same governments who often profess backing for increased land tenure security, are often displacing farmers from their land with little compensation, or else violating their human rights, as documented in various NGO and other reports.²⁷

Of the five countries under review, large-scale land acquisitions are significantly affecting two - Ethiopia and Tanzania. According to the Land Matrix, the number of large scale land acquisitions that have been negotiated or are under negotiation ranges from 53 in Ethiopia, to 27 in Tanzania, to two each in Rwanda and Burkina Faso, with no data available on Burundi.²⁸

Ethiopia’s PIF states that ‘improved land tenure security is seen as a vital ingredient of sustainable land use and land use planning.’²⁹ It also cites the Rural Development Policy and Strategy of 2003 which guarantees ‘the availability of land to people who seek to make a living out of land’.³⁰ Yet the PIF also highlights the importance of large-scale farming, stating that ‘Ethiopia still has large areas of arable land that are not used for crop production, but could be developed for large-scale commercial farming.’³¹

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

Indeed, the PIF notes that ‘whilst the focus will be clearly on the smallholder sub-sector’, 3.3 million hectares will be developed for ‘extensive commercial agriculture’.³² Independent reports suggest that large number of farmers in Ethiopia have been victims of large scale land acquisitions.³³ Yet in Ethiopia, 32 million people – 37 per cent of the population – are undernourished.³⁴

The potential, and real, conflict over land between smallholder farmers and large-scale investments is nowhere addressed in Ethiopia’s PIF. Neither is the same problem addressed in **Tanzania’s** TAFSIP.

The TAFSIP only briefly identifies insecure land tenure as a problem.³⁵ As the CAADP technical review of the TAFSIP states: ‘The TAFSIP does not sufficiently incorporate land administration issues and measures that would need to be in place to enhance security of tenure for small scale operators’.³⁶ In particular, the TAFSIP does not address the issue of smallholders being displaced from their land by large-scale land acquisitions. As the CAADP technical review notes, land policies in Tanzania have not so far guaranteed security of land to smallholders.³⁷ Indeed, the TAFSIP appears quite coy about the issue of large-scale investments, stating that Tanzania has ‘large areas of arable land that are not used for crop production, but could be developed for commercial farming’, including by foreign investors.³⁸

TAFSIP also highlights an enhanced role for the private sector, ‘particularly within the growth corridor approach’³⁹ This is a reference to the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor (SAGCOT) project which the TAFSIP mentions as providing mutual benefits for small- and large-scale farmers.⁴⁰ SAGCOT covers nearly one third of the country and 9 – 11 million people (depending on the source⁴¹). Launched at the World Economic Forum Africa in 2010, SAGCOT project documents state that it is a Public-Private Partnership that aims to boost agricultural productivity in Tanzania and to bring 350,000 hectares of land under agricultural production; it also aims to generate \$2.1 billion of private sector investment in agriculture over 20 years.⁴²

Yet there are major concerns as to whether the SAGCOT project will benefit smallholders or else displace them from their land in favour of foreign investors. SAGCOT documents make clear that some people will be displaced by SAGCOT projects and that a Resettlement Policy Framework will be developed.⁴³ Yet despite nearly 30 project documents on the SAGCOT website⁴⁴, none say how many people this will be; this undermines transparency in the process and raises suspicions that the number of displacements could be large.

Tanzania’s TAFSIP also states that although smallholders are the primary target group, ‘there is a risk that smallholders will be marginalised or at least fail to participate fully against a background of rapid agricultural commercialisation’.⁴⁵ This statement does not inspire confidence that smallholders are the overriding priority of the TAFSIP. The TAFSIP also states that it is seeking to transform Tanzanian agriculture ‘from traditional low-input-low-output subsistence to high-technological input high-output modern commercial farming’.⁴⁶ This appears more a recipe for promoting large-scale farming.

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

Yet elsewhere the TAFSIP document states that the optimal impacts of investments are likely to come from ‘balanced support for both the commercial and smallholder sub-sectors, along with efforts to help subsistence smallholders graduate to the ranks of small-scale commercial farmers’.⁴⁷

Although **Burkina Faso** has not been subject to a large number of potential large-scale land acquisitions, domestic disputes over land ownership, use, succession, investment and boundaries are common in rural areas of the country. Hundreds of land-related conflicts were reported to the national and local authorities in 2012.⁴⁸ Burkina Faso’s PSNR mentions the need to increase land tenure security and indeed to implement the national policy on land tenure security (the PNSFMR, in the French acronym) which has been debated and finalised in recent years.⁴⁹ The PNSR results framework aims to have 50 per cent of land under effective land tenure security by 2015 (it is unclear from what percentage).⁵⁰

3.1.2 THE ABSENCE OF SUPPORT FOR LABOUR-SAVING TECHNOLOGIES

Absent from most of the NAIPs is support for labour-saving technologies, which can be of particular importance for the majority of farmers (ie, women). Labour-saving technologies and practices can make the existing tasks of farmers easier and/or increase the productivity of labour and draught power. Access to such technologies can thus be vital to increasing farm production, promoting food security and increasing incomes. Labour-saving technologies come in many forms. In the field, they include hoes of different lengths and lighter weights. For processing, they include grain grinders, plastic drum seeders and cassava graters. As regards carrying devices/transport, they include wheelbarrows, donkeys, carts and bicycles. As regards cooking, they include improved (quicker, cleaner, more fuel-efficient) stoves.

Ethiopia’s PIF and **Burundi’s** PNIA do not mention labour saving technologies. Neither does **Rwanda’s** ASIP, although its PSTA II mentions a campaign to promote the use of more efficient fuelwood stoves but nothing else.⁵¹

Tanzania’s TAFSIP identifies ‘mechanisation’ as one of several priority areas for investment.⁵² The TAFSIP states that 70 per cent of farmers depend on hand hoes and only 20 per cent use ox ploughs and 10 per cent tractors. Thus the TAFSIP calls for greater investment in the mechanisation programme that has been initiated to enable more smallholders to use ox-ploughs and tractors.⁵³ The problem with this approach is that tractors, in particular, are likely to be useful only to larger-scale farmers on large land areas (around 50 ha⁵⁴) and are too expensive for poor farmers (especially women), and also tend to be controlled by men and larger-scale farmers. Animal draught power (such as oxen and donkeys) can be useful to smallholder farmers but again usually only on larger land areas (a minimum of 5 ha⁵⁵) than are often available.⁵⁶ The TAFSIP only mentions once in passing the need to enable smallholders to access ‘labour-saving

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

technologies such as zero or minimum tillage’ – and this statement is unclear since minimum tillage is not a technology so much as an approach to farming.⁵⁷

Burkina Faso’s PNSR has a somewhat stronger (though still insufficient) emphasis on labour saving technologies. It pledges to increase farmers’ access to agricultural equipment, though is somewhat vague in suggesting that ‘viable mechanisms’ will be established to ensure this.⁵⁸ More concretely, and as noted above, it pledges to provide 100,000 items of animal traction equipment to farmers, of which half will go to women. It aims to increase the use of such equipment by 75 per cent.⁵⁹ It also pledges to promote the use of improved technologies and equipment for harvesting and storage in the forestry sub-sector, though does not provide details.⁶⁰

3.1.3 LACK OF PRIORITISATION OF THE CROPS OF MOST BENEFIT TO THE POOR

All governments face choices as to which crops to prioritise in terms of support and investment. Cash and/or export crops can benefit smallholder farmers under certain circumstances, for example when prices are good. However, food staple crops, produced for local markets for domestic consumption, are often much more important to smallholders. There is considerable research showing that investments in staple crops reduce poverty and promote economic growth more than in other crops. For example, an analysis by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) shows that, in Rwanda, the economic returns from all types of agricultural investment were high but that the largest gains were made from investing in the food staple, maize. For every \$1 invested in maize, agricultural GDP grew by 7 per cent. By contrast, for every \$1 invested in coffee, an export crop, agricultural GDP grew by only 1.2 per cent.⁶¹ A key question, therefore, is the extent to which the NAIPs prioritise crops, especially staple crops, likely to be of most benefit to reducing poverty and promoting pro-poor economic growth.

