



ROPPA



Agricultural Investment

FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILY FARMING AND
SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS IN AFRICA



African farmer workshop

“Agricultural Investment strengthening family farming and sustainable food systems in Africa”

4 and 5 May 2011, Mfou, Yaoundé, Cameroun

Synthesis Report

This report is dedicated to Ndiogou Fall, founder-president of ROPPA and co-organizer of the Mfou, Yaoundé workshop, who devoted his life to the African peasant movement.

African farmer workshop
“Agricultural Investment strengthening family farming and
sustainable food systems in Africa”

4 and 5 May 2011, Mfou, Yaoundé, Cameroun

Synthesis Report

This report is dedicated to Ndiogou Fall, founder-president of ROPPA and co-organizer of the Mfou, Yaoundé workshop, who devoted his life to the African peasant movement.

Contents

1	Introduction and summary outcomes	1
2	Context: strategies and realities of investment in African agriculture today	3
3	Family farming in Africa: concepts, realities and potential to strengthen sustainable food systems	5
4	Constraints faced by African family farmers and their proposals for investment in agriculture	7
5	Improving African farmer organizations' participation in, and impact on, the design and implementation of agricultural policies and investment programmes.	9
6	Action plan	11
Annexes:		
	1. Programme	13
	2. Participants	14
	3. Key decision-making events/processes on agricultural investment in Africa and internationally	15

Agricultural Investment strengthening family farming and sustainable food systems in Africa

African Farmer Perspective

The issue of agricultural investment is a key one in Africa and how and where these investments are directed is of considerable concern to African family farmers and their organisations. From CAADP to the reformed Committee on World Food Security, enhanced investment for food security is at the top of the agenda. Although there is now a commitment on the part of multilateral institutions and of a number of donors to give greater priority to supporting family farmers, a number of questions need to be explored in depth in order to ensure that the support proposed is what is wanted by, and is potentially beneficial to, Africa's family farmers and their sustainable food systems. These productive and resilient family farming systems currently provide food for more than 80% of the African population and could deliver more.

The African regional farmers' platforms conclude that in order to defend and promote family farming, sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, it is necessary:

1. to realise a common approach in the face of harmful agricultural investments that are capturing productive resources, imposing industrial models of production, and implementing policies, strategies and research and other programmes that undermine local food systems;
2. to redirect agricultural investments towards more agroecological, biodiverse and resilient models of production supported by participatory research, development and extension systems under farmers' control;
3. to give priority to agricultural investments that support the infrastructure and input requirements of sustainable family farming;
4. to secure agricultural investments to improve the effectiveness, capacities and capabilities of farmers' organisations and networks, including their ability of farmers to self organize, for example in co-operatives that have social, economic, welfare and equity principles;
5. to ensure that there is meaningful participation by our networks and organisations, by using in particular, the approach agreed by States for civil society engagement in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) which recognizes the autonomy of civil society organizations and welcomes them – small-scale food producers, in particular – as full participants. Existing arrangements in, for example, the accelerated CAADP and other investment programmes, are not as effective.

**African farmer workshop
“Agricultural Investment strengthening family farming and
sustainable food systems in Africa”**

4 and 5 May 2011, Mfou, Yaoundé, Cameroun

1. Introduction

The workshop was organised by PROPAC with ROPPA, EAFF and PAFO. The participants were leaders or staff members of these West, Central and East African regional and continental family farmers' platforms, advisers and representatives of the NGOs in the EuropAfrica network. It was held in Mfou, Cameroun with the support of Terra Nuova, the More and Better network, Concord, Practical Action and FAO.

The issue of agricultural investment is a key one in Africa and how and where these investments are directed is of considerable concern to African family farmers and their organisations. From CAADP to the reformed Committee on World Food Security, enhanced investment for food security is at the top of the agenda. Although there is now a commitment on the part of multilateral institutions and of a number of donors to give greater priority to supporting family farmers, a number of questions need to be explored in depth in order to ensure that the support proposed is what is wanted by, and is potentially beneficial to, Africa's family farmers and their sustainable food systems.

The workshop was designed to start a process of reflection during 2011 that would sharpen and deepen the strategies and methodologies by which the national, regional and continental organisations of family farmers and other small-scale producers can have an effective influence on policy, especially agricultural investment¹.

It examined the current state of play of investments in African agriculture from the perspective of African farmers; it discussed key principles for investments that will strengthen family farming and sustainable food systems; and proposed actions to influence decisions.

In this context, the deliberations in the workshop were divided into 4 themes: 1) Family farming and food systems; 2) Agricultural investment strategies of the international community and the implications for family farming; 3) Farmers' organisations and processes to design and implement policies and support programmes: what participation/involvement and what outcomes?; 4) Next steps – priority action plans, calendar, actors and organisations, resources.

The methodology for the workshop used three approaches in dealing with each area of the agenda. First, each region described the situation of investments and family farming in order to provide a shared basis of knowledge and understanding, and facilitate the formulation of positions to be proposed and defended. Secondly, on the basis of these inputs, and those provided by the NGOs present, there was an analysis of the perspectives of family farming and the challenges that it faces, in order to address investment needs in a relevant manner, taking into account the programmes that are currently underway, their results and their limitations. Thirdly, contributions to an action plan were proposed. These were to provide a road map and suggest how to disseminate and build upon on the conclusions of the workshop, strengthening farmers' organisations and PAFO in its work on the sensitisation of its members, its interface with governments and development partners and its advocacy in relevant forums.

