


**Effective Aid for Small Farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa:
Southern Civil Society Perspectives**

Case Studies in Ethiopia, Ghana and Mozambique



Coordinated by and Prepared for the
Canadian Food Security Policy Group
January 2007

COMBINED REPORT

Foreword

This document is a summary of country studies on agricultural development carried out in Ethiopia, Ghana and Mozambique in the second half of 2006. These studies were commissioned by the Canadian Food Security Policy Group as a way of giving voice to civil society organizations concerned with agricultural development in these CIDA-priority countries. The civil society organizations consulted were intended to be representational but, obviously, not comprehensive.

The views expressed in this report come directly from these studies and may not reflect the specific views of all of the members of the Canadian Food Security Policy Group.

The Canadian Food Security Policy Group brings together Canadian international development agencies, emergency relief providers, farmers/producers' organizations and human rights groups who have worked for decades in sectors related to enhancing food security in developing countries and in Canada.

Members include Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Canadian Foodgrains Bank, CARE Canada, Christian Reformed Church, Developing Countries Farm Radio Network, ETC Group, Inter Pares, Mennonite Central Committee Canada, National Farmers Union (Canada), Oxfam Canada, Oxfam Québec, CHF - Partners in Rural Development, Rights & Democracy, UPA Développement international, USC Canada, United Church of Canada and World Vision Canada.

Effective Aid for Small Farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa: Southern Civil Society Perspectives Case Studies in Ethiopia, Ghana and Mozambique¹

1 Introduction

In mid-2006 the Canadian Food Security Policy Group sponsored a series of independent research studies of priorities for aid to agriculture and CIDA's bilateral supported initiatives in agriculture and rural development in three sub-Saharan African countries – Ethiopia, Ghana and Mozambique. The purpose of this research was to inform a dialogue in Canada on increasing the amount and effectiveness of CIDA's aid for agriculture in reducing poverty. Local researchers drew upon the knowledge of local civil society organizations, local government, and donor officials, in order to better understand the relevance of CIDA-supported programs for agricultural development in the context of small-scale farmer livelihoods.

2 Key Findings

Based on the case study research for Ghana, Ethiopia and Mozambique, the following common agricultural development priorities were expressed by civil society organizations (CSOs) in these countries:

1. Strengthening farmer-based organizations and related domestic CSOs.
2. Improving access to rural credit for small-scale farmers and particularly for women farmers.
3. Expanding and better utilizing small-scale irrigation and/or other means for water management appropriate for small farmers.
4. Researching and promoting technologies relevant to the conditions facing small-scale farmers in order to improve their livelihoods (much current research is disconnected from the needs and priorities of small farmers).
5. Increasing extension services geared particularly to support women farmers.

¹ Members of the Canadian Food Security Policy Group commissioned research in Ghana (Professor Saa Dittoh), Ethiopia (Dr. Berhanu) and Mozambique (Mr. Jaqueline Massingue). Brian Tomlinson, Policy Analyst with CCIC, summarized this research in this paper, taking account of advice and input of a small reference group composed of Faith Mansfield (CHF), Kioko Munyao (World Vision Canada), Stuart Clark (Canadian Foodgrains Bank) and Jean Christie (Consultant).

A Canadian consultant interviewed CIDA officials in Ottawa and assembled an overview of CIDA programming in agriculture, rural development and food security for each country. The focus of this research is on bilateral programming initiatives, in part because of insufficient data on programming supported through Canadian Partnership Branch. Bilateral programming is non-responsive and therefore should closely reflect the priorities of the CIDA's 2003 agriculture and rural development policy. The intention of the FSPG is to share the lessons and recommendation of this research with CIDA officials following the finalization of this report.

6. Providing fair and transparent legal access to productive resources for small scale farmers (and pastoralists in Ethiopia).
7. Improving rural infrastructure for local markets, storage facilities, market information and marketing structures that direct an increased proportion of the market price to local farmers.
8. Improving access to commercial markets, with a strong emphasis on developing local and regional markets, while not ignoring export opportunities where these do not undermine domestic food security.
9. Supporting the role of small farmers in conserving and promoting agro-ecological diversity, and ensuring farmers' stewardship of their seed supply systems.

