

Fair shares: is CAADP working?

May 2013



Credits

This is an ActionAid report based on input and writing from John Howell and Mark Curtis.

Editor: Stephanie Ross

Design: Nick Purser

Thanks to all those who gave input including: Aftab Alam, Alberta Guerra, Buba Khan, David Adama, Fredrick Kawooya, Kate Carroll, Katie Campbell, Ruchi Tripathi, Soren Ambrose, Edward Karangwa, Constance Okeke and Queronica Quartey.

ActionAid, *Fair shares: is CAADP working?* May 2013.

FRONT COVER:

MEMBERS OF THE HUGUKIRWA
COOPERATIVE IN MUSANZE, RWANDA,
TEND TO THEIR MODERN BANANA
SEED BED. THE SEEDLINGS ARE SOLD
TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES.
PHOTO: ACTIONAID

Executive summary

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), launched by African heads of state in 2003, offered the prospect of a new, intensified focus on agriculture throughout the continent. Ten years on, how successful has CAADP been? This paper offers a brief assessment, examining if agricultural budgets have increased, if the focus of spending has improved, and if CAADP is providing 'fair shares' to the millions of smallholder farmers who do most of Africa's farming and produce most of its food. The paper is based largely on country studies undertaken by ActionAid, examining African governments' agriculture budgets and spending priorities.

The concept of 'fair shares' means that governments must promote investment and policies that recognise, support and encourage smallholder farmers' own investment in agriculture and food security.

The key CAADP commitment made by African states was to allocate 10% of public expenditure to agriculture. Yet, as of 2010, only eight countries have exceeded the 10% target^{1,2} and ActionAid's analysis of the level of African governments' agriculture budgets reveals a mixed picture. Rwanda and Ghana are spending around 10% of their budgets on agriculture, and have increased investment in recent years. Yet Uganda's spending is low and static, hovering at 3-4% in recent years, while Nigeria – which has increased spending – still only allocates around 3.5% of the federal budget to agriculture.³

Although the adoption of CAADP-aligned national strategies has played a role in increasing agricultural investment in some (though not all) countries, there are serious problems with the focus of spending, especially in the lack of adequate support to the needs of smallholder farmers, notably women farmers. CAADP is promoting a farming model associated with the Green Revolution, which promotes the use of expensive external inputs such as chemical fertilisers, pesticides and improved and/or hybrid seeds bought from agribusiness companies; this comes at the expense of promoting sustainable agriculture approaches that are likely to benefit poor farmers much more. Despite the fact that women constitute the majority of farmers in some countries in Africa,⁴ they are often only paid lip service in CAADP programmes and are largely ignored in countries' CAADP and other agricultural strategies. Women farmers and smallholders generally are being insufficiently consulted in the design of agricultural research policies.

1. NEPAD, CAADP; *Highlighting the successes*, 2010. Available at <http://www.nepad.org/foodsecurity/agriculture/about>

2. ReSAKKS, *Annual trends and outlook report 2011*

3. ActionAid, *Public financing for agriculture: Uganda, Kenya, Nigeria and Rwanda* (individual) reports, 2011- 2012 (unpublished)

4. FAO, *Women in agriculture: closing the gender gap for development*, 2011. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e00.htm>

In two respects, CAADP is working. Firstly, the national agriculture strategies developed under CAADP auspices are a comprehensive approach to agricultural development, and secondly, most governments in sub-Saharan Africa are now committing higher levels of public expenditure to agriculture,⁵ even though these levels are not high enough and are not meeting the CAADP 10% target. However, CAADP has not lived up to its goal of transforming African agriculture. The most important change needed – to ensure investment in agriculture is aligned with farmers’ own investments and builds on their ‘fair share’ – is not being met. Furthermore, CAADP must move away from the standard promotion of improved crop and livestock technologies towards targeted and locally-adapted initiatives/interventions to boost the potential of smallholder and women farmers.

Recommendations

Ten years on from the launch of CAADP - and with national investment plans developed by many African governments - it is a good time to scrutinise public agriculture expenditure, and to show whether it is addressing the needs of smallholder farmers. **One of the biggest failures for CAADP-aligned national investments is that they have not recognised the potential of smallholders’ own investments, or their potential to build on their ‘fair share’.** Despite its failings, CAADP offers an innovative approach for an African-driven strategy that promotes agriculture as the engine for development. The key needs are to ensure from the outset the effective participation of farmers and civil society in policies and investment plans, and to develop public interventions that boost farmers’ own investments and strengthen local food systems.