In the context of the discussions about defending productive and resilient family farming systems that currently provide food for more than 80% of the African population and could

¹ *The definition of 'farmers' in this meeting was meant as an term that includes the women and men, peasant and other family farmers, livestock keepers and pastoralists, fisher peoples and other fisherfolk, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples and other small-scale food providers, in both rural and urban areas. Similarly 'agriculture' was used in a broad sense to refer to multiple systems of food and non-food production, gathering and harvesting in both rural and urban areas, through farming, livestock raising, pastoralism, fisheries, aquaculture, gardening and collection of forest products.*

deliver more, the workshop summarised the analysis, in the different regions, of the state of agricultural investments in Africa and their impacts on family farming and sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, and determined collective actions.

Summary Outcomes:

The FO platforms commit to increase their knowledge and strengthen and deepen their analysis of investment dynamics and share information with their members and other networks in PAFO. They intend to find ways to increase the capacity of the networks to make the united voices of farmers' organisations heard at all levels, and to defend the interests of all Africa's family farmers, in decision making forums.

They also commit to develop and defend, in different national, regional, continental and international forums, the advocacy strategies which are urgently needed to redirect agricultural investments and defend family farming, sustainable food systems and food sovereignty. The workshop has initiated a process to determine, in different regions, the typology of family farming and its development and support needs and to share this across the continent. The processes of engagement in decision making - nationally, regionally, continentally and internationally – will be promoted especially using the approach adopted by the UN Committee on world Food Security (CFS). In this context the Chair of the Pan African Farmers' Organisation (PAFO) is encouraged to set up a working group to provide information and analysis on key issues concerning agricultural investment, other agricultural policies and related issues.

The farmers' platforms conclude that in order to defend and promote family farming, sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, it is necessary:

1. to realise a common approach in the face of harmful agricultural investments that are capturing productive resources, imposing industrial models of production, and implementing policies, strategies and research and other programmes that undermine local food systems;
2. to redirect agricultural investments towards more agroecological, biodiverse and resilient models of production supported by participatory research, development and extension systems under farmers' control;
3. to give priority to agricultural investments that support the infrastructure and input requirements of sustainable family farming;
4. to secure agricultural investments to improve the effectiveness, capacities and capabilities of farmers' organisations and networks, including their ability of farmers to self organize, for example in co-operatives that have social, economic, welfare and equity principles;
5. to ensure that there is meaningful participation by our networks and organisations, by using in particular, the approach agreed by States for civil society engagement in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) which recognizes the autonomy of civil society organizations and welcomes them – small-scale food producers in particular – as full participants. Existing arrangements in, for example, the accelerated CAADP and other investment programmes, are not as effective.

2. Investment in Agriculture in Africa: the context: opportunities and challenges

The food crisis has opened a window of opportunity by provoking a rethinking of investment strategies to attain sustainable food security but has not yet resulted in a decisive re-orientation of approaches.

Food insecurity in Africa is a structural issue.

Food insecurity in Africa is the result of three decades of failed policies that have cut back public support to agriculture while opening African markets to unfair competition from underpriced, subsidized food products from abroad. Investment in agriculture, drastically reduced, has been oriented towards export crops targeting the global market rather than food crops for domestic consumption. It has promoted the growth of industrial systems that poison the environment and rob land and water from peasants, pastoralists and artisanal fisherfolk.

The food price crisis has provoked a range of contrasting strategy proposals

The food price crisis, with its impact on national security, has sounded a wake-up call. There is today a general recognition on the part of governments and institutions of the imperative of food security, the need to increase investment in agriculture, to strengthen domestic food production especially in food deficit countries, to address risk and resilience issues such as climate change and price volatility. But very different strategies are being proposed to meet these goals.

Most governments and institutions recognize, at least in words, the need to support small-scale producers as key actors in achieving food security. Some link food security to climate change and poverty reduction. They acknowledge the role of sustainable family farming - as compared with industrial agriculture - in creating employment, stimulating local economies and providing environmental services.² Others, however, place the accent on increased productivity using industrial technologies as the key factor in attaining food security. They tend to view family farming as an archaic mode of production, incapable of feeding Africa's population, that needs to be "modernized" through a transition to market-led industrial agri-food systems in which some small-scale producers could participate through contractual arrangements.³

Most forget that family farmers account for the bulk of Africa's food

Most governments and institutions – both in Africa and internationally – tend to ignore the evidence that African family farmers NOW are meeting up to 80% of Africa's food needs, despite the fact that they are receiving little or no policy and programme support. This blindness is compounded by a tendency to separate out investment from the issue of what agricultural models are most suited to meet food security, environmental, poverty reduction objectives. Yet an increasing body of reports, like those of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and the International Assessment on Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology⁴, document the fact that small-scale producers adopting agro-ecological approaches are capable of delivering sufficient food for the growing population as well as ensuring improved equity and a restored environment.