In addition to identifying agricultural development priorities, the local CSOs recommended that Northern CSOs, including those from Canada, should:

1. Strengthen the capacities of their local partners to influence donor and government policies for food security and agriculture.
2. Support the mutual exchange of experience and knowledge among all CSOs.
3. Commit to relationships with local partners that extend beyond the normal 2-3 year project cycle.
4. Show greater inter-agency coordination in their work.

3 Background

Achieving food security through improved support for small-scale agriculturalists, pastoralists and rural households is widely recognized as an essential base for poverty reduction in sub-Saharan Africa. The rural sector still accounts for 70% of sub-Saharan Africa's population and two-thirds of all livelihoods. Women remain responsible for up to 70% of food production in Africa. Despite growing food insecurity in urban areas, most of Africa's poor and under-nourished groups still live in rural areas.

Like other donor countries; prior to 1990, Canada recognized the importance of agriculture in developing countries by directing approximately 20% of its aid towards agricultural development. But, also like other donors, it cut its aid for agricultural development dramatically during the 1990s, falling by 34% between 1990 and 2000. The 57% drop in aid for agriculture to sub-Saharan Africa was particularly steep and difficult to understand.

Members of the Canadian Food Security Policy Group (FSPG) welcomed the renewal of CIDA's attention to agriculture and rural development in its 2003 policy statement, *Promoting Sustainable Rural Development through Agriculture* (CIDA, 2003a). The policy not only sets out important expenditure targets for agriculture, reaching Cdn\$500 million by 2007 (approximately 10% of Official Development Assistance), from a low of Cdn\$84 million in 2001. It also recognizes the central place of small-scale farmers, with a strong focus on women farmers, in an integrated approach to agricultural development that is based on an understanding of sustainable local livelihoods and ecosystem health. Its approach is largely consistent with strategies detailed

in a recent OECD DAC “best practices” document, *Promoting Pro-Poor Growth – Agriculture* (DAC, 2006).

In its proposals for CIDA’s 2003 strategy, the FSPG focused on poverty reduction through improved rural livelihoods and the application of the principles of sustainable agriculture. The Policy Group stressed the importance of rural infrastructure and services with priority to household food security needs and sustainable local production for *domestic* markets. It called for coordinated donor interventions² that respond to the vulnerabilities of the poor and that strengthen their assets and capabilities. Since women play a predominant role in food production in Africa, building rural capacity must ensure that rural women are empowered to gain equal access to essential resources and inputs (land, credit, financing, technology, markets, business support, training etc.). By collaborating in diverse partnerships, including with civil society organizations, CIDA was encouraged to support the poor in organizing themselves (into cooperatives, self-help groups, farmer and peasant associations) to become significant actors in local and regional markets. Finally, the FSPG recommended that CIDA’s policy interventions with governments (and other donors), should promote appropriate agricultural trade, investment and support policies consistent with the principles of the human right to food, local food security and sustainable agriculture. [FSPG, 2002; FSPG, 2004]

CIDA met the 2003 policy’s spending targets for the first two years. However, according to recent CIDA figures, projected total expenditure on agriculture in 2005/06 will be between \$200 million and \$230 million, well short of the target of \$300 million for the year. Future projections point to a levelling off at current expenditure levels, far below the 2007 target of \$500 million. In light of this seemingly diminishing place for agriculture in CIDA’s current priorities, the FSPG is concerned that CIDA’s agriculture and rural development strategy is being abandoned, ignoring the essential contributions that Canada should be making to reducing rural poverty in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

4 The Importance of CIDA’s Support for Agricultural Development

Canada’s commitment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 requires increased CIDA focus on improved livelihoods for rural people, where the majority of people living in poverty continue to live. It is important that CIDA meet the five-year financial targets (reaching an investment of \$500 million in 2007) set out the 2003 strategy, *Promoting Sustainable Rural Development through Agriculture*.

² Since 2002, CIDA is improving its aid effectiveness by collaborating with like-minded donors in pooled funding for Sector Wide Approaches (SWAs) with Ministries of Government, including Ministries for Agriculture, and aligning Agency priorities with a country’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). While working with other donors and Ministry officials in a coordinated approach to sector development is positive, CIDA is also a modest donor in any given country, which in turn may limit the extent to which CIDA may influence the final outcomes for its program resources. On the other hand, Canadian CSOs have suggested that CIDA adopt a “niche approach” to maximize its influence on SWAs and General Budget Support programs. For a CSO critique of donor aid effectiveness strategies see Tomlinson, 2006.