Tanzania’s TAFSIP does not appear to prioritise the crop (maize) it has itself identified as being most critical. The TAFSIP cites analysis by IFPRI stating that the most effective way to reduce poverty and improve nutrition is to improve the productivity of crops grown by the poor, such as maize, root crops, pulses and oilseeds. In particular, maize is identified as a ‘priority subsector for achieving pro-poor growth’, but ‘the opposite is true of rice and wheat’.⁶² Indeed, the TAFSIP explicitly notes an IFPRI study stating that one reason why poverty has not fallen in Tanzania in recent years, despite overall economic growth, is partly because agricultural investments have focused on ‘large-scale production of rice and wheat, and export crops’.⁶³ Yet despite this, later in the document, the TAFSIP identifies priority food crops as ‘maize, rice, cassava, wheat, beans, sorghum, sugar and oil seed crops’ – failing to distinguish between maize, on the one hand and rice/wheat, on the other. It also identifies export crops as priorities alongside food crops,

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

failing to prioritise the latter.⁶⁴ Nowhere is maize mentioned as a priority in the five-page TAFSIP results framework included at the end of the document.⁶⁵ The government does prioritise maize in the input subsidy programme – which provides a subsidy on a range of food and cash crops, mainly maize.⁶⁶ However, the government has also prioritised rice and has set a goal of doubling rice production within a ten year period up to 2018.⁶⁷

In the case of Ethiopia's PIF, the NAIP does not make any prioritisation between crops. Neither does it prioritise production for domestic (rather than export) markets, but focuses on increasing commercialisation of production for 'both domestic and export markets'.⁶⁸

Three of the five NAIPs have a relatively strong focus on crops likely to be of most benefit to the poor. Burkina Faso's PNSR notes that millet, sorghum, maize and rice are the most important food crops, and the PNSR's results framework includes indicators for yield improvements for these four crops.⁶⁹ Burundi's PNIA has a strong focus on food security, and prioritises rice, potatoes, cassava and maize. It has a particular focus on increasing production of rice, through improved irrigation; this has an ambitious target of 20 per cent annual growth in certain regions.⁷⁰

Rwanda's ASIP identifies increasing the productivity of staple crops as one of three 'absolute priorities'.⁷¹ It states that 'staple-led' growth is needed 'as this contributes to increased incomes for all income levels, but especially the poorest'.⁷² The ASIP will focus on 'primarily staple crops, closely followed by the export crop sub-sector'.⁷³ Thus the ASIP also states that to transform agriculture into a sector where farming is seen as a business rather than subsistence activity, a focus is also needed on 'high value crops' to compete in regional and international markets.⁷⁴ Programme 1 of the ASIP supports staple crops through the fertilizer subsidy and other programmes and Programme 3, which focuses on developing commodity chains, emphasises promoting both 'high value export crops (such as coffee, tea, horticulture and the processing of staple crops) and staple crops'.⁷⁵

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

INADEQUATE SUPPORT TO PASTORALISM IN ETHIOPIA

In **Ethiopia**, where drylands stretch across 60-65 per cent of the country and are home to 10-15 million people **pastoralism** is a major source of livelihoods. Yet marginalisation by government policies over several decades has resulted in low levels of investment in pastoralist areas, where chronic food insecurity is prevalent. Ethiopia's PIF mentions that pastoralists will be beneficiaries of, for example, food security and natural resources management programmes, but precise levels of support are unclear. The PIF's 3.5 page results framework, for example, does not mention pastoralists. The CAADP technical review of the PIF states:

'A key finding of the review is that the unique challenges and opportunities faced by pastoralists are not effectively reflected in the PIF and its related flagship program documents. Of particular concern is the potential trade offs that could be forced on pastoralists in low land areas where there is an emphasis on irrigation development. Access to water and grazing rights will be sensitive issues to sustain productive livestock systems. Further, the innovative work on land certification does not appear to include or develop options to secure the land and water rights of pastoralists.'⁷⁶

By contrast, **Burkina Faso's** PNSR has a relatively strong focus on pastoralists. Burkina Faso is estimated to have around 30 million head of cattle, and has 24 dedicated zones for pastoralism around the country.⁷⁷ The PNSR allocates 11.5 per cent of its budget to promoting pastoralism and increased animal production.⁷⁸ The PNSR's results framework also includes a goal of promoting resources in pastoralist areas and of sustainable livestock production. This includes several indicators including an increase from 24 to 40 in the number of dedicated pastoralist zones, a doubling of the area allocated for this purpose (from 700,000 h to 1.5 million) and a 50 per cent increase in animal production in pastoralist areas.⁷⁹

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

3.2 POOR FOCUS ON WOMEN FARMERS

All the NAIPs under review mention women farmers and call for policies promoting gender equality, in one way or another. Yet in all cases except Rwanda, few details are provided as to how women farmers will actually be supported. Women figure little if at all in the results frameworks of the NAIPs and so it is unclear how, if at all, policies that support them will be measured. Women farmers also figure little in the actual budgets of the NAIPs, meaning that it is unclear if actual spending will specifically target women.

An examination of the five NAIPs highlights an insufficient focus on women farmers. Although some recognise the importance of women farmers, there are few specific budget allocations to them, few concrete policy actions outlined and little explicit monitoring of how policies will benefit women, if at all.

In **Ethiopia**, although women heads of households can own land and have access to extension services, they rarely occupy positions of power in peasant associations and cooperatives. Women in male-headed households tend not to be members of such groups and lack access to inputs and services. Ethiopia's PIF recognises that 'gender disparities significantly impede women's empowerment' and that while the constitution guarantees gender equality and supports affirmative action, women have heavier workloads than men, tend to be excluded from control of farm income and inheritance of property, suffer disproportionately from environmental degradation and shoulder a greater burden of rural poverty.⁸⁰ Also positively, the PIF states that 'removing gender disparity and ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment is key to accelerated economic growth and social development'.⁸¹ It adds that:

'Gender mainstreaming needs to be strengthened and expedited in order to increase the benefit obtained from rural labour (men and women) and enhance value addition in the agricultural sector. Gender imbalances also need to be addressed at all levels of the institutional framework.'⁸²

Yet these good aspirations do not translate into concrete actions. The PIF elsewhere simply calls for a 'more balanced participation of men and women' in development and income-generating activities.⁸³ Although the 3.5 page PIF results framework, which is included in the annex to the PIF, notes that all the indicators of progress towards PIF objectives will be gender disaggregated⁸⁴, it does not otherwise mention gender or women in the indicators. Thus how or whether the PIF will specifically target women farmers, and monitor that, is unclear. Equally, although the PIF envisages funding irrigation more than any other agricultural sub-sector, it is unclear how and whether women will benefit. The PIF simply says that 'gender issues in irrigation development... need to be considered'.⁸⁵