Rhetoric is most often not matched by action

The rhetoric about the need to invest in agriculture to combat food insecurity is not being matched by action. Some African governments, like those of Burkina Faso did take steps to support food production by family farmers in the wake of the 2008 food price crisis, with quite positive results. Nonetheless, the commitment to devote at least 10% of the national budget to agriculture adopted by African Heads of State and Government

² See, for example, the EC policy framework to assist developing countries in addressing food security challenges. http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/COMM_PDF_COM_2010_0127_EN.PDF

³ See, for example, the "New Vision for Agriculture" of the World Economic Forum http://www3.weforum.org/docs/IP/AM11/CO/WEF_AgricultureNewVision_Roadmap_2011.pdf and the SAGCOT proposal for Tanzania www.africacorridors.com/sagcot/.

⁴ See IAASTD documents at www.iaastd.net, and explanations and commentaries in "Agriculture at a Crossroads" - report of a conference in the UK Parliament www.ukfg.org.uk. See report on agroecology and the right to food by Prof Oliver De Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, at www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/officialreports/20110308_a-hrc-16-49_agroecology_en.pdf

at the AU Summit in Maputo in 2003 has been met by less than a handful of governments. Some national and regional agriculture policies place family farming and food sovereignty at the centre of their strategies⁵, yet there is a broad gap between these policies and the programmes formulated to implement them. For example, the EAC has an ARD strategy and policy that was adopted more than 5 years ago but is still relatively unimplemented, despite the persistent drought cycles in the region, with some countries in the region issuing export bans of agriculture commodities to their neighbours notwithstanding that they are implementing a full customs union and have already ratified a common market protocol that allows for free movement of goods and services.

On the side of the international community, donor ODA pledges have not been followed by disbursements. Meeting in L'Aquila in 2008 the G8 pledged \$22 billion of investment in agriculture in developing countries for the 2009-2011 period, of which only \$6.7 billion proved to be new, additional resources. By the time of the AFSI meeting in Paris in April 2011 disbursements amounted to only \$4.2 billion. Those programmes that have been funded by ODA have most often not applied significantly different approaches to better target food security and small-scale producers.⁶

New sources of investment have appeared alongside of ODA and government expenditure

New forms of private and private/public investment have come on the scene strongly. Targeting different objectives than those of food security, poverty reduction, development, they are driven by a range of interests ranging from political (desire of rich food deficit countries to outsource food production) to commercial (for example biofuels), to financial speculation (for example hedging by investment funds). They are resulting in the commodification of African land and water resources, most visibly in the form of landgrabs. Competition for growing African urban food markets (one of few growing food markets in the world) is also on the horizon.

African governments are tending to compete to obtain these new investment flows by offering cheap and easy access to resources. In this they are aided by permissive investment regulations promoted under Bilateral Investment Treaties and the policy advice of the International Finance Corporation of the –World Bank group. Unaccountable governance and corruption is also an issue. The collusion among Foreign Direct Investment, national authorities and national capital is widespread but insufficiently documented. There is also collusion between corporate interests and development partners and philanthropic foundations that act as front runners for multilateral corporations in areas like that of introducing the products of biotechnology research and permissive bio-safety regulations.

Lots of noise about FDI and ODA but most investment is made by farmers themselves

There is increasing recognition that role of FDI and ODA in agricultural investment is marginal. What counts is in-country government investment and above all investment by family farmers themselves, which accounts for the bulk of investments in agriculture.⁷ According to statistics, in 2007 out of a total of \$189 billion investment in agriculture, of which \$139 billion were from domestic sources (public and on-farm). Only \$3 billion were attributed to FDI. It follows that what can make the most difference in terms of food security is to design an enabling policy and regulatory environment and ensure public investments in key public goods to encourage and enhance the effectiveness of family farmers' on-farm investment.

Who decides what policies and investments to promote?

As detailed in section 5 below, the family farmers' movements in Africa have built up their organizational strength and their capacity to advance and defend alternative development and investment proposals within

⁵ For example, the ECOWAS regional agricultural policy, ECOWAP, and the national Agricultural Framework Document of Mali.

⁶ An example is provided by the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP- www.gafspfund.org) administered by the World Bank, which up to now has tended to support activities which are gap-fillers or scaling up of programmes already being executed by the World Bank and Regional Development Banks. The civil society members of the GAFSP Steering Committee are advocating for a revision of the call criteria of the GAFSP to privilege objectives of food security and support to family farmers.

⁷ This will be a major message of the 2012 issue of FAO's *The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA)*, dedicated to investment in agriculture.

the framework of food sovereignty. They are now capable of representing the interests of the primary agricultural investors in reflections and negotiations regarding agricultural investment, but they are not sufficiently involved in decision-making at all levels. Stakeholder participation is intended to be a key component of the CAADP process, but the race towards investments is accelerating the CAADP compact and Country Investment Plan process to such a degree that stakeholder participation and impact on policy and programme design and implementation becomes increasingly difficult.

At regional, continental and global levels there is a multiplication of proposals for guidelines, codes of conduct, and principles relevant to agricultural investment at all levels. Only a few of these – notably the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on Governance of Land and Natural Resource Tenure – involve the actors most concerned in the process of formulation in a meaningful way. Others, like the RAI Principles formulated by the World Bank, FAO, IFAD and UNCTAD, have seen no involvement by civil society actors (or governments) and risk legitimizing unaccountable decisions on private and private/public investment to the detriment of family farmers and sustainable food systems. The reformed Committee on World Food Security (CFS), in which family farmers' organizations are full and active participants, provides a potential opportunity to bring food security concerns to bear on strategies for investment in agriculture.