CIDA's 2003 agriculture strategy is still highly relevant for improving the livelihoods of rural people. It provides a crucial focus on the relationship between agricultural development and food security, highlighting the critical importance of sustainable agriculture for small-scale farm families with particular attention to women farmers.

With particular reference to CIDA, the research noted that:

1. CIDA's support to the agricultural sector in Ghana, Ethiopia and Mozambique is largely coherent with these governments' strategies for agriculture and food security. CSOs suggested several areas where these directions could be strengthened at the country and local levels.
2. In Ethiopia and Ghana, there is a large disconnect between Southern (and Northern) CSOs involved in the agricultural sector and donor/government policy-setting.
3. Many donor programs, including CIDA's, have had only modest impact at the local level. Regular dialogue with local CSOs (and their counterparts in Canada) will improve donor impact on the well-being of small-scale farmers and the position of women in the rural food economy.

With respect to the development of commercial agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa, CIDA is encouraged to evaluate these efforts explicitly in terms of the impact of these strategies on the livelihoods of the majority of poor and small-scale farmers as well as on achieving national food security goals.

SUMMARIES OF COUNTRY RESEARCH

5 Ghana

5.1 An Overview of Government Strategies and CIDA's Programming

CIDA has a long history of supporting the agricultural and rural sectors in Ghana, primarily in the Northern Regions. In the 1990s CIDA addressed food security in this region by supporting water and sanitation projects, funding district administration, and irrigation in drought prone areas. Currently, CIDA's Ghana program takes its lead from the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS), which it describes as a "locally owned" medium-term strategy to reduce poverty in Ghana. The GPRS emphasises agriculture's role in leading economic growth in much of the country. It focuses on "modernizing agriculture" through mechanization, irrigation, promotion of agri-business zones, re-forestation and strengthening the role of the private sector.

While there is not an official programming framework for Ghana at the moment, CIDA's Ghana program has been closely guided by the "discussion document" *CIDA Food Security Support in Ghana – moving towards full Ghanaian leadership and management, 1999/00 to 2009/10* [CIDA, 2003b]. CIDA makes the point that the GPRS is not a 'food security document and does not...sufficiently or strategically address the causal factors or issues of hunger" [CIDA 2003b]. Therefore the program in Ghana sets out two inter-related objectives: "a practical food security objective and a transformative objective aimed at strengthening the public system to deliver services in the long term" [CIDA 2003b, 6].

"By addressing food security, CIDA is able to ensure that its development resources are being applied to the problems of the extreme poor... Reducing poverty will not necessarily resolve all the root causes of hunger, which can also have to do with structural inadequacies, cultural biases, ill health, social and economic exclusion, conflict and natural disasters. This reality has led to a growing recognition of the need for specific, targeted food security programming within a poverty reduction framework. [CIDA 2003b]"

CIDA takes a number of issues into consideration when targeting interventions: its positive impact on poverty; its response to Ghanaian priorities; how it will increase the capacity of Ghanaian institutions to address root causes of food insecurity; avoiding conditions exacerbating conflict; and assurances that the food insecure (particularly women) in the north participate fully in the development of plans and interventions affecting them.

CIDA's support to agriculture is primarily focussed in the Northern Regions, with recent programming strongly influenced by program-based approaches that support national priorities for agriculture through the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA)³. This is accomplished in part through a \$85M contribution to a multi-donor sector fund, that emphasizes institutional capacity building, improving financial services, support for technology development, development of infrastructure, improved access to markets and ensuring food security.

³ A summary of CIDA bilateral programming in Ghana related to agriculture and rural development can be found in Appendix One to this report.

Additional relevant programs and projects include: Farmer Responsive Mechanisms in Extension and Research (FARMER), Food Security and Environment Facility, the District Wide Assistance Program, District Capacity Building and Community Driven Initiatives for Food Security. CIDA also provides general budget support to the Ghanaian government through its \$93M contribution to a multi-donor support fund.