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

Women farmers figure more specifically in Ethiopia's Agricultural Growth Programme (AGP), which resulted from its GAFSP funding request of September 2010, and which aims to increase incomes and reduce food insecurity in 2 million households. The AGP identifies women as amounting to 19 per cent of the programme's beneficiaries and, in its results monitoring framework, disaggregates the beneficiaries to include female-headed households.⁸⁶

Tanzania's TAFSIP, like Ethiopia's PIF, also calls for a 'more balanced participation of men and women' in development and income-generating activities.⁸⁷ It states that Tanzania will promote gender equity, 'ensuring that women and other vulnerable groups have equitable access to resources', and that gender mainstreaming will be strengthened. It adds that 'gender imbalances also need to be addressed at all levels of the institutional framework'.⁸⁸

Yet the TAFSIP does not prioritise the targeting of women. A technical review of the TAFSIP by CAADP is blunt in stating that 'there is... very little explicitly about gender issues in any of the programmes'.⁸⁹ The five-page results framework in the annex of the TAFSIP contains only one gender target (concerning the percentage of pregnant women supported in food security policies). It does state that 'indicators to be gender disaggregated where possible', but does not indicate how or when this will be done.⁹⁰

Burundi's PNIA recognises the 'central' role that women play in food security and, importantly, that they are the 'principal' agricultural producers in Burundi. It also acknowledges that they are 'marginalised' and have less access to inputs and services than men. The PNIA also states that gender issues 'will be systematically considered' in all development activities in conformity with the National Gender Policy, which was drawn up in 2003, and its broader development plan, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper.⁹¹ Yet, although the PNIA states that women will be among the main beneficiaries of the strategy⁹², there are no specifics or targets outlined for achieving this: for example, the brief 2.5 page list of PNIA indicators does not mention women.⁹³

More positively, Burundi's GAFSP project, which part-finances the PNIA and supports increasing food production and the supply of inputs in two regions (Imbo and Mosso), aims to ensure that 50 per cent of the beneficiaries are women. This will be 'easier in as much as [sic] most farmers are in fact women', the GAFSP proposal states.⁹⁴

Burkina Faso's PNSR also calls for the 'equal participation' of men and women in the PNSR, including in the design and implementation of investment priorities.⁹⁵ Unlike the three NAIPs mentioned above, the PNSR also includes some specific figures indicating the extent to which women will be beneficiaries. For example, the PNSR pledges to provide 100,000 items of animal traction equipment to farmers, of which half will go

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

to women.⁹⁶ It also states that 30 per cent of the areas to be improved by irrigation development will be set aside for ‘vulnerable groups (women, youth)’.⁹⁷ It also calls for the creation of specific rural finance mechanisms to support the activities of women and youth.⁹⁸ However, despite these specifics, the nine-page results framework of the PNSR, which provides indicators and means of verification for achieving the PNSR objectives, mentions women only once (stating that half the new jobs in forestry to be created by the PNSR will go to women).⁹⁹ Thus the PNSR does not outline concrete indicators for measuring positive impacts on women farmers specifically.

The positive exception to an otherwise poor focus on women in the NAIPs is **Rwanda’s** PSTA II. This recognises that women are responsible for the majority of food crop production¹⁰⁰, suffer from inequitable access to land¹⁰¹ and that there are too few women extension officers¹⁰². PSTA II also mentions the need to promote the training of farmers, including women farmers in irrigation and drainage systems and in the management of water user associations.¹⁰³ It also identifies the importance of rural credit programmes, stating that these ‘should be oriented as much or more toward women as toward men’.¹⁰⁴ PSTA II also promotes ‘gender friendly crops and livestock’ including programmes for controlling banana wilt disease and mushroom cultivation for rural women.¹⁰⁵ Unlike the other NAIPs under review, both the PSTA II¹⁰⁶ and the ASIP¹⁰⁷ specifically note the importance of supporting women’s rural organisations.

Women also figure prominently in PSTA II’s logical framework, which outlines objectives, indicators and means of verification for the policies included under the PSTA. The indicators include the number of women to be trained in soil and water conservation, the increase in the number of women extension agents and the number of women farmers’ organisations trained in entrepreneurship.¹⁰⁸

Rwanda’s ASIP states that policies will promote gender equality¹⁰⁹ and that a gender strategy will be designed and implemented¹¹⁰. It also states that a new M&E system will enable policies to be monitored, including for groups such as female-headed households.¹¹¹ In addition, Rwanda’s Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources is part of the government’s gender-responsive budgeting initiative, which means that the budget will be disaggregated to determine the extent to which it addresses the needs of both women and men farmers.¹¹²

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

3.3 LACK OF EXPLICIT PRIORITISATION OF SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

Sustainable agriculture (or agro-ecological farming) encompasses approaches such as agro-forestry, low external input farming, organic agriculture, and water harvesting in dry land areas and aims to integrate biological and nutrient processes such as nutrient cycling, nitrogen fixation and soil regeneration into food production processes. Sustainable agriculture makes use of the knowledge and skills of farmers and uses farming practices and technologies that fit local conditions, notably local, traditional varieties of seeds (bred by farmers themselves) and animal dung or crop residues for fertilizer, and that do not require large financial investments in inputs and technology. By contrast, chemical pesticides are not only expensive but are also responsible for millions of cases of poisoning a year and the contamination of groundwater. Chemical fertilizers also pose major dilemmas. Although they can increase yields, they can also cause soil degradation and loss of soil fertility in farmlands through destroying organic matter and cause pollution and dead zones in lakes and rivers.¹¹³ Some 30-80 per cent of nitrogen applied to farmland escapes to contaminate water systems and the atmosphere.¹¹⁴

While all five NAIPs under review emphasise the importance of natural resources management, none explicitly prioritises sustainable agriculture over 'conventional' farming that uses often large quantities of chemicals. All of the NAIPs under review have an ambivalent stance towards sustainable agriculture and the use of chemicals. They are all supporting forms of sustainable agriculture through natural resources management, but also calling for significant increased use of chemicals, which in most cases have specific indicators to be monitored. The approach that needs to be taken is not necessarily either/or. In some cases, a mix of (judiciously used) chemicals and sustainable agriculture approaches can be most effective for increasing farmer's yields. In others, the priority could be on significant *reductions* in the use of chemicals in favour of greater emphasis on sustainable agriculture approaches. However, none of the NAIPs is clear about what balance to strike and which to prioritise and why. Also, the NAIPs are largely silent on the environmental, human and financial risks of increased use of chemicals.

In **Rwanda**, the government has promoted a fertilizer subsidy programme since 2008, and increased access to fertilizers is a key aspect of Rwanda's agriculture strategy, noted in both the ASIP and PSTA II. Indeed, a specific indicator in the ASIP is to increase fertilizer usage from 14 to 56 million tonnes during the three-year ASIP programme.¹¹⁵ Indicators in PSTA II include an increase in the proportion of farms using chemical fertilizers (from 12 to 25 per cent) and in those using pesticides (from 26 to 37 per cent).¹¹⁶ The ASIP notes that 'the largest challenge here is developing effective demand for agrochemical inputs' since 'currently, the farming population does not appreciate

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

the value of modern inputs, particularly for the production of staple crops'.¹¹⁷ The ASIP states that the fertilizer subsidy will be gradually withdrawn once the private sector and smallholders are sufficiently strengthened.¹¹⁸ Neither the ASIP nor PSTA II acknowledge how use of agrochemicals can pollute soil or water.