3. Family farming in Africa : concepts, realities and potential to strengthen sustainable food systems

Preliminary considerations

In order to discuss family farming meaningfully it is necessary to define the **objectives** of agriculture in Africa. This has not yet been done in the many African countries that have not adopted a national agricultural policy. When such an exercise of strategic orientation is undertaken a number of other key questions emerge which must also be addressed, among others:

- What kind(s) of market(s) should be created or promoted, with which actors?
- What kinds of accompanying measures are necessary to add value to the products?
- What other social, cultural, economic and environmental services, apart from production alone, do African societies want agriculture to provide?

Family farming must be analysed in a holistic and multifunctional fashion. When this kind of broader framework is applied the advantages of sustainable family farming as compared with industrial agriculture become overwhelmingly evident, as documented in a growing body of studies.

What do we mean by family farming and family farms?

It can be useful to start off by demolishing some misleading myths. Family farming is **not** an archaic model of agriculture, imprisoned in impossibly tiny farm sizes and frozen into a declining destiny of subsistence production. On the contrary it is a diversified and constantly evolving model which is perfectly capable of increasing its already substantial contribution to the food security and the economic, social and environmental well-being of African countries and regions.

Family farming is a way of life as well as a mode of production. It is opposed to the model of industrial agriculture by its objectives in the first instance. While industrial agriculture aims only at generating profits from financial capital, the primary objective of family farming is the reproduction of the family unit through food production for household consumption and, successively, the generation of revenues to meet the other needs of its members.

By definition, a **family farm** is a human unit/entity of production in which the farmers (and their associates) apply a system of agricultural production.

Agricultural units can be classified into two categories which are associated with two modes of production that have very different bases:

- family farms ;
- industrial agricultural enterprises (agribusiness and agro-industry).

The **family farm** could be defined as follows:

An association composed of two or more members united by family or customary ties, which exploits production factors in common - in rural or urban areas - in order to generate resources (for social reproduction as well as financial, material, moral resources...). The family farm operates under the direction of one of its members, male or female. Its priority is to produce food for the members of the unit and, successively, to create wealth in order to contribute to their well-being.

The head of the unit is responsible for managing the farm's activities and ensuring the best possible exploitation of the factors of production while respecting the environment. He or she exercises this function as his/her principle occupation. The members of the unit – men, women, and young people - have the responsibility of working to achieve the economic and social viability of the farm.

In other words:

A family farm is a group of people with family ties who produce, while protecting the environment, in order to feed themselves in the first instance and to provide the surplus to the local market or elsewhere in order to earn income to improve their living conditions. It is directed by a man or woman member of the farm.

Basic principles

There is a variety of typologies of family farming both among African regions and within each region. Mapping these typologies and the kinds of policy and programme/investment support they require is a priority engagement of the African regional farmers' platforms. However, family farming throughout Africa responds to a set of basic principles which are interrelated and cannot be dissociated:

- The model of agriculture promoted by family farms aims at feeding its members as a first priority and then at generating income.
- It is a model which – unlike industrial agriculture – allows for working in harmony with the environment by respecting the principles of sustainability based on agro-ecological modes of production.;
- It creates sustainable employment both for the members of the unit and for others outside of the farm, like local artisans and small-scale traders.
- It systematically promotes the diversification of production. By placing priority on minimizing risks rather than maximizing profits it combats the industrial monoculture systems which destroy the environment;
- It contributes to organizing local food markets according to an approach by levels: from the household on up to the village, the commune or district, the region, and so on. It contributes to social economy and solidarity by promoting a better redistribution of the resources generated ;
- It promotes participatory research within the production space and carries out on-going professional training structured around the farm activities and mode of life;
- The means of production are under the control of the members of the farm;
- It is oriented towards the attainment of food sovereignty and the respect of human dignity.

Family farming and Africa's food needs

Family farms produce up to 80% of the food consumed in African countries, much of which does not enter the formal market. They provide employment for 70% of the population, both directly and by stimulating local economies, and constitute the only potential solution for absorbing the growing population of unemployed young people. They use a large proportion of cultivated, fallow and grazed land⁸ and are responsible for the sustainable management of the bulk of Africa's natural resources. They constitute a response to the risks of food price volatility. Research conducted in Senegal demonstrates that family farms produce two-thirds of all of food consumed in Senegal today and practically all of the dry cereals that constitute the staple food of more than 60% of the population.⁹ If they benefited from the necessary political, economic and social accompanying measures they would be able to feed Africa's growing population in a sustainable fashion and contribute to a more vibrant and equitable economy.

⁸ See Joan Baxter, 7 April 2011 "The War On Africa's Family Farmers" <http://allafrica.com/stories/201104080804.html>

⁹ "Les exploitations familiales ont la capacité de nourrir le Sénégal" - www.cncr.org/IMG/pdf/forum_paysan_message_1_texte_1_.pdf

4. Constraints and Proposals

As described in the previous section, African family farmers and their sustainable food systems are able to feed Africa and more, given adequate protection and support, and this could be enhanced by a redirection of agricultural investments. The key question is therefore: How to ensure that agricultural investments are directed towards the model of production that is embodied in family farming?