CIDA's *Food Security Support in Ghana* discussion paper, in its assessment criteria, makes no reference to the impacts of twenty years of forced trade liberalization in the food sector on small farmers and local food security in northern Ghana. Donor conditionalities for loans starting in the mid-1980s required various Ghanaian governments to remove most forms of government support for the small scale agricultural sector, to privatize local processes and marketing, and to lower tariffs far below WTO-sanctioned rates on a flood of food imports, which continued to be highly subsidized in their countries of origin in the North. The livelihoods of many Ghanaian small farmers have been devastated through increases in competition from subsidized EU agricultural products, resulting in, for example, sharp declines in processing of domestic tomatoes, declining rice production, and declining markets for domestic production of chicken parts [Khor, 2006].⁴

5.2 Small-Farmer Agricultural Development Priorities

Professor Saa Dittoh, at the University of Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana, conducted research on behalf of the FSPG to identify civil society priorities for small-scale agricultural development in Ghana⁵. He interviewed organizations and individuals with considerable grassroots experience in agriculture and food security issues in Northern Ghana. The results of this research pointed to the following top priorities (in order)⁶:

1. **Improved access to credit for farmers.** Respondents referred to the high cost of agricultural inputs for poor farmers, particularly those involved with improved technologies. They stressed the need for “supervised credit” as well as capacity building of farmers in credit management. Donors should support micro-credit facilities, which are close to rural communities, through the Rural Banks. A key question raised was how to extend credit efficiently to small farmers.

⁴ In July 2006, the Millennium Challenge Account in the United States announced a five-year development assistance of US\$547 million to modernize Ghana's agricultural sector, improve and expand transportation and deliver rural development services and facilities. Approximately half of the funds will target commercial agriculture among small farmers, improve access to credit, invest in irrigation, storage and processing facilities. Other funds will be directed to transportation projects to improve access to markets, education, water and sanitation and electricity in rural areas. No doubt the scale of this investment may affect the impact of CIDA's focus on agriculture and rural development in Northern Ghana.

⁵ Professor Dittoh's research has been complemented by parallel research by Vera Amedofu (ISSER). The latter focuses on CSO priorities for agriculture in Ghana as a whole, while Professor Dittoh focuses on CSOs in Northern Ghana. Reviews of this research noted the distinct absence of women in the individuals surveyed and made the point that women as farmers and agro-processors might have had a different ranking of priorities

⁶ The ranking of CSO priorities differed somewhat between Dittoh and Amedofu. While there is strong agreement in these priorities between the two studies, the latter put more emphasis on capacity building, including the extension of technical information and training, with less on infrastructure and irrigation, stressing that this priority depended on the part of the country the CSO was based [Amedofu, 2006a, 8]

2. **Small-scale irrigated agriculture.** Agricultural intensification is essential in Northern Ghana and improving food security requires irrigated agriculture. Irrigated agriculture will keep more youth on the land and will form the basis for improving market oriented agriculture and agro-industries. However, the delivery of viable small-scale irrigated systems continues to be a challenge - although one worth addressing, given the problems observed with large-scale systems - and that donors need to work with others to develop ways to effectively meet this need.
3. **Strong farmer-based organizations.** Civil society observers linked the presence of strong farmer-based organizations and cooperatives to more successful delivery of credit and irrigated agriculture. The challenge is to find avenues and support for farmers and development agents to work together locally. (See also Amedofu 2006a for a discussion of issues in forming and supporting farmers groups [6-7].)
4. **Strengthening of extension services at the district level through MoFA and NGOs/ Up-scaling of best practices and ensuring adoption of improved technologies.** Interviewees pointed to the wide gap between available appropriate technology, knowledge of best practices and its use by farmers. In part this is caused by a strict technology transfer approach that does not recognize local knowledge and experiences of small farmers. In addition, lack of capacity and funds hamper the reach of extension services in Ghana.
5. **Promotion of agricultural product marketing** (including prices and processing technologies). While variable weather creates variations in production, the availability and dependability of markets for small farmers also influences farmer's choices and opportunities. Access to markets, fair pricing, storage and processing are all interrelated issues that often leave small-scale producers with no other option but to sell to farm-gate buyers at low prices at the time of bumper harvests. Some respondents suggested the promotion of regional commodity markets to open up markets for produce from different African countries. Amedofu notes that small farmers are increasingly affected by unfair competition from imported products, while Ghanaian small farmers lack market information to produce for international and regional markets. [Amedofu, 2006a, 3-4]
6. **Provision of appropriate technology to reduce drudgery / Promotion of animal traction.** Ghana has 50 years of experience in animal traction which is superior to tractors for small plots, but its use is not very widespread.
7. **Intensification of soil fertility management technologies for small farmers / sustainable land management practices.** It is essential to internalize appropriate improvements for soil management through participatory extension methods. Such technologies in the future need to be developed with small farmers.