In order to achieve this goal, African governments should:

1. **Increase their investment** in agriculture and establish clear timetables for achieving the 10% CAADP target.
2. Promote a much stronger **gender perspective** in agricultural policy-making, including targeting investments specifically to women farmers, establishing gender-based budgeting and producing gender disaggregated data to record the gender impact of policies.
3. Adopt a **‘right to food’** approach for developing national investment plans that put food security at the centre of strategies, and address the specific constraints of women smallholders.
4. **Recognise the ‘fair share’ principle**, whilst ensuring public investment is aligned with and acts as a catalyst for smallholders’ efforts:
 - by **providing the services and inputs** that matter most to small farmers
 - by putting in place the measures and policies needed to **strengthen farmers’ own investments in agriculture**
 - by creating positive enabling environments: including enhancing land tenure security and protecting against evictions, promoting beneficial pricing mechanisms, and increasing investment in extension, research, rural finance and sustainable agriculture.
5. Ensure the effective and meaningful **participation of non-state actors** in the policy-making process, giving prominence to women smallholders and other small scale food producers.

Bilateral donors and multilateral agencies should:

- **support the efforts of African countries** towards these goals and fund the national investment plans that best respond to these priorities.

5. ReSAKSS, *Agricultural growth trends and outlook for Southern Africa*, 2010, Available at www.resakss.org/index.php?pdf=5318

Introduction

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme, launched by African heads of state in 2003, offered the prospect of a new, intensified focus on agriculture throughout the continent. It aimed to increase the resources governments devote to agriculture; reducing hunger, increasing food production, improving rural infrastructure and marketing, and boosting agricultural research.

Ten years on, how successful has CAADP been? This paper offers a brief assessment, examining if agricultural budgets have increased, if the focus of spending has improved, and if CAADP is providing 'fair shares' to the millions of smallholder farmers who do most of Africa's farming and produce most of its food. The paper is based largely on several country studies undertaken by ActionAid, examining in detail African governments' agriculture budgets and spending priorities.

CAADP's four pillars

CAADP is based on four pillars:⁶

Pillar 1: extending the area under sustainable land and reliable water control systems

Pillar 2: improving rural infrastructure and trade-related capacities for market access

Pillar 3: increasing food supply and reducing hunger

Pillar 4: agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption.

These pillars emphasise increasing the amount of irrigated land, responding better to the growing frequency of disasters, improving roads to enhance export competitiveness and increasing the farm productivity of smallholder farmers. The key principles outlined in CAADP are those of dialogue, policy review, accountability and partnerships with farmers, agribusiness and civil society. More than two dozen African countries have so far signed 'compacts' with CAADP and completed 'roundtable' processes, which involve reaching consensus among key stakeholders to define national strategies and investment plans for reducing hunger and increasing agricultural productivity.

6. For more information see: <http://caadp.net/implementing-caadp-agenda.php>



1. Why do fair shares matter?

The concept of 'fair shares' means that governments must promote investment and policies that recognise, support, encourage and align with smallholder farmers' own investments in agriculture and food security.

Before analysing CAADP, a key question is: why should more public resources be put into agriculture and to support smallholder farmers? Are 'fair shares' simply a matter of justice and equity, or is there a broader economic development case for re-directing investment into smallholder agriculture?

We believe 'fair shares' for smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa are necessary for three reasons:

- because women smallholders produce much of the continent's food, represent the majority of its poorest people and manage many of its natural resources⁷
- because the neglect of rural areas is creating an unbalanced pattern of growth that limits the capacity for long-term national development⁸
- because the enormous potential for smallholder farmers' own investment is being limited by the lack of an enabling environment to release the energy and enterprise of smallholder farmers.