A number of other questions were raised in the workshop, which highlight the key challenges that confront family farming, including:

- How can access by family farmers to land and other productive resources be secured without promoting the privatisation of the country's land?
- How can the visibility of family farming be enhanced and consumer choices be directed towards local products in the face of the loss of traditional food habits as a result of food aid, dumped food imports etc?
- How can priority be given to an approach that focuses on overall income for family farms rather than one based on prices, which does not take into account the expenses that family farmers incur that allow the farm family to feed itself as well as generate sufficient income for basic social services such as education, health, housing and water?
- How can local, national and regional markets be organised in such a way as to better integrate family farming into an economic system based on social solidarity, which creates employment and redistributes wealth?
- How can research be developed towards agroecological methods and techniques, in a participatory way, to give priority to the production, processing and provision of local foods produced sustainably by family farms? How can the results of this research be better shared at the level of family farmers to facilitate the adoption of innovative production techniques? How can information provision support family farming and sustainable food systems?
- How can technical assistance and extension be organised so that it supports family farming – both production and local processing which adds value?
- How can coherent agricultural policies be developed in the framework of food sovereignty?
- How can farmers' organisations, platforms and networks defend themselves from the imposed creation of parallel structures, by states, NGOs and international programmes, that will undermine a coherent voice in support of family farming and sustainable food systems by our established networks?

Following detailed discussions, participants identified four sets of constraints which have been summarised below; and made a non-exhaustive set of proposals of how to deal with these. In addition there was a fifth constraint – that of 'participation' – and it is dealt with separately in the subsequent section.

Constraint:

- In the face of widespread land and water 'grabs', the privatisation of natural resources and farmers' seeds and other resources as well as various threats to natural resources such as the degradation of soils and the reduction in grazing lands, climate change impacts, family farmers must be able to secure access to and control over the means of production – land, water, seeds and agricultural biodiversity, energy – especially for women and youth, that are necessary to strengthen family farming.

Proposal

To realise this, the coherent resistance across the regions is needed to confront the capture, commodification and privatisation of resources and that policies, in the framework of food sovereignty, should be developed at national and regional levels to protect the resources for, and increase the resilience of, agroecological production¹⁰, necessary for family farming now and in the future.

¹⁰ *The necessary move towards agroecological production is one that would integrate cropping, livestock raising and fisheries in the production system, where possible*

Constraint:

- The shortage of long-term credit, funding and insurance to support, especially women, family farmers, pastoralism and artisanal fishing is a major constraint. What is currently available does not address the priority needs of family farmers, which funders do not recognise and understand.

Proposal

Dedicated funds at affordable costs should be made available for the long-term support of family farming and the supply of inputs needed to realise their sustainable food systems e.g. locally adapted and biodiverse seeds, diverse breeding stock, biopesticides, organic manures, appropriate equipment for tillage, irrigation and transport, and sustainable, especially bio-, energy sources.

Constraint:

- The availability of, and access to, appropriate markets for surplus products, and those grown or raised or harvested sustainably for national and regional markets, is very limited. The transport infrastructure does not serve family farms in many areas. Regional integration of policies and practices for the free movement of people and goods is problematic. Locally produced foods struggle to compete with imported subsidised products: local production is unprotected. Inadequate storage facilities on-farm, locally and nationally limit ability to realise price stabilisation. Supply management policies are weak or non-existent.

Proposal

Investments should be directed to improving and facilitating access to local, national and regional markets, including those which are transboundary, and trade and other policies to stabilise prices and protect family farming should be introduced. Improvements in the organisation of family farmers' and smallholder organisations – especially their ability to self organize- should be encouraged. The appropriate types of organisation include a co-operative models that have social, economic, welfare and equity principles. They are a vehicle for sustainable rural development approaches and can be entities that will improve access to credit, agriculture advisory services, warehousing, postharvest, bulking and marketing etc. EAFF has already prepared and presented a regional policy framework on co-operatives to EAC and currently to COMESA for consideration and adoption by their respective council of Ministers.

Constraint:

- The limited availability of appropriate capacity building at different levels and the necessary institutional infrastructure was highlighted as a major constraint. Training centres are needed to develop skills necessary to develop family farming and local markets and the capacity for effective lobbying. This constraint contributes to the weak involvement of farmers' platforms and networks in developing, following and monitoring policies and strategies that should be redirected towards realising a sustainable food system provided by family farming and in the implementation of farming and rural development projects in support of this. Capacity is limited for developing farmers' own proposals for realising this shift in policy and practice.

Proposal

To realise improved capacity for the diversification of biodiverse, ecological and resilient family farming, requires improved formal (institution based) and informal (on-farm) training, farmer to farmer extension systems, improved information systems as well as the development of improved policy and lobbying capacities at national and regional levels.

5. Participation: improving African farmer organizations' participation in, and impact on, the design and implementation of agricultural policies and investment programmes.