Other priorities noted by Dittoh included:

8. Provision of adequate and timely production inputs to farmers.
9. Development (intensification) of small ruminant production.
10. Introduction (reintroduction) of subsidies for essential farm inputs/services.
11. Farm-based research / Ensuring strong, practical research-extension-farmer linkages.
12. Promotion of agriculture as a business (enterprise promotion).

Professor Dittoh identified two additional priorities which he considered critical:

1. Decentralized small farmer development policy and programs; and
2. Improved coordination of small farmer development efforts among development actors under a common development framework.

These two areas need to be developed by government, donors and NGOs in close consultation with small farmers. They have to be accompanied by long-term commitments, otherwise small farmers become highly sceptical that changes will be sustainable.

Respondents mentioned a number of important constraints that they perceive influence progress in addressing these priorities. Slow and unresponsive bureaucracy in approving funds and in implementing agricultural policies and programs play an important role. There is generally ineffective collaboration between MoFA and NGOs. In training programs, there is too little emphasis on sustainable production systems, on storage, processing, marketing and micro-financing. There remains a perception that the Government of Ghana's priorities still seem to be focussed on cocoa production, with less emphasis on supporting sustainable small-farm production.

5.3 Assessing CIDA-Supported Agriculture Development in Ghana

Both Dittoh and Amedofu highlight strong connections between the intent of CIDA's programming in agriculture and the concerns of small farmers. However, Dittoh points out that CSOs in Northern Ghana have experienced only modest achievements with many of CIDA's initiatives. This is particularly true of those that support government agencies such as the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA). He argues that until the latter "is effectively decentralized with regards to finance, centralized budgetary support cannot tackle issues at the community and district levels" [Dittoh, 2006, 11]. He uses the example of support to irrigated agriculture and suggests that while there has been considerable discussion at the Ministry level and associated agencies, little is changing 'on the ground'.

Building a more responsive formal agricultural research and development system through strengthening participatory approaches and building the capacities of farmers and their organizations to articulate their needs are an objective of key CIDA supported initiatives in Northern Ghana. However, Dittoh points out that farmer confidence in these initiatives is undermined by the short timeframe of the project, and differing visions of the best way to go about meeting the goals of the project. Dittoh adds that patience and long term commitment is critical for success: "Real successful food security programming in northern Ghana should take at least five years of actual implementation and patient understanding of learning processes for concrete and sustainable results to begin to be seen" [Dittoh, 2006, 23].

6 Ethiopia

6.1 An Overview of Government Strategies and CIDA Programming

For CIDA, “food security is at the core of poverty reduction and is the number one priority of Ethiopia's development agenda” [CIDA, 2004a, 3]. “Agriculture, rural development and food security” is therefore one of two strategic objectives for CIDA’s current program in Ethiopia (2004 to 2009). CIDA’s objectives support the implementation of Ethiopia’s Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (SDPRP), which covers the period 2002 to 2005. The Government of Ethiopia is finalising its Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP) which will cover the period 2005-2010.

Canada accepted that the SDPRP “demonstrates strong country ownership and unprecedented participation, includes a sound diagnosis of the poverty situation, and an appropriate emphasis on rural/agricultural development as well as development of the private sector” [CIDA, 2004, 6]. The overall aim of the SDPRP was to reduce poverty, while maintaining overall macroeconomic stability. It developed government programming priorities based on four pillars:

1. Agricultural development-led industrialization and food security. Agriculture is the source of livelihood for 85 % of the population and the bulk of the poor.
2. The justice system and civil service reform.
3. Governance, decentralization and empowerment of the poor.
4. Capacity building [DAG, 2006; DFID, 2006].