At the same time, Rwanda's ASIP has a strong focus on natural resources management, with one aim being the protection of all the land against soil erosion – recognised as a major problem in Rwanda - using techniques such as terracing and agro-forestry, and promoting water conservation through, for example, water harvesting.¹¹⁹ A sub-programme of the ASIP focusing on sustainable management of natural resources is allocated a sizeable 25 per cent of the entire ASIP budget.¹²⁰ In addition to increases in farmers using chemicals, PSTA II also includes indicators for farmers practising sustainable agriculture: indicators include an increase in the proportion of farmers using organic fertilizer (from 7 to 25 per cent) and farms practising Integrated Pest Management, which usually reduces chemical pesticides (from 10 to 40 per cent).¹²¹

Tanzania's TAFSIP is unclear on whether the focus will be on sustainable agriculture or the increased use of chemicals, or in what balance. On the one hand the TAFSIP identifies the 'limited use' of fertilizers and agrochemicals as a constraint to increasing productivity.¹²² It also states that the government's input (ie, fertilizer) subsidy programme will cover the whole country – a significant expansion - and be a key pillar of the effort to increase agricultural productivity.¹²³ Indeed, the input subsidy programme is the largest single investment in Tanzania's agriculture budget.¹²⁴ In addition, a major aim of the GAFSP project in Tanzania, which supports increased rice production in the SAGCOT area, is precisely to increase the use of fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides; the project is promoting an expansion of the input subsidy programme to target rice farmers. Indeed, the GAFSP project intends to fund half the costs of the subsidised inputs package for rice farmers, amounting to around US\$14 million over 5 years.¹²⁵

On the other hand, the TAFSIP also calls for the promotion of sustainable agriculture and water management and the need to promote approaches such as water harvesting, conservation agriculture and agro-forestry.¹²⁶ It also calls for climate change issues to be mainstreamed into Tanzania's agriculture strategy and notes, positively, that 'a number of instruments need to be considered for adapting to climate change, including research on new crop/varieties and farming systems suited to hotter/drier conditions'.¹²⁷ The TAFSIP also states that all farmers should have 'full access to knowledge about different farming systems for sound environmental management'.¹²⁸ This would be very valuable in supporting a much larger promotion of sustainable agriculture in the country. Yet it would also require big investments in extension services which are not detailed in the TAFSIP.

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

The CAADP technical review of the TAFSIP notes that the team was not able to find adequate assessments of what would or could be the levels of pollution that will arise from the increased use of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides. In the case of Zanzibar, in spite of a huge envisaged expansion in the use of agrochemicals, no monitoring mechanisms are proposed to track environmental impacts.¹²⁹

Ethiopia's PIF states that government policy envisages a tripling of fertilizer use.¹³⁰ At the same time, the PIF calls for the adoption of 'more sustainable natural resource management practices' to reverse land degradation and a greater emphasis on climate change adaptation and mitigation.¹³¹ It recognises that the country suffers from 'severe land degradation' and has one of the highest rates of soil nutrient depletion in SSA.¹³² The PIF states that Ethiopia will address land degradation through for example, expanding the Sustainable Land Management project and by addressing climate change adaptation.¹³³

Burundi's PNIA highlights low soil fertility and land degradation as major problems and emphasises the funding of programmes to address these and improve the natural resource base. In particular, the PNIA aims to increase the quantity of animal manure used by 10 per cent a year in certain regions and to increase the proportion of farmers using sustainable approaches, such as agro-forestry and the use of fodder crops for animals, by 20 per cent a year.¹³⁴

At the same time, Burundi's PNIA laments the low use of fertilizer and pesticides¹³⁵ and calls for increased use of chemical fertilizer - by 10 per cent a year in certain regions¹³⁶. It also supports programmes to distribute fertilizer¹³⁷ though it does not specify the extent to which the government will do this. The GAFSP project proposal, which part-finances the PNIA, also aims to increase the supply of fertilizer to small farmers¹³⁸ and has an indicator in the results framework, also promoting a 10 per cent annual increase in fertilizer consumption.¹³⁹

Burkina Faso's PNSR notes that 46 per cent of the country suffers from land degradation, involving the disappearance of plant cover and soil erosion.¹⁴⁰ The PNSR places considerable emphasis on improving the natural resource base, especially through protecting water sources, enhancing soil fertility, promoting biodiversity and protecting forests and promoting agro-forestry. The 'sustainable development and management of natural resources' objective of the PNSR is allocated 19 per cent of the budget.¹⁴¹ The PNSR notes that the country's present production of organic manure is insufficient and the results framework calls for an increase in total organic manure production from 8 to 12 million tonnes.¹⁴² At the same time, however, the PNSR notes low fertilizer usage and states that it will facilitate increased farmers' access to chemical fertilizer and pesticides.¹⁴³ Indeed, it calls for increasing average chemical fertilizer use from 40kg/ha currently to 50 kg/ha by 2015.¹⁴⁴

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

3.4 UNREALISTIC FUNDING

Most of the governments under review are simply not spending enough on agriculture to reach the expenditure levels outlined in the NAIPs. All of the NAIPs under review include spending plans that are unrealistic – and often appear more as wishful thinking – in light of the actual budgets being allocated by governments to agriculture. Yet none of the NAIPs make clear which spending areas would be cut back, and how, if all the funds are not forthcoming.

Rwanda's ASIP is costed at \$848 million over three years but has a funding gap – the difference between pledges by government, donors and others, and costs – of \$325 million, or 28 per cent.¹⁴⁵ The ASIP notes that the government will 'aim' to allocate 10 per cent of the budget to agriculture.¹⁴⁶ Yet the government has not so far done this; available figures suggest that agriculture spending is likely to be under 7 per cent of the national budget.¹⁴⁷ The ASIP states that public investments in agriculture 'need to roughly double from current levels' to achieve the CAADP target of 6 per cent annual agricultural growth.¹⁴⁸

Burundi's PNIA requires Bf 1.45 trillion (US\$1.18 billion) for the six years 2012-17. However, of this sum only Bf 577 billion is already available while the funding gap is Bf 875 billion, or 60 per cent of needs.¹⁴⁹ The PNIA states that government spending on agriculture will rise¹⁵⁰, yet it is still difficult to see how the level of funds required will be reached. The PNIA does not detail where the extra funds will come from. Burundi's allocation to agriculture has traditionally been very low, at less than 2 per cent. It was only in 2008 that the government increased the sector's share to 4.2 per cent, but then reduced it again to 3.6 per cent in 2009 and to 2 per cent in 2010. In 2011, however, the allocation was significantly increased, to 6.8 per cent, according to the government¹⁵¹, although some figures suggest the proportion is higher, and over 10 per cent¹⁵²