Family farmers throughout Africa have reacted to the onslaught of structural adjustment and neo-liberal policies by developing a variety of strategies to defend their local food systems and by building up their organizations from the national to the regional and continental levels. Today, family farmers' networks exist and interact with governments and intergovernmental institutions at national level and regionally; ROPPA in West Africa, PROPAC in Central Africa, EAFF in East Africa, SACAU in Southern Africa. In October 2010 these four platforms, along with UMAGRI in the Magreb, came together in Malawi to constitute the Pan-African Farmers' Organization (PAFO), which has been recognised by the African Union.

Participatory formulation of agricultural policies and investment programmes – and the CAADP process - have been a strong focus of the farmer platforms' fight to achieve meaningful involvement in decision-making. Already in 2004 the four SSA farmers' platforms submitted to NEPAD their concerted vision of agriculture in the context of CAADP. Since then they have continued to deepen their platforms of proposals based on sustainable family farming and increased control over their food systems in a framework of food sovereignty.¹¹ They have defended these platforms in forums from the national to the global level, on issues ranging from agricultural policies to trade (e.g. EPAs and WTO), access to natural resources, biodiversity, research, the formulation and implementation of agricultural sector programmes, and others.

These efforts have met with a certain degree of success. Farmers' platforms have been enabled in some countries and regions to organize consultative processes in order to feed farmers' views into the formulation of agricultural policies and land tenure and pastoral codes.¹² In some cases national farmer platforms have been able to obtain the reformulation of Country Investment Programmes in whose formulation they were not involved and which did not respond to objectives of food security and poverty reduction.¹³ In these cases key factors have been the ability to speak with one voice and to build strong alliances with other actors. Calling government officials and elected representatives to account has also been effective.

But much more needs to be done. Farmers' platforms need to be able to go beyond generic defence of family farming to develop their own proposals for alternative policies and programmes that strengthen their sustainable food systems rather than co-opting them into agro-industrial systems. They need to defend their autonomy against official efforts to create parallel platforms and to divide the movement. At the same time, to ensure integrity, the legitimate organisations and networks of family farmers must achieve accountability and transparency in leadership at all levels.

There is a need for opening up agriculture policy processes to more diverse views and forms of knowledge derived from farmers and their organisations and for these processes to embrace participatory decision-making approaches in the policy-making and agenda setting as well. Much has been written about the kind of inclusive deliberative processes that can ensure meaningful and decisive participation¹⁴. A significant achievement by civil society, including especially farmers' movements, in the process of reform of the UN/FAO Committee on world Food Security (CFS), has been the recognition of civil society's right to autonomously develop an inclusive and self-organised process for interacting with the member governments and the CFS as a whole – the Civil Society Mechanism (CSM).¹⁵ In the CFS, all participants – including civil society - engage in the debate on an equal footing but it is member governments that are responsible and accountable for making decisions.

There is a need to realise this standard of meaningful engagement in all policy making forums including those focused on agricultural investment decisions in and for Africa. Recognizing that the same issues are raised at different levels – from local to global – and in a variety of different forums, it is necessary to develop multi-level strategies of engagement that can enable farmers' platforms and their allies to defend coherent common platforms of claims and proposals wherever there is an opportunity to have an impact.

¹¹ See the Declaration and Synthesis Report of the Nyéléni 2007 Forum for Food Sovereignty (www.nyeleni.org). See also www.roppa.info, <http://eaflu.org>; www.sacau.info

¹² For example in Senegal, Mali, ECOWAS.

¹³ For example, Burundi and Benin.

¹⁴ See, for example, publications by McKeon and Pimbert

¹⁵ See website of CSOs in the CFS/CSM process: <http://cso4cfs.org>.

To achieve this, the recommendations concerning participation are:

- Improve capacity building for policy and investment programme processes (including formulation, interpretation, analysis, tracking and reporting) at all levels, both within and outside of the farmers' networks.
- Advocate the establishment at all levels of inclusive institutional frameworks in which the roles and responsibilities of all actors are clearly defined.
- At country and regional levels, the farmers organisations will strive to improve their ability to make their own proposals on agriculture investments and table them during national or regional debates/discussions on investments in a coherent manner that will be mutually supportive across the movement.
- While respecting diversity of views in different platforms and countries, a common platform through PAFO will help ensure coherence in engagement in processes and proposals made at all levels.
- In the context of PAFO, develop a system of information sharing among regional platforms and of drawing on the human resources available in the platforms and in partner organizations.
- Strengthen economic resources of farmers' platforms to ensure autonomous, self-organising capacities at national/regional/continental levels.
- Strengthening alliances with CSOs, other FOs and like minded organizations in Africa and other regions¹⁶
- Increasing knowledge at all levels including individual farmers' organisations to national platforms and the regional and continental networks about the CFS/CSM process and ensuring continuity in engagement and follow-up.