The 2005 draft PASDEP continues the focus on a strategy of industrialization led by agricultural development, but with more emphasis on urban development and shifts to diversification and commercialization of agriculture [DFID, 2006]. With respect to agriculture, PASDEP states that “the main objective during the PASDEP period is to accelerate the transformation from subsistence to a more business/market-oriented agriculture”. It will do so “while protecting the essential agricultural base on which the poor depend for their livelihoods”. The aim is to achieve food security by 2010 (Government of Ethiopia, 2005). Decentralization, strengthening service delivery at the regional and district level, is to be accompanied by further governance reform in a strengthened justice system.

Civil society organizations, represented in the Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE) welcomed the overall directions of PASDEP. But they are disappointed that it “does not recognize the strong contributions that civil society has made to the development of the country” (Berhanu 2006a). They welcomed the greater emphasis on participation at regional and local levels, but sought more regular inclusion of civil society expertise in carrying out government and donor plans. With respect to agriculture, PANE appreciated the emphasis on a more modern commercial agriculture, but suggested that its impact on poverty would depend on “access to local market infrastructure that could be easily utilized by farmers” and a fair price for farmers’ produce. They also emphasized the importance of further consideration of land tenure issues and the importance of conservation of genetic resources as Ethiopia expands commercialized agriculture. Finally, in their view, an integrated approach to supporting a pastoralist way of life

is missing from the government's current strategies, particularly a pastoral land use policy, conflict resolution mechanisms, and improved economic and social services. [PANE, 2005]

Following the famine of 2002/03, the donor community, civil society and government have collaborated to support national food security priorities through the New Coalition for Food Security. The program aims to improve the food security of the 5 million people who are chronically food insecure and the additional 10 million who are vulnerable to shocks such as drought. CSO critics point to the very short time frames to achieve food security in difficult circumstances and the bad experiences of earlier resettlement programs. More generally, CSOs in Ethiopia have also recognized the importance of collaboration, stakeholder alliances and the alignment of resources when appropriate [Berhanu, 2006a, 23-24].

More recently, the government has presented to donors an ambitious five year plan for "agriculture development-led industrialization" (ADLI) by focusing on the development of water resources and expansion of irrigated agriculture in order to increase non-subsistence market-based agriculture and export-led agricultural growth. The ground-work for comprehensive plans for agriculture and rural development were laid out in 2005 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) in several published policy briefs: "Millennium Development Goals Based Need Assessment: The Rural Development and Food Security Sector" and the "National Agricultural Input and Output Marketing Strategy". These priorities find expression in the draft PASDEP [Government of Ethiopia, 2005].

Donors, in a detailed analysis of these sector plans, welcomed the serious focus by the government on food security and agricultural development, but also suggested that the plans failed to make solid links between their detailed proposals for investments in more commercial agriculture production, water resource management and marketing and the impact of these investments on the incomes and livelihoods of those living in poverty and the food insecure. [Diao and Gabre-Madhin, 2005] Nevertheless, CIDA is working with a range of donor agencies, including DFID, Finland, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, the Africa Development Bank and the World Bank, in support of the government's agricultural priorities.

CIDA's 2004-2009 Program Framework proposes "significant contributions to major initiatives in agriculture/food security that have strong government leadership and multi-donor support, under the broad umbrella of the Ethiopian/donor New Coalition for Food Security" [CIDA, 2004a, 16]. Specifically, since the publication of the Framework, CIDA is contributing over the next five years to the following multi-donor initiatives⁷:

- "*Improved Productivity and Market Success*" to improve the negotiating power of farmers to market their produce, increase the capacity of MoARD to support market-oriented community based development. (International Livestock Research Institute, \$19.9 million, 2004-2010)
- "*Water Harvesting and Institutional Strengthening in Amhara*", to improve the sustainable use of water for irrigation and increased crop production. (Hydrosult Inc., \$16.9 million, 2005 – 2010)

⁷ A summary of CIDA bilateral programming in Ethiopia related to agriculture and rural development can be found in Appendix Two to this report.