The case for redistributing investment to rural areas has become evident in Africa over the past decade. This has been a period of high economic growth in many countries,⁹ especially those exporting minerals and oil, and this is strikingly manifested in new housing, financial services, communications technology,

7. FAO, State of Food and Agriculture, *Women in agriculture: closing the gap for development*, 2011. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf>

8. IFPRI, *Rural investments to accelerate growth and poverty reduction in Kenya*, Discussion Paper 00723. Available at: www.ifpri.org/pubs/dp/ifridp00723.pdf

9. IMF, *Regional economic outlook: sub-Saharan Africa sustaining growth amid global uncertainty*, April 2012. Available at: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/reo/2012/afr/eng/sreo0412.htm>

retail parks, etc. But it is overwhelmingly urban growth and largely capital-intensive, in contrast to the more employment-intensive agricultural sector.

In comparison to many national growth rates in Africa, those in rural areas (as measured in agricultural GDP, for example) remain very low, and the social and economic changes so visible in cities and towns is absent from most rural parts of the continent, even if more village children go to school and more mothers survive childbirth.

This urban-rural gap contributes to Africa having some of the highest rates of inequality in the world. For example:

- In Nigeria, the poorest 20% of people receive only 4% of national income, while the wealthiest 20% receive 53%.¹⁰
- In Zambia, the 1.2% share in income of the poorest 10% has actually halved in the commodity boom years since 2000.¹¹

Most of the poorest people in Africa live in rural areas, with two out of every three dependent on farming for their livelihoods and incomes.¹² This continuing level of poverty is a major brake on development. The *Report of the Africa progress panel 2012*, written by a group of high-profile individuals across different sectors, concludes: “extreme poverty in income is slowing the pace of poverty reduction and hampering the delivery of broad-based economic growth.”¹³ The need to import food for an expanding urban population is often the immediate concern of political leaders in seeking more agricultural investment. But the longer-term issue for growth is that large parts of the economy are still characterised by low levels of income, weak demand, low savings and limited investment.¹⁴

The UN’s Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) estimates that, in low- and middle-income countries, **farmers invest more than three times as much as their governments** in capital stock each year.¹⁵ By ‘capital stock’, the FAO means activities focused on future improvements: for farmers, this includes expending time and energy on planting fruit trees, making provision for rearing animals, purchasing machinery or building materials. For governments, capital stock can similarly include irrigation, feeder roads and storage, but also includes items not normally regarded as ‘capital’ such as research and development.

The FAO finds that the lowest levels of agricultural capital invested per worker (and hence lowest labour productivity) are in Africa. Moreover, it notes that prior public investment in capital stock is critical to stimulating higher levels of on-farm investment. The FAO also argues that the returns to physical infrastructure and research (in terms of land and labour productivity) are much higher than for non-capital expenditures such as input subsidies for short-term seasonal cultivation (a feature of most governments’ CAADP-aligned national agriculture and food security investment plans).

It is in this area that ‘fair shares’ are important. Governments, donors and farmers need each other to make a major breakthrough in agriculture, and women farmers’ fair shares are vital to ensure their participation in the debate.

However, the *type* of spending on agriculture is also critical. For smallholder farmers, especially lower income women farmers (producing principally for their own consumption with small surpluses only going to the market), the key need is often for labour-saving technologies and measures to reduce their vulnerability to crop and livestock losses. In such cases, subsidised fertiliser and gifted livestock can be important; but

10. Africa Progress Panel, *Africa progress report 2012*. Available at: <http://www.africaprogresspanel.org/en>

11. Kevin Watkins, Kapuscinski Lecture 2013, citing World Bank

12. Africa Progress Panel, *Africa progress report 2012*. Available at: <http://www.africaprogresspanel.org/en>

13. Africa Progress Panel, *Africa progress report 2012*. Available at: <http://www.africaprogresspanel.org/en>

14. UNECA, *Economic report on Africa: unleashing Africa’s potential as a pole of global growth*, 2012

15. FAO, *The state of food and agriculture*, 2012

for their future sustainability smallholder farmers need sustained technical support to encourage investments in changes in production that promote sustainable agriculture practices.

Women farmers are dominant in food crop cultivation, representing around 70% of the total in sub-Saharan Africa.¹⁶ Women are also heavily involved in other aspects of farming: in Nigeria, 60% of food processing and 50% of animal husbandry is undertaken by women.¹⁷ Yet women have to balance farming activities with onerous domestic responsibilities such as food preparation, family health and nutrition. Support to women farmers, therefore, has to recognise both the need for opportunities in farming and also for reducing the burden of household chores, in order to release the potential for more productive and equitable ways of handling competing demands.