¹⁶ Alliances include: *EuropAfrica; More and Better network; IPC for food sovereignty; CFS/CSM*

6. Action Plan

In the context of the discussions about defending our productive and resilient family farming system that currently provides food for more than 80% of the African population and could deliver more, we commit to sharing our analysis of the state of agricultural investments in Africa and their impacts on our family farming and sustainable food systems and food sovereignty with our members and other networks in PAFO. We highlight the following points:

1. We will work with our networks and organisations across all regions to realise a common approach to defending family farming and sustainable food systems in the face of harmful agricultural investments that are capturing productive resources, which should be available to family farmers, commodifying and privatising these, imposing industrial models of production tied to mainly industrial input and market channels, and the promulgation of policies, strategies and research and other programmes that undermine our food systems.
2. We propose that agricultural investments are redirected towards developing and realising more agroecological, biodiverse and resilient models of production, in particular for local consumption, which should be proposed by farmers' organisations, supported by appropriate participatory research, development and extension systems under their control.
3. We want to ensure that priority is given to agricultural investments that support infrastructure requirements for family farming and sustainable food systems, to provide the inputs needed, and to ensure that markets for local (and often healthier) products are prioritised and protected.
4. We need resources from agricultural investments to improve the effectiveness, capacities and capabilities of our organisations and networks at all levels to be able to develop, promote and defend family farming, our sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, including their ability of our farmers to self organize, for example in co-operatives that have social, economic, welfare and equity principles.
5. We urge that all decision making forums about agricultural investments and related policies, at all levels, ensure that there is meaningful participation by our networks and organisations, by using, in particular, the approach agreed by States for civil society engagement in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS). Existing arrangements in, for example, the accelerated CAADP and other investment programmes, are not effective in ensuring the defence of family farming and our sustainable food systems.

Specific actions:

- Encourage the Chair of PAFO to set up a working group to provide information and analysis on key issues concerning agricultural investment, other agricultural policies and related issues.
- Share the outputs of this workshop with regional networks and member organisations and deepen the debate and understanding of challenges and the core concepts presented e.g. the typology of family farming and its development and defence; and the processes of engagement nationally, regionally, continentally and internationally, including the approach used in the CFS.
- Develop processes, including a continental workshop, to strategise, develop and take further the advocacy strategies, in different national, regional and international forums, which are urgently needed to redirect agricultural investments and defend family farming, our sustainable food systems and food sovereignty.

Steps to translate into action the vision of the African farmers' organizations regarding family farming and agricultural investment

Action to be undertaken	By whom and at what level	Targets	By when
Finalise the synthesis report and send to the regional platforms and for translation	Workshop Steering Committee		10 May 2011
Feedback from the regional platforms and validation of the synthesis report	EAFF PROPAC ROPPA		16 May 2011
Reflection of the typology of family farms and their support needs	EAFF PROPAC ROPPA SACAU UMAGRI	Farmers' organisations Public institutions Private sector Research institutes Development partners	2011
Continental workshop to harmonize the concept of family farming leading to drafting of a position paper/advocacy document	PAFO	Regional platforms (EAFF, PROPAC, ROPPA, SACAU, UMAGRI)	2011
Advocacy directed to African and international institutions	EAFF PROPAC ROPPA SACAU UMAGRI PAFO with allies.	AU and specialized institutions NEPAD Regional Economic Organizations and specialized institutions, including the African Development Bank FAO IFAD World Bank CFS EU G20	On-going (see partial list of up-coming meetings, events, forums and processes in Annex 3)

ANNEXES**ANNEX 1 Agenda****Meeting to discuss agricultural investments that would benefit sustainable family farming****Mfou, Yaoundé, Cameroon, 4 and 5 May 2011****AGENDA****Day 1****4 May 2011****Morning:****Session 1:** Moderator - Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC)

9:00 – 10:00

1. Welcome and opening of workshop
2. Introductions by participants
3. Presentation of the objectives, expected results and the agenda of the workshop – Mamadou Goïta (ROPPA)
4. Tour de table: expectations of participants followed by questions and discussion

10:00 – 10:15: Refreshments

10:15 – 13:00

5. Introduction to theme No°1 : **Family farming and food systems** – Mamadou Goïta (ROPPA)
6. Presentations by the three regional platforms – Celestin Nga (PROPAC), Stephen Muchiri (EAFF), Mamadou Goïta (ROPPA)
 - a. Currently, up to what extent and how is family farming providing the food needs of people in both rural and urban areas?
 - b. What is your vision from here to the next 10 years?
 - c. Do current policies and programmes allow the realisation of this vision? If not, what are the constraints and what alternatives can be proposed?
7. Discussion

13 :00 – 14 :30 : Lunch

Afternoon:**Session 2:** Moderator – Stephen Muchiri (EAFF)

14 :30 – 16 :00

1. Introduction to theme No. 2 : **Agricultural investment strategies of the international institutions and the implications for family farming** – Nora McKeon (Terra Nuova) and Patrick Mulvany (Practical Action)
2. Discussion

16 :00 – 16 :15 : Refreshments

16:15 – 18 :00

3. Introduction to theme No.°3 : **Participation/ involvement of FOs in processes to design and implement policies and support programmes: what participation/involvement and what outcomes?** – Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC)
4. Presentations by the three regional platforms – Annick Sezibera (EAFF), Kolyang Palebele (PROPAC), Leopold Lokossou (ROPPA)
5. Discussion

Day 2 –	5 May 2011
----------------	-------------------

Morning:

8 :30 – 10 :30

Session 3 : Moderator – Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC)

1. Presentation of the synthesis of the first day followed by questions
2. Reactions by the three regional platforms – Kolyang Palebele (PROPAC), Stephen Muchiri (EAFF), Mamadou Goïta (ROPPA)
3. Discussion

10 :30-10 :45 : Refreshments

10 :45 -12 :30

Session 4 : Moderator – Mamadou Goïta (ROPPA)

Theme No 4 : **Next steps – priority action plans, calendar, actors and organisations, resources.**

12 :30 – 14 :00 : Lunch

14 :00 – 17 :00 (with refreshment break from 15 :30 à 15 :45)
Theme No. 4 : continuation and conclusion

Closure of the meeting : Elisabeth Atangana (PROPAC)

ANNEX 2 Participants

PAFO: Elisabeth Atangana

EAFF: Stephen Muchiri and Annick Sezannick (Burundi)

ROPPA: Mamadou Goïta and Leopold Lokossou (Benin).