Tanzania's TAFSIP requires investments of TShs 8.7 trillion (US\$5.3 billion) in its first five years.¹⁵³ Yet the total funds identified as being available were only TShs 4.0 trillion, leaving a financing gap of TShs 4.7 trillion (US\$2.9 billion) or 54 per cent of needs; of this gap, 45 per cent is envisaged to be provided by donors, 20 per cent by government and 35 per cent by the private sector, NGOs, farmers and others.¹⁵⁴ Not only is this a very large financing gap, the proportion of the gap to be filled by the private sector, NGOs and farmers seems unrealistic. The CAADP technical review of the TAFSIP produced even higher figures for the financing gap – of \$6.3 billion for the first five years.¹⁵⁵ In addition, Tanzania's TAFSIP commits the government to allocate 'a minimum ten percent' of its budget to agriculture.¹⁵⁶ This would be a significant increase: agriculture expenditure amounted to only 3.9 per cent in 2008/09, 3.6 per cent in 2009/10, 3.0 per cent in 2010/11 and 6.8 per cent in 2011/12.¹⁵⁷

Of the five countries in this review, Ethiopia and Burkina Faso devote the largest proportions of their national budgets to agriculture. But in both cases, spending is

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

insufficient to meet the costs outlined in the NAIPs. **Ethiopia's** PIF states that the government has been allocating 13 – 17 per cent of the total budget to agriculture and food security in recent years.¹⁵⁸ The PIF requires \$16.6 billion over 10 years of which, it states, \$2.5 billion is already committed under existing programmes. It gives contradictory figures for how much funding is need. Page ii of the PIF states that the government will fund around \$8.4 billion and donors \$5.6 billion.¹⁵⁹ On page 25, however, the PIF states that \$9.3 billion is required from government and \$6.2 billion from donors.¹⁶⁰ The funding gap is very large and it is unclear how it will be met.¹⁶¹

Burkina Faso's PNSR is costed at CFA 1.38 trillion for the five years 2011-15 but the document notes that current resourcing (from government, donors, the private sector and NGOs) amounts to only CFA 847 billion, leaving a financing gap of CFA 529 billion – or 38 per cent.¹⁶² The PNSR notes that the government's budget allocation to 'rural development' has been around 14 per cent during 2006-10, of which around 86 per cent has gone to the Ministry of Agriculture, 8 per cent to the Ministry of Animal Resource and 6 per cent to the Ministry of the Environment.¹⁶³ This is a large proportion compared to other countries in Africa. However, in volume terms, government spending amounts to around CFA 136 billion a year while the PNSR is costed at an average of CFA 275 billion a year.¹⁶⁴ Donors have filled some of the gap, but not enough. The PNSR does not commit the government to find the difference; it simply states that the government 'is expected' to make an additional effort to provide more resources.¹⁶⁵

As regards the allocation of the spending *within* the NAIP budgets, there is a particular emphasis on irrigation in Ethiopia and Burkina Faso. Around 38 per cent of **Ethiopia's** planned funding under the PIF is envisaged to go to irrigation, amounting to around \$3.4 billion.¹⁶⁶ Yet despite the PIF's focus on expanding irrigation, it says little about how it will do this; there is no separate section in the PIF, for example, providing details of its plan for irrigation. There is also no argument advanced as to why so much spending is justified on this area compared to others.¹⁶⁷

There is a similar concern with **Burkina Faso's** PNSR, which also allocates a large proportion of its budget to irrigation (18 per cent) and drinking water/sanitation (21 per cent).¹⁶⁸ Support for water and sanitation is not normally included in agriculture budgets and is not analysed further here. As regards irrigation, the PNSR results framework suggests that the level of ambition in terms of irrigation objectives appears quite low, despite the large budgetary allocation. For example, the PNSR aims to increase the proportion of agricultural production from irrigated areas as a proportion of total production from 10 to only 15 per cent and to increase the area under irrigation management from 38,000 to 55,000 hectares.¹⁶⁹ The PNSR does, however, envisage a substantial increase in irrigated rice production, from 143,000 to 455,000 hectares.¹⁷⁰ As with Ethiopia's PIF, the heavy budgetary focus on irrigation in the PNSR raises the issue whether other areas could be supported more.

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

SUMMARY OF FINANCING GAPS

	The funding gap compared to needs costed in the NAIP
Burkina Faso	CFA 529 billion, or 38 per cent.
Burundi	Bf 875 billion, or 60 per cent.
Ethiopia	Unclear
Rwanda	\$325 million, or 28 per cent.
Tanzania	TShs 4.7 trillion or 54 per cent.

There are several ways that African government could find extra resources for agriculture, such as by reducing military spending, reducing or abolishing the often massive tax exemptions (such as corporate income tax holidays) they give to companies¹⁷⁶ and/or by clamping down on 'illicit financial flows', mainly meaning tax evasion by transnational corporations, which cost Africa an average of US\$60 billion a year during 2005-10.¹⁷⁷

THE LACK OF DETAIL ON COORDINATION

Cross-government agriculture strategies often require a high level of coordination to be effective. Policy implementation can be very complex, and often involves coordination across different Ministries, departments, regions of the country and a variety of actors (government, private sector, donors and civil society). This is especially the case in promoting food security, which involves health and water policies in addition to agriculture. Yet Ministries of Agriculture tend to suffer from a lack of adequate capacity and coordination mechanisms. All the NAIPs recognise the need for coordination yet none provide significant details on how this will be ensured.

Burkina Faso's PNSR is intended to be implemented and evaluated by the Coordination Secretariat for Agriculture Policies (SP/CPSA in the French acronym) in collaboration with sector ministries.¹⁷⁸ But the PNSR says little about how this will be ensured at central or regional level, and does not identify the possible risks of lack of coordination. Neither does the issue of effective management coordination specifically appear in the results framework.¹⁷⁹ Similarly, in **Rwanda's** ASIP, coordination and the M&E system is a separate sub-programme but no detail is provided on how programmes will be coordinated. The ASIP simply states that the 'necessary coordination mechanisms' will be established.¹⁸⁰ Neither does PSTA II detail how effective coordination of programmes will be implemented.¹⁸¹

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

Burundi's PNIA recognises that inter-ministerial coordination is fundamental to its success and mentions the importance of coordination at several places in the document. It asserts that, although the PNIA is to be led by the agriculture ministry, MINAGRIE, inter-ministerial coordination 'will be assured' at Vice-President level and through an Agriculture and Rural Development Sectoral Group.¹⁸² Yet few details are provided, especially on how the different ministries will implement the PNIA. However, the largest problem is likely to be capacity. Burundi's GAFSP proposal document of March 2012 is frank in conceding that 'the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock is not currently in a position to supervise and support development of the sector. The inappropriate nature of its organisation and style of operating prevent it from carrying out the new tasks it is responsible for under the poverty alleviation strategy and the agricultural sector strategy as effectively as would be wished.'¹⁸³

Ethiopia's PIF recognises a variety of problems with institutional coordination, for example:

'There are also identified institutional gaps related to sector-wide linkages, relationships and synergies. Specific issues include lack of communication among ministries and between ministries and CSOs and parastatals; inadequate vertical and horizontal collaboration among research institutes; weak research-extension-farmer linkages; and lack of communication and collaboration with the private sector... The CAADP and PIF studies have identified a lack of coordination of development planning among federal and regional governments, and between these, CBOs and donor organisations.'¹⁸⁴

Yet despite this frank assessment, the PIF reveals very little about how these coordination constraints will be addressed, especially with CSOs and the private sector, while coordination is not mentioned in the PIF results framework.