Relatively better-off farmers (those engaged principally in commercial sales) may not need support in technology as much as stability in the price of their produce and access to markets to sell in. Since these farmers tend to have greater influence over public spending priorities, state procurement or floor price intervention are prominent policies in several African countries. Similarly, it is unsurprising that measures to lower production costs (through fertiliser and credit subsidies for example) are important to on-farm investment decisions taken by more influential commercial farmers.

Why does CAADP matter?

CAADP marked a new drive to improve the contribution of agriculture to the economic prospects of Africa. It signalled three major failings in agricultural development in the previous post-independence decades:

- Agricultural policy in most countries had lacked a clear strategic direction and had been subject to significant donor influence that often fostered inconsistent, short-term interventions. CAADP emphasised developing, within Africa, a strategic framework for growth that individual countries could adapt to their own circumstances. Such Africa-led strategies would help direct and coordinate donor support to the sector.
- Public investment had been inadequate for a sector that, in most countries, was by far the largest employer and source of household income and export earnings. This lack of investment had contributed to declining donor attention to agriculture. Hence the new stress on African ownership and donor partnership, to be realised by both increasing their spending on agriculture.
- The CAADP strategy called for a 'transformation' in agricultural development. This was partly to readjust the dominant role of governments in the supply of production inputs and output marketing and to create conditions for private sector growth, but it was also to promote the role of farmers' organisations in the implementation of government programmes.

All three tasks were bound to take time, especially given the emphasis on building a strategic consensus within countries that involved private agribusiness, farmers' organisations and civil society organisations.

16. ActionAid, *Five out of ten?: assessing progress towards the 10% target*, 2009 (unpublished)

17. ActionAid, *Nigeria's public agricultural spending: need for urgent government action*, 2012 (unpublished)



Members of the Abisyizehamwe cooperative from Gisagara district, Rwanda, with the fruits of their 10 hectare banana plantation.

PHOTO: EDWARD KARANGWA/ACTIONAID

2. Is investment in agriculture increasing?

The key CAADP commitment was for African states to allocate 10% of public expenditure to agriculture. The principal measurement agency for CAADP (the Regional Strategic Analysis and Support System, ReSAKSS) reported that, as of 2011, only seven countries had met the 10% target and appeared able to sustain that level; since 2003, only 11 countries had surpassed the target in any one year.¹⁸ For sub-Saharan Africa as a whole, the share of agricultural spending in total expenditure rose only slightly from 6% in 1995-2003 to 7% in 2003-09. There has, however, been an increase in the *growth* of agriculture expenditure from 8% in the period 1995-2003 to 15% in 2003-09 (although this could partly be explained by general improvements in economic performance and public expenditure).¹⁹

A study by the non-governmental organisation (NGO), ONE, found that only 4 of 19 African countries on which it compiled data had met the 10% target by 2011, with 8 of the 19 actually showing a decrease in expenditure in 2010 and 2011 from the 2003-09 average. However, it also revealed that agricultural spending almost doubled in the period 2000 to 2007 in sub-Saharan Africa as a whole.²⁰

Notwithstanding some of the complexities of measuring agricultural spending,²¹ sub-Saharan African governments have clearly not met their top line commitment.

18. ReSAKSS, *Annual trends and outlook report*, 2011

19. Samuel Benin, *Are African governments serious about agriculture?* IFPRI Discussion Note, 2012

20. ONE/DATA Report, *A growing opportunity: measuring investment in African agriculture*, 2013

21. In sub-Saharan Africa, there are difficulties in determining what constitutes agricultural expenditure. Some governments legitimately argue, for example, that environmental conservation, local community development or trade facilitation are essential components of agricultural development policy. The CAADP secretariat (the NEPAD Planning and Co-ordination Agency) has recommended standardisation in reporting, employing the Classification of the Functions of Government (COFOG) system.