PROPAC: Elisabeth Atangana, Celestin Nga, Koliang Palebele (Chad)

Practical Action/EuropAfrica/More&Better/Concord European Food Security Working Group: Patrick Mulvany

Terra Nuova/EuropAfrica/More&Better/Concord European Food Security Working Group: Nora McKeon

Expected but deeply regretted: Ndiogou Fall and Ousmane Ndiaye.

ANNEX 3 Policy forums/processes to target

In Africa

- **CAADP processes** at national, regional and continental levels
- **Food Security Programmes** at national and regional levels
- **Agricultural Policy** formulation and implementation at national and regional levels
- **African Union Land Tenure Guidelines** application
- **Economic Partnership Agreements** and other trade agreements

At International Level

- **Committee on World Food Security (CFS):** next plenary session 17-22 October 2011 preceded by civil society forum.
 - Possibility for African FOs to input into the discussions and the documents on which decision-making will be based through the CSM and the IPC.
 - Pertinent issues on 2011 agenda:
 - √ Adoption of Voluntary Guidelines on Governance of Land and other Natural Resource Tenure
 - √ Investment in agriculture with accent on smallholders.
 - √ Price volatility ;
 - √ Development of a Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition
- **FAO**
 - State of Food and Agriculture 2012 special issue on agricultural investment. Opportunity for FO input into the contents.
 - FAO work on developing a framework for agricultural investment highlighting the importance of farmers' own investments and on immigrant remittances and agricultural investment. Opportunities for FO input.
 - Possibility of cooperation with FAO to enhance farmer platforms' participation in the formulation of Country Investment Plans in countries whose governments have requested FAO assistance.
- **IFAD**
 - Farmers' Forum
 - Programmes of support for FO capacity building (EC/IFAD programme) and for FO involvement in GAFSP programmes.
- **European Commission**
 - Collaboration with Concord European Food Security Working Group and the EuropAfrica programme provides opportunity for monitoring of the impact of Europe's policies and practices on African sustainable family farming and for effective advocacy.
 - Support for FO capacity building (EC/IFAD programme)
- **Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP) - next meeting of Steering Committee 7-8 June 2011.**
 - Participation of African FOs in Steering Committee and alliances with other CSOs provides occasion for advocacy.
 - Discussions regarding refocusing of call criteria provide occasion to highlight issues of model of agriculture.
 - Opportunity of/need to bring IFC under scrutiny and critique its strategy of public-private partnerships.
- **G20 (June 2011)**
 - Price volatility, RAI principles, smallholder producers are on the agenda for the French Presidency.
- **Rio+20 (June 2012)**
 - Green economy – food and agriculture

Agricultural Investment

FOR STRENGTHENING FAMILY FARMING AND SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS IN AFRICA

The issue of agricultural investment is a key one in Africa and how and where these investments are directed is of considerable concern to African family farmers and their organisations. From CAADP to the reformed Committee on World Food Security, enhanced investment for food security is at the top of the agenda. Although there is now a commitment on the part of multilateral institutions and of a number of donors to give greater priority to supporting family farmers, a number of questions need to be explored in depth in order to ensure that the support proposed is what is wanted by, and is potentially beneficial to, Africa's family farmers and their sustainable food systems. These productive and resilient family farming systems currently provide food for more than 80% of the African population and could deliver more.

The African regional farmers' platforms conclude that in order to defend and promote family farming, sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, it is necessary:

1. to realise a common approach in the face of harmful agricultural investments that are capturing productive resources, imposing industrial models of production, and implementing policies, strategies and research and other programmes that undermine local food systems;
2. to redirect agricultural investments towards more agroecological, biodiverse and resilient models of production supported by participatory research, development and extension systems under farmers' control;
3. to give priority to agricultural investments that support the infrastructure and input requirements of sustainable family farming;
4. to secure agricultural investments to improve the effectiveness, capacities and capabilities of farmers' organisations and networks, including their ability of farmers to self organize, for example in co-operatives that have social, economic, welfare and equity principles;
5. to ensure that there is meaningful participation by our networks and organisations, by using in particular, the approach agreed by States for civil society engagement in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) which recognizes the autonomy of civil society organizations and welcomes them – small-scale food producers, in particular – as full participants. Existing arrangements in, for example, the accelerated CAADP and other investment programmes, are not as effective.



This publication, and the workshop which generated the report, was made possible by the More and Better network, CONCORD and the EU, through the public awareness project "EuropAfrica: towards food sovereignty". The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the project partners and can under no circumstances be regarded as a reflected position of the European Union.