The CAADP technical review of the PIF notes that 'there is not adequate cross Ministry coordination to ensure and maximise synergies and avoid any possible overlap' between the priority areas of the PIF. It adds that there is no instrument to involve both the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and the Environmental Protection Agency to coordinate efforts on sustainable land management, water and climate change issues.¹⁸⁵ The CAADP technical review of **Tanzania's** TAFSIP notes that the proposed coordination structures involving stakeholders from different ministries, private sector and civil society are commendable. However it adds: 'the challenge is that the complex structures for coordination will make it difficult to establish and maintain accountability'. It recommends that TAFSIP includes the proposed coordination mechanisms in the M&E framework with indicators to track whether and how well coordination is taking place.¹⁸⁶

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

3.5 LIMITED COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN IMPLEMENTING THE NAIPS

Farmers' organisations, community-based organisations and civil society organisations can be critical to the effective implementation of the NAIPs and to the design of agriculture policy. Farmer organisations should be championed and empowered to have an effective voice in decision-making. CSOs are increasingly delivering services, and providing technical support, to farmers, within frameworks set by government. Being independent of government, CSOs can also provide important external inputs into government policy and also help to hold government – and donors and the private sector – to account for their pledges and policies.

Yet the NAIPs strongly vary in the role envisaged for community based organisations in the implementation of policies, and our analysis here focuses on the role foreseen for CSOs. At one extreme is **Rwanda's** ASIP, in which CSOs are entirely absent in the 37 page document. The ASIP notes that all investments will be monitored under MINAGRI's new M&E system, but does not mention a role for CSOs or the private sector.¹⁸⁷ PSTA II mentions NGOs only in passing and fails to mention any role in coordination, M&E or other aspects of agricultural strategy.

Similarly, in **Ethiopia**, the PIF recognises that there has been a lack of communication and collaboration between ministries on the one hand, and CSOs and the private sector, on the other.¹⁸⁸ Yet the PIF does not subsequently mention CSOs, so it remains unclear how such coordination and collaboration will be improved. The CAADP technical review of the PIF notes that 'the role and modalities to engage non-state actors is not well developed in the PIF or the related program documents'. It states that the role of non-state actors, including the private sector, 'must be redefined in a way that makes full use of their potential'.¹⁸⁹ The PIF also states that 'CSOs are stakeholders and implementing bodies working in line with GoE [government of Ethiopia] policies and strategies'; yet this significantly downplays the more independent role of government that CSOs could and should play.¹⁹⁰

Ethiopia's AGP/GAFSP proposal is ambivalent on the degree of CSO involvement. The document does not mention CSOs; it does say that planning, implementation and M&E of the AGP will be 'supported by the advisory role' of bodies called Agricultural and Rural Development Partners Linkages Advisory Councils (ARDPLACs), which are multi-stakeholder rural councils chaired by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and which intends to expand its membership to include CSOs and the private sector.¹⁹¹

ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL INVESTMENT PLANS

Tanzania's TAFSIP identifies CSOs, and the private sector, as participating in activities such as input supply, financial services, marketing, storage and extension services.¹⁹² It also identifies CSOs as members of the Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Committee; this body is intended to meet quarterly and reports to the Cabinet and provides overall strategic coordination to TAFSIP and monitors its performance to ensure that its goals are met.¹⁹³

Both Burkina Faso and Burundi recognise CSOs as partners in the implementation of their NAIPs. Indeed, **Burkina Faso's** PNSR outlines five specific roles for CSOs: to participate in policy dialogue with the government; to participate in consultations with other actors; to provide technical assistance in implementing the PNSR; to contribute to mobilising financial resources; and to participate in M&E.¹⁹⁴ The PNSR includes expenditure by CSOs in its costing of the entire PNSR, and estimates these as 3 per cent of the total.¹⁹⁵

In **Burundi**, the PNIA's logical framework recognises CSOs as one of the partners (alongside, government, donors and the private sector) in implementing the PNIA.¹⁹⁶ It also recognises CSO reports as a source of verification for evidence that agriculture production is increasing and that farmers organisations are being strengthened.¹⁹⁷ An Agriculture and Rural Development Sectoral Group, which includes civil society representatives as well as government and donors, oversees implementation of the PNIA.¹⁹⁸ Burundi's GAFSP project proposal, which part-finances the PNIA and supports increasing food production and the supply of inputs in two regions, will be implemented by involving farmers' organisations and the private sector. Moreover, the project will be subject to annual supervision missions by the government and donors and farmers' organisations and the private sector will take part in these missions and be represented on the project technical committee.¹⁹⁹

CONCLUSIONS

The National Agriculture Investment Plans show a significant commitment to the agricultural sector, in particular by outlining a costed strategy for addressing holistically the needs of the agriculture sector, by increasing the government's attention to agriculture and by providing an often detailed statement of government intent. The individual NAIPs of the five countries under review all contain distinct positive features, including Ethiopia's significant continuing commitment to agriculture and food security, Rwanda's strong focus on supporting women farmers, Tanzania's relatively strong focus on promoting nutrition, Burundi's emphasis on promoting sustainable agriculture, and Burkina Faso's focus on pastoralists.

On the other hand, this report identifies major deficiencies in the NAIPs under review. Despite the important recognition in the NAIPs that smallholders are the primary intended beneficiaries, the real needs of smallholder farmers are often being bypassed, especially as regards enhancing land tenure security, increasing access to labour-saving technologies, prioritising the crops of most benefit to the poor and the failure to explicitly prioritise sustainable agriculture. There is a poor focus on women farmers in the sense that there is little specific, concrete targeting of them, they are not seen as a priority for investments, and there are few monitoring and other mechanisms to ensure that they benefit from agriculture investments. In addition, the proposed funding levels for all the NAIPs under review are wholly unrealistic; governments are simply not spending enough on agriculture to match the goals outlined in the NAIPs. Finally, most of the NAIPs envisage insufficient community participation in implementing or monitoring them, which is likely to further reduce their effectiveness.



Pastoralists fetching water in Ethiopia, Credit: ACORD

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the five governments should:

NEEDS OF SMALLHOLDER FARMERS

Land tenure security

- Ensure that smallholder farmers are enabled to increase the security they have over the land they farm, including by promoting land reform programmes
- Stop large-scale land acquisitions by adhering to the Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure. These should ensure that land investments are negotiated in a transparent way and protect the rights of smallholders²⁰⁰

Labour saving technologies

- Conduct a review of the needs of smallholder farmers as regards labour-saving technologies and increase farmers', especially women farmers, access to them. Both government support programmes and enabling private sector delivery should be considered

Crops of most benefit to the poor

- Ensure that NAIPs prioritise investments that are most likely to reduce poverty and promote agricultural development; this is likely to mean a focus on staple crops

WOMEN FARMERS

- Develop a much stronger overall focus on supporting women farmers by reviewing agriculture strategies and plans to understand how best to do so, and to outline implementation plans
- Explicitly target women farmers in NAIP policies and budgets and ensure that objectives are gender-disaggregated, monitored and included in the results framework
- Re-focus agriculture spending to target women farmers in key services, especially extension services, rural credit programmes and agricultural research
- Take more far-reaching steps to ensure that women are treated equally under the law – both in legislation and in practice – including as regards land ownership

RECOMMENDATIONS

SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

- Increase investments in farming approaches that promote sustainable agriculture
- Develop a national strategy to promote sustainable agriculture and to reduce farmers' dependence on chemical inputs