Another way of assessing whether governments are increasing their assistance to agriculture is to consider spending on agricultural research, which is widely seen as of key importance to improving agricultural productivity. The FAO notes that investment in agricultural research rose by over 20% in sub-Saharan Africa between 2001 and 2008, after a 20-year period of stagnation and decline. It also reports that research spending as a share of agricultural GDP has risen since from 0.55% in 2000 to 0.61% in 2008.²² By that measure at least, sub-Saharan Africa is ahead of both east Asia and south Asia, although it is still below the 0.75% recorded in the 1980s.

Aid to agriculture

G8 and G20 summits have endorsed increased expenditure on agriculture, as well as on food security. Although aid to agriculture is also not straightforward to measure,²³ the data suggests there has been an upward trend in recent years. ReSAKSS calculates that agricultural aid from OECD donors to sub-Saharan Africa has risen from US\$39 per capita in 2003 to US\$54 in the period 2003-2010. ReSAKSS also calculates, however, that agricultural aid as a proportion of all aid rose only slightly, from 2.98% in 2003 to an average of 3.77% in the period 2003-10. FAO statistics suggest a larger increase than this: from US\$1.5 billion in 2000 to US\$2.9 billion in 2010 (in constant US\$). However, FAO statistics show only a slight increase in the percentage share of agriculture in overall aid in the same period – from 7.1% to 7.4%.

Aid to agriculture appears poorly focused on the CAADP-aligned national agricultural and food security investment plans developed by governments. An ActionAid USA study of aid to agriculture in 2009-2010 – following the L'Aquila G8 summit pledge to support CAADP and similar country investment plans – found that while aid has increased, there was no evidence that African countries with national investment plans had received priority support.²⁴

By early 2013, 27 CAADP-aligned national agricultural investment plans had been prepared;²⁵ of these, 11 had secured small grant project funding from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP, which was set up in 2009 following the L'Aquila summit in response to the global food price crisis). It is not clear if aid to the GAFSP is additional to existing finance, but at least the contributions signal donor support to agriculture and CAADP (since funding is conditional upon developing CAADP-aligned proposals). Up until 2011, however, donors allocated only 23% of their agricultural aid to low-income countries which had developed national investment plans.²⁶

22. FAO, *The state of food and agriculture*, 2012

23. As with domestic public expenditure, there are challenges in tracking external aid. The standard measure is the reporting system of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), which receives and collates information from OECD member countries. But the limitation of DAC data is that it records (or 'codes') agriculture as a sub-sector of production and hence normally includes only clearly identifiable agricultural projects. As a result, other projects designed to support agriculture (such as rural development, credit and co-operatives, land development, or development food aid) are coded and reported separately. In a study for the Global Donor Platform on Agricultural and Rural Development, the Overseas Development Institute recalculated agricultural aid using codes from elsewhere, such as development food aid and rural roads, and proportions of budgetary support and trade facilitation programmes where such spending was designed, in large part, to promote agricultural production. Global Platform for Rural Development, *Aid to agriculture, rural development and food security*, 2011

24. ActionAid USA, *Pledges, principles and progress: aid to agriculture since L'Aquila*, 2012

25. CAADP Secretariat, *Concept Note, Ninth Partnership Platform*, 2013

26. ONE/DATA Report, *A growing opportunity: measuring investment in african agriculture*, 2013

ActionAid's analysis of the level of African governments' agriculture budgets reveals a mixed picture.

Rwanda allocated 10.2% of its national budget to agriculture in 2010-11, a rising proportion over recent years, but this includes only 6.8% directly expended by the Ministry of Agriculture and the parastatals for which it is responsible. The Rwandan government includes as agricultural spending the contributions from non-agriculture ministries and parastatals (such as trade and industry and local government).²⁷

Uganda's agricultural spending is low and static, hovering at 3-4% in recent years with no noticeable increase as a result of the commitment to CAADP.²⁸ However, Uganda does devote a large share (38%) of public investment to transport and public works, but this would only benefit farmers if it was allocated to improving the worrisome state of rural feeder roads in Uganda.

In **Ghana**, agricultural spending has increased from 5.7% in 2003 to an average of 9.9% in 2006-10, though these figures include spending on rural roads and presidential initiatives outside the Ministry of Food and Agriculture budget. The allocation to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture was only 3.9% in 2010.²⁹

Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development received a miniscule 1.8% of public expenditure in 2003, which had risen to an average of 3.5% in 2007-11.³⁰ State level spending appears to be broadly similar, ranging from 2.0-5.9%.

In **Zambia**, the share of agricultural spending rose from 3% in 2004 to reach 8% in 2009, but was then cut in 2010 and 2011 to around 7%.³¹

In **Kenya** the allocation to agriculture is hard to specify since there are contradictory figures in the public domain; our estimates are that the government allocated an average of only around 3.3% in the three years 2007/08-2009/10, though the government gives a higher figure (5.9%).³²

27. ActionAid, *A comprehensive national analysis of expenditure in the agricultural sector in Rwanda*, 2013. (unpublished)

28. ActionAid, *A baseline study on public financing of agriculture in Uganda*, 2013. (unpublished)

29. ActionAid, *Ghana's agriculture spending*, 2011. (unpublished)

30. ActionAid, *Nigeria's public agricultural spending*, 2012. (unpublished)

31. ActionAid, *Saying one thing, doing another: how the Zambia government needs to improve agriculture spending*, 2011 (unpublished)

32. ActionAid, *Supporting small farmers: the need for change in Kenya's agricultural budget*, 2011. (unpublished)

Smallholder farmers from Kakamega county, Kenya.

The farmers are showcasing their produce during World Food Day.

PHOTO: CHARLES ONYANGO/ACTIONAID



3. Are smallholder farmers benefiting?

The adoption of CAADP-aligned national strategies has played a role in increasing agricultural investments in some (but not all) countries. However, there are serious problems with the *focus of spending*, especially in the lack of adequate support to the needs of smallholder farmers, notably women farmers.

In a 2012 report Aprodev, a European NGO network, argues that CAADP is promoting a farming model associated with the Green Revolution, which promotes the use of expensive external inputs such as chemical fertilisers, pesticides and improved and/or hybrid seeds bought from agribusiness companies; this comes at the expense of promoting sustainable agriculture approaches that are likely to benefit poor farmers much more. CAADP's lead partner in agricultural research, the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa, is a proponent of genetically modified (GM) crops and of strong Intellectual Property Rights regimes that threaten farmers' rights to retain and exchange their traditional seeds. The Aprodev report urges CAADP to follow the smallholder farmer-led sustainable farming approach advocated by the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development. It also notes that, despite the fact that women constitute the majority of farmers in Africa, they are paid lip service in CAADP programmes and are largely ignored in countries' CAADP and other agricultural strategies. Women farmers, and smallholders generally, are being insufficiently consulted in the design of agricultural research policies.³³

ActionAid's country analysis supports these criticisms and raises several further problems with the focus of government spending on agriculture.

33. APRODEV/PELUM, *Agricultural research in Africa: why CAADP should follow IAASTD*, 2012

In **Ghana**, although funding of agriculture has increased, the government devotes considerable resources to a tractor subsidy programme, which is of very limited use to smallholders with little land, and appears to be promoting farming using chemical fertilisers and pesticides much more than the sustainable agriculture that would reduce or eliminate the need for such chemicals. Although the Ministry of Food and Agriculture has a Women in Agriculture Department, it is poorly resourced and there are otherwise no budget lines in the agriculture budget targeted to women.

In **Zambia**, the government's fertiliser subsidy programme – which accounts for over a third of the agriculture budget – provides few benefits for smallholder farmers. The cost of the programme leaves fewer resources for supporting extension services and agricultural research, each of which receives less than 5% of the budget. The government is making some efforts to promote sustainable agriculture and address climate change, but its spending on this area is miniscule – probably less than 1% of the agriculture sector budget.³⁴

In **Kenya**, agriculture policy is also poorly focused on women: our analysis is that only 5% of women farmers receive extension services, less than 2% have access to credit and only 14% benefit from the government's input subsidy programme. The government allocates around 25% of its agriculture budget to extension services – a relatively high amount compared to other African countries – but the service is still recognised as inadequate: the increased reliance on private extension providers means that extension services are skewed towards well-endowed regions, bypassing poorer farmers, and are not backed by sufficient state funding to make them work.³⁵