FUNDING

- Review NAIP budgets to ensure that they are realistic, and revise NAIP plans in this light
- Governments that have not yet reached the 10 per cent budget target should set a timetable for doing so. The African Union should adopt a timeline for reaching the 10 per cent commitment during the 2014 Year of Agriculture and Food Security
- Study mechanisms and non-agriculture budget lines to find extra resources for agriculture (by, for example, by considering reductions in military spending and reducing illicit capital flight)
- International donors should also ensure that their aid to agriculture is aligned to the NAIPs and to the improvements in the NAIPs outlined in this report, to ensure that aid is focused on the real needs of smallholder farmers

INVOLVEMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS

- Review the NAIPs to ensure that CSOs are seen as partners involved in implementation and monitoring as well as being independent of government

COORDINATION

- Increase capacity and management support for more effective cross-Ministry and cross-departmental coordination of policies

REFERENCES

- 1 – ‘FAO Director-General urges increase in agricultural investments’, 15 March 2011, <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/52745/icode/>
- 2 – <http://www.familyfarmingcampaign.net/>
- 3 – <http://caadp.net/>
- 4 – ‘About CAADP’, <http://caadp.net/about-caadp.php>
- 5 – D.Spencer, ‘The future of agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia: Whither the small farm?’, Proceedings of an International Conference, *IFPRI*, September 2001
- 6 – FAO, Committee on Agriculture, ‘Policies and Institutions to Support Smallholder Agriculture’, June 2010, para
- 7 – High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, *Land Tenure and International Investments in Agriculture*, FAO, July 2011, p.33
- 8 – High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, *Land Tenure and International Investments in Agriculture*, FAO, July 2011, p.33; UN, High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition, *Investing in Smallholder Agriculture for Food Security*, June 2013, p.47. As recently noted by the FAO, smallholders can have significant advantages over large-scale farmers in terms of efficiency in producing staple foods, for example. It notes that ‘there is a rich empirical literature suggesting that output per unit area in small farms is higher compared with larger farms’. This is due to greater intensity in the use of inputs, especially of family labour, which increases food security. The use of family labour offers flexibility denied to larger farms that depend on wage labour. The FAO also notes that smallholder production is more suitable for labour-intensive produce, such as vegetables, that require transplanting (moving a crop from one place to another), multiple harvests by hand and for other produce that require attention to detail. (FAO, Committee on Commodity Problems, ‘Identifying Appropriate Policy Intervention in Support of Smallholder Participation in Markets’, May 2012, para 22. See also Peter Hazell et al, ‘The future of small farms for poverty reduction and growth’, *IFPRI Discussion paper 42*, May 2007; Colin Poulton et al, ‘The future of small farms: New directions for services, institutions and intermediation’, IFPRI, June 2005; Peter Hazell and Xinshen Diao, ‘The role of agriculture and small farms in economic development’. IFPRI, June 2005; ActionAid/Food First, *Smallholder Solutions to Hunger, Poverty and Climate Change*, 2009; Peter Rosset, ‘The Multiple Functions and Benefits of Small Farm Agriculture in the Context of Global Trade negotiations’, *Food First Policy Brief*, 1999)
- 9 – FAO, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012*, p.28
- 10 – FAO, *The State of Food and Agriculture 2012: Investing in Agriculture*, p.6
- 11 – ActionAid, *Assessing Progress Towards the African Union’s 10 Per cent Budget Target for Agriculture*, June 2009, p.18; FAO, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World, 2008*, pp.48-50
- 14 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia’s Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.3
- 15 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.23
- 16 – Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.4
- 17 – Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d’Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.9

REFERENCES

- 18 — Republic of Burundi, *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, September 2006, p.38
- 19 — IFAD, *Republic of Burundi: Country Strategic Opportunities Programme*, September 2008, p.1
- 20 — See, for example, ActionAid, *Fertile Ground: How governments and donors can halve hunger by supporting small farmers*, April 2010
- 21 — See, for example, ActionAid, *Fertile Ground: How governments and donors can halve hunger by supporting small farmers*, April 2010
- 22 — FAO, *The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11*, p.5. If women farmers in Kenya had the same access to farm inputs and education as men food yields could increase by 22 per cent and the GDP growth rate would have doubled in 2004 from 4.3 per cent to 8.3 per cent. It is estimated that in Ghana if women had equal access to land and fertilizer as men, farm profits per hectare would double and that in Burkina Faso and Tanzania, provision of equal inputs and education to women as men could increase business incomes by 20 per cent. IFAD, FAO and World Bank, *Gender in Agriculture sourcebook*, 2009, p.522; 'Women in agriculture: The critical food producers', 15 October 2008, www.fao.org
- 23 — FAO, *The State of Food and Agriculture 2012: Investing in Agriculture*, p.26
- 24 — The PIF states that the 'primary beneficiary group' of the PIF will be smallholder farmers and pastoralists and that smallholder agriculture is the 'most important sub-sector of Ethiopia's economy' (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, pp.28, 13). Tanzania's TAFSIP states that the 'primary beneficiary group' will be smallholder farmers, pastoralists and fishing households. (United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.12)
- 25 — International Land Coalition, 'Land Rights and the Rush for Land', 2011, <http://www.landcoalition.org/cpl/CPL-synthesis-report>.
- 26 — Oxfam, "*Our Land, Our Lives*": *Time out on the global land rush*, 4 October 2012, p.2
- 27 — See, for example, Oxfam, "*Our Land, Our Lives*": *Time out on the global land rush*, 4 October 2012; Oxfam, *Land and Power: The growing scandal surrounding the new wave of investments in land*, September 2011; ActionAid, *Fuel for Thought: Addressing the social impacts of EU biofuels policies*, April 2012; various reports by the Oakland Institute and GRAIN and www.farmlandgrab.org
- 28 — <http://www.landmatrix.org/get-the-detail/by-target-country/?more=70>, accessed 4 November 2013
- 29 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.9
- 30 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.6
- 31 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.17
- 32 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.18

REFERENCES

- 33 — See, for example, www.farmlandgrab.org, and work by the Oakland Institute: <http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/land-deals-africa-ethiopia>
- 34 — FAO, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013*, p.42
- 35 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.27
- 36 — CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.11
- 37 — CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.12
- 38 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.36
- 39 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.33
- 40 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.38
- 41 — The Investment Blueprint says 9 million (SAGCOT, *Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania: Investment Blueprint*, January 2011, p.21, www.sagcot.com). The *Strategic Regional Environmental and Social Assessment* says 11 million (Government of Tanzania, *SAGCOT: Strategic Regional Environmental and Social Assessment, Interim Report*, July 2012, p.5)
- 42 — SAGCOT, *Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania: Investment Blueprint*, January 2011, Preface, www.sagcot.com
- 43 — SAGCOT’s environmental and social assessment states: ‘There will inevitably be impacts in relation to land use and acquisition, affecting peoples’ access to ownership of land as well as their livelihoods’. *SAGCOT: Strategic Regional Environmental and Social Assessment, Interim Report*, July 2012, p.61
- 44 — <http://www.sagcot.com/resources/downloads-resources/>, accessed 10 July 2013
- 45 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.7
- 46 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.34
- 47 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.35
- 48 — ‘Slow but steady progress on Burkina Faso land reform’, 18 September 2013, <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/22583-slow-but-steady-progress-on-burkina-faso-land-reform#sthash.Tai1B2P6.dpuf>
- 49 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.32
- 50 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.66