In **Nigeria**, the federal government allocated a tiny 0.6% of its agriculture budget to extension services during 2007-11. This results in only 1.3% of Nigerian farmers having access to extension services. Although Nigeria has the largest agricultural research system in Africa in terms of investments and number of researchers, the government recognises that research services are 'poor'. Agricultural research is beset by numerous challenges, including the lack of stable, predictable and adequate funds to the research institutes, high research staff turnover and weak linkages between the various institutes. Agricultural spending also emphasises the provision of tractors to large-scale, wealthier farmers, at the expense of increasing access to cheaper and more appropriate labour-saving technologies for small farmers.³⁶

34. Zambia National Agricultural Investment Action Plan, 2012

35. ActionAid, *Public financing for agriculture*, 2011 (unpublished)

36. ActionAid, *Public financing for agriculture, Nigeria*, 2011, (unpublished)



Women's cooperative in Karongi district, Rwanda, with a maize milling machine that processes and packages the grain with their full brand name.
PHOTO: EDWARD KARANGWA/ACTIONAID

4. Is CAADP working?

In two respects, CAADP is clearly working. Firstly, the national agriculture strategies developed under CAADP auspices are a *comprehensive approach* to agricultural development, covering not only production but also infrastructure, trade and marketing and environmental sustainability. There is also recognition, at least on paper, of the wider role of agriculture in creating jobs, reducing poverty and contributing to national food self-sufficiency.³⁷

Secondly, as seen above, most governments in sub-Saharan Africa are now committing **higher levels of public expenditure to agriculture**, even though these levels are not high enough and are not meeting the CAADP 10% target. The rising cost of food imports is a contributory factor to this increased focus on production, but so too is the high level focus emanating from the Africa Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development and CAADP itself. In addition, since 2007, aid from donors has increased both in volume and as a proportion of total aid.³⁸ There is increased attention to the agricultural sector in Africa from OECD, major private foundations and others.³⁹

However, CAADP has clearly not lived up to its goal of transforming African agriculture. The most important change needed – to ensure investment in agriculture is aligned with farmers' own investments and **builds on their 'fair shares'** has not been realised. Furthermore, CAADP must move away from the standard promotion of improved crop and livestock technologies towards targeted and locally-adapted assistance to smallholder farmers, especially women farmers – who are currently insufficiently prioritised.

A key reason is that the **national consultative mechanisms** promoted by CAADP have not provided a sufficiently effective voice for smallholder farmers. In Ghana, for example, our analysis is that the national agricultural investment plan resembles an exercise in government-donor relations without significant civil society influence. In Kenya, it is the influence of private business, rather than civil society, which has prevailed in the national investment plan. In Nigeria, agricultural investment planning remains top down and civil society participation has been superficial.

37. Gollin, D, *Agriculture as an engine of growth and poverty reduction: what we know and what we need to know*, a framework paper for the African Economic Research Consortium, 2009

38. FAO, *The state of food and agriculture*, 2012

39. IFPRI, *Foreign aid to agriculture review of facts and analysis*, Discussion Paper 01053, 2011

Agricultural spending in Africa under CAADP is strongly biased towards technological improvements to increase production, and thus on those farmers with more land and resources who are best placed to benefit from such support. Therefore, there remains a neglect of poorer, smallholder farmers, particularly poorer women farmers, who are restricted in the resources they can bring to commercial crop production and have other considerations to consider in their 'triple roles' on the farm, in the household and in the community.⁴⁰

This relative neglect of smallholder farmers represents a major challenge for CAADP strategies. This is because such farmers are a major **unrealised asset to national agricultural development**, as they continue to demonstrate a willingness to improve and diversify their production and to make efforts to conserve the soil and water resources on which they – and we all – depend. Farmers want to reduce the drudgery and amount of time expended in land preparation, cultivation and processing – in order to allow more opportunity to enhance their income, improve the nutrition of their families and protect themselves from the risks and uncertainties inherent in agriculture.

Giving support to the needs of smallholder farmers

The evidence from ActionAid's country analyses is that smallholder farmers are, like better-off farmers, strongly prepared to innovate and invest in their farming – if given support, and especially if given support on which they have themselves been consulted. For example:

In **Zambia's** Chongwe district, ActionAid, together with the Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection, works with farmers who request support in small scale irrigation and ploughing, to enable the inclusion of soya bean and groundnut rotations in establishing a form of conservation agriculture with minimal external inputs.

There is a similar finding in **Rwanda** where almost all poorer farmers are constrained by dependence upon handheld hoes. Support from NGOs has therefore focused on low cost ploughing technology. Animal draught is also being investigated with farmers, since cows provided free by the government are being used mainly for the manure benefits and there has been little support for either draught training or dairying. Also in Rwanda, women farmers' livestock preferences have been for animals producing a quick income stream that are manageable close to the household. In response, NGOs are assisting with the supply and care of pigs, poultry and rabbits.

In **Ghana**, women farmers have been seeking support on composting, not least because of difficulties in securing credit for purchased inputs and the time involved in queuing for coupons, and then transporting bags of fertiliser. As elsewhere, labour saving is critical to releasing the enterprise of poorer farm households. In Ghana's Upper East, Upper West and Northern regions, women farmers call for support in accessing batch dryers for cassava, grinding mills, rice processing equipment and donkey carts, to improve food processing and marketing.

In **Uganda**, women's groups have been formed to help press the government to provide required farm support as well as to promote non-farm activities such as literacy development.

The concept of 'fair shares' is not just about the entitlement of poorer regions, small villages or rural women. It is about realising the potential of smallholder and women farmers to promote their own economic wellbeing, and the sustainable economic growth of rural Africa as a whole.

40. Curtis, M; *Improving African agriculture spending: budget analysis of Burundi, Ghana, Zambia, Kenya and Sierra Leone*, 2013.



Edisa Mukamana, 31, a mother of four, is one of millions of women farmers throughout the world who face 'triple roles' on the farm, in the household and in the community.
PHOTO: EDWARD KARANGWA/ACTIONAID

Recommendations

Ten years on from the launch of CAADP, and with national investment plans developed by many African governments, it is a good time to scrutinise public agriculture expenditure and to show whether it is addressing the needs of smallholder farmers. *One of the biggest failures of CAADP-aligned national investments is that they do not recognise the potential of smallholder farmers' own investments, or their potential to build on their 'fair shares'.* Despite its failings, CAADP offers an innovative approach for an African-driven strategy that promotes agriculture as an engine for development. The key needs are to ensure the effective participation of farmers and civil society in policies and investment plans, and to develop public interventions that boost farmers' own investments and strengthen local food systems.

In order to achieve this goal, African governments should:

1. **Increase their investment** in agriculture and establish clear timetables for achieving the 10% CAADP target.
2. Promote a much stronger **gender perspective** in agricultural policy-making, including targeting investments specifically to women farmers, establishing gender-based budgeting and producing gender disaggregated data to record the gender impact of policies.
3. Adopt a '**right to food**' approach for developing national investment plans that put food security at the centre of strategies, and address the specific constraints of women smallholders.
4. **Recognise the 'fair shares' of farmers' own investments**, whilst ensuring public investment is aligned with, and acts as a catalyst for, smallholders' efforts:
 - by **providing the services and inputs** that matter most to small farmers
 - by putting in place the measures and policies needed to **strengthen farmers' own investments in agriculture**

- by creating positive enabling environments: including enhancing land tenure security and protecting against evictions, promoting beneficial pricing mechanisms, increasing investment in extension, research, rural finance and sustainable agriculture.

5. Ensure the effective and meaningful **participation of non-state actors** in the policy-making process, giving prominence to women smallholders and other scale food producers.

Bilateral donors and multilateral agencies should:

- **Support the efforts of African countries** towards these goals and fund the national investment plans that best respond to these priorities.

ActionAid is a global movement of people working together to achieve greater human rights for all and defeat poverty. We believe people in poverty have the power within them to create change for themselves, their families and communities. ActionAid is a catalyst for that change.

International Registration number: 27264198

Website: **www.actionaid.org**

Telephone: **+27 11 731 4500**

Fax: **+27 11 880 8082**

Email: **mailjhb@actionaid.org**

ActionAid International Secretariat,
Postnet Suite 248, Private Bag X31, Saxonwold 2132,
Johannesburg, South Africa.

Fair shares: is CAADP working?

ActionAid, May 2013.