REFERENCES

- 51 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.60
- 52 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, pp. 20, 35
- 53 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.39
- 54 — Hiroyuki Takeshima and Sheu Salau, 'Agricultural Mechanisation and the Smallholder Farmers in Nigeria', NSSP, *Policy Note 22*, IFPRI, undated, p.2
- 55 — Hiroyuki Takeshima and Sheu Salau, 'Agricultural Mechanisation and the Smallholder Farmers in Nigeria', NSSP, *Policy Note 22*, IFPRI, undated, p.2
- 56 — World Bank et al, *Gender Sourcebook*, p.290
- 57 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.39
- 58 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.19
- 59 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.19
- 60 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.37
- 61 — Tewodaj Moques et al, *The Impacts of Public Investment In and For Agriculture: Synthesis of the Existing Evidence*, IFPRI, October 2012, p.24
- 62 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, pp.19-20
- 63 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.18
- 64 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.38
- 65 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, Annex 1
- 66 — United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Finance, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Request for funding – Public sector window*, March 2012, p.12
- 67 — United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Finance, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Request for funding – Public sector window*, March 2012, p.12
- 68 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.18
- 69 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, pp.5, 62

REFERENCES

- 70 — Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, pp.23-24
- 71 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.3
- 72 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.7
- 73 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.22
- 74 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.6
- 75 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.20
- 80 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.4
- 81 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.5
- 82 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.15
- 83 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.28
- 84 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.33
- 85 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.10
- 86 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Agricultural Growth Program*, September 2010, p.9 and annex 1
- 87 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.7
- 88 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.31
- 89 — CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.17
- 90 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.64
- 91 — A summary of the PNIA is contained in Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.10

REFERENCES

- 92 — Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.52
- 93 — Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, pp.78-80
- 94 — Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.18
- 95 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.17
- 96 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.19
- 97 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.25
- 98 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.29
- 99 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.68
- 100 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.vi
- 101 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.14
- 102 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.61
- 103 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.55
- 104 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.81
- 105 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.60
- 106 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.63
- 107 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.16
- 108 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, pp.93-99
- 109 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.10
- 110 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.26
- 111 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.33

REFERENCES

- 112 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.33
- 113 — Reyes Tirado, 'Defining Ecological Farming', *Greenpeace Research Laboratories Technical Note*, June 2009, p.4
- 114 — Jules Pretty, 'Agroecological Approaches to Agricultural Development', Background Paper for the World Development Report 2008, 2008, p.6
- 115 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.12
- 116 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.96
- 117 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.11
- 118 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.12
- 119 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, pp.6, 9
- 120 — Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, Annex 3
- 121 — Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture in Rwanda, Phase II (PSTA II)*, Final Report, February 2009, p.96
- 122 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.26
- 123 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.38. The CAADP technical review of the TAFSIP cites discussions with the government during the review to the effect that the proposed nationwide coverage of the input subsidy programme in the TAFSIP is a 'typographical error'. Officials stated the aim is to ensure the TAFSIP enables farmers throughout the whole country to access inputs, including through the fertilizer subsidy. CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.33
- 124 — CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.33
- 125 — United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Finance, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Request for funding – Public sector window*, March 2012, pp.16-18, 29
- 126 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, pp.36-7
- 127 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.30
- 128 — United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.30

REFERENCES

- 129 — CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.11
- 130 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.10
- 131 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.i. The PIF states: 'Climate change is a further crosscutting issue that will be addressed in all areas of the PIF. ... A number of instruments need to be considered for adapting to climate change including research on new crops and farming systems suited to hotter/drier conditions, water harvesting, agro-forestry, improved short and long term weather forecasting, and risk management measures to cope with increasing climatic variability. Mitigation measures such as carbon sequestration through conservation agriculture and reforestation should also be considered. In this way, climate change issues will be mainstreamed into the PIF by undertaking carbon accounting studies of all key investments and identifying opportunities for adaptation and mitigation.' Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.15
- 132 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.3
- 133 — Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.14
- 134 — Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.21
- 135 — A summary of the PNIA is found in Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.9
- 136 — Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.22
- 137 — A summary of the PNIA is found in Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.10
- 138 — Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.17
- 139 — Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.26
- 140 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.3
- 141 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.74
- 142 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, pp.19, 63
- 143 — Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.19

REFERENCES

- 144 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.19
- 145 – Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.3
- 146 – Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.6
- 147 – <http://www.resakss.org/region/rwanda/caadp-targets>
- 148 – Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.7
- 149 – Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, pp.47-9; Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.11
- 150 – Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.45
- 151 – Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, pp.11-12.
- 152 – See, for example, Resakss figures at: <http://www.resakss.org/region/burundi/caadp-targets>
- 153 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.10
- 154 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, pp.52-3
- 155 – CAADP, *CAADP Post Compact Review – Tanzania: Country Review Report*, July 2011, p.43
- 156 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.7
- 157 – United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Finance, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Request for funding – Public sector window*, March 2012, p.8
- 158 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.12
- 159 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.ii
- 160 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.25
- 161 – CAADP, *CAADP Technical Review: Summary of Key Findings for Ethiopia*, September 2010, p.10
- 162 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.52

REFERENCES

- 163 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.47
- 164 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.47
- 165 – ‘Aussi, un effort supplémentaire est attendu a partir de recettes propres de L’Etat’. Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.52.
- 166 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia’s Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.26
- 167 – The PIF states: ‘Given the prominence of irrigation in Ethiopia’s investment plans, there is also a need to strengthen planning and design of irrigation schemes, including community participation and environment impact assessment, and to strengthen irrigation extension services and water user associations.’ Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia’s Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.12
- 168 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.48
- 169 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, pp.64-5
- 170 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.65
- 176 – Recent research by ActionAid and the Tax Justice Network Africa found that four East African countries (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda - lose up to US\$2.8 billion a year from the tax incentives and exemptions their governments provide. ActionAid/Tax Justice Network Africa, *Tax Competition in East Africa: A Race to the Bottom?*, April 2012
- 177 – Global Financial Integrity, *Illicit Financial Flows from Developing Countries, 2001-10*, December 2012, p.6
- 187 – Government of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, *Agriculture Sector Investment Plan 2009-2012*, undated, p.33
- 188 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia’s Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.11
- 189 – CAADP, *CAADP Technical Review: Summary of Key Findings for Ethiopia*, September 2010, p.4
- 190 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, *Ethiopia’s Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020*, September 2010, p.8
- 191 – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme: Agricultural Growth Program*, September 2010, pp.10, 20
- 192 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.44
- 193 – United Republic of Tanzania, *Tanzania Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21*, October 2011, p.47

REFERENCES

- 194 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.57
- 195 – Burkina Faso, *Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR) 2011-15*, July 2012, p.51
- 196 – Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.61
- 197 – Republique du Burundi, *Plan National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA), 2012-17*, June 2011, p.62
- 198 – Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.23
- 199 – Republic of Burundi, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, *Global Agriculture and Food Security Program: Request from the Government of Burundi*, March 2012, p.23
- 200 – FAO, *Voluntary Guidelines on the Governance of Tenure, At a glance*, 2012, p.6. For a full version go to FAO, *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security*, 2012, p.3 ff, http://www.fao.org/nr/tenure/governance-of-tenure/en/?no_cache=1



Women farmer in Ethiopia, Credit: ACORD



Agency for Co-operation and Research in Development
Association de Coopération et de Recherches pour le Développement
Agência de Cooperação e de Pesquisa para o Desenvolvimento

ACORD
P.O. Box 61216 - 00200,
Nairobi, Kenya

Tel. +254 20 272 1186
Email. info@acordinternational.org
www.acordinternational.org



Farmer in Burundi, Credit: ACORD