- “*Water Harvesting and Institutional Strengthening in Tigray*”, working with Tigrean regional government institutions to improve food security in drought prone areas (complementing a larger multi-donor food-for-work program in Tigray, to which Canada contributes an additional \$7.5 million). (Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, \$7.2 million, 2002 – 2007)
- “*Ethiopia Food Security Project*”, with the World Bank, tackling food security issues within a least 60 woredas (districts) in Ethiopia, providing micro-grants through the government of Ethiopia to build assets at the community level. CIDA is providing 13.5% of the budget for this program. (World Bank, \$19.5 million, 2004 -2010)
- “*Ethiopia Productive Safety Net Project*”, with the World Bank, responding to the reported failure of substantial humanitarian assistance to protect livelihoods, to generate community assets and preserve physical and human capital. The Ethiopia Productive Safety Net Program is a key instrument of the New Coalition for Food Security. It aims to shift Ethiopia from dependence on food aid towards a development-oriented safety net system that is both growth-enhancing and effective in the social protection of chronically food insecure households. The program is a key element of the "famine prevention framework" highlighted specifically in the Communiqué of the June 2004 G-8 Summit in Gleneagles. Donor resources, beyond a US\$55.7 million World Bank loan, are not all additional, but may include amounts in lieu of humanitarian assistance that Ethiopia would have received. (World Bank, 2006 – 2010, CIDA contribution still being planned)

Influenced by donor principles set out in the Paris Declaration, CIDA, along with other donors in Ethiopia, had been working closely with government, harmonizing their support (through the Donor Assistance Group) and developing sector-wide initiatives. Most donors are now withholding direct transfers to the government due to the setback of human rights and ongoing issues related to governance. The World Bank has cut back on direct budget support for the government of Ethiopia, where the government has the most discretion in allocating resources. But the Bank indicated that it would maintain support for projects where resources go much more directly to the poor, such as the support for basic services, the Productive Safety Net or rural road projects, many of which are those with which CIDA seeks to be a partner.

6.2 Small-Farmer Agricultural Development Priorities

Dr. Berhanu undertook a series of interviews with representatives of civil society organizations with experience and knowledge of issues facing small farmers and food insecure rural populations in Ethiopia [Berhanu, 2006a]. He points to the broad experience of CSOs active in Ethiopia in the areas of food security, humanitarian assistance, water conservation, capacity building with local CSOs and local government, improved agricultural technologies and practices, preservation of agro-biodiversity, small scale irrigation, advocacy for the rights of women, etc.

His CSO respondents identified a number of priority issues and constraints with respect to agriculture and food security, which they believed the development community should be taking into account in Ethiopia [Berhanu, 2006a, 15-16]. Berhanu’s report notes that it is essential to understand the regional differences and agro-ecological settings in Ethiopia when identifying priority issues for agriculture and food security. Hence, each priority on the following list should

be applied in a regional context and should not necessarily be assumed to be nationally applicable.

1. **Improved capacity at woreda and community levels** is needed to implement development plans. These capacity constraints limit the development impact of government and donor initiatives to decentralize administrative power to woreda/district levels. Close collaboration between government and civil society at this level has proven very fruitful and should be encouraged to reduce these capacity constraints. Furthermore, interventions at the community level should be differentiated to consider the wealth status of community members, with different priorities for more wealthy farmers (new markets), middle group (irrigation) and the poorest (labour and livestock rearing).
2. **Improved demand-side and marketing infrastructure.** CSOs pointed to the need to improve the capacities and infrastructure for national marketing and transportation of surplus agricultural produce from food surplus regions to food deficit regions. Efforts should include establishing community level grain banks to increase the marketing power of small farmers, including women, to maximize the prices for their grain.
3. **Strengthened credit and savings schemes.** CSOs emphasized the crucial importance of rural credit and saving schemes for small farmers.
4. **More focused and appropriate attention to pastoral development.** The government's objective is to encourage sedentary agriculture, despite considerable controversy in Ethiopia about appropriate approaches to conditions facing pastoralists. It is noted that pastoralists are expected to be most affected by the impact of climate change. "Modern" institutions are replacing traditional local ones, which are now unable to play important roles in mediating land use issues, water management and relationships between communities and neighbouring clans. Traditional local institutions and communal resource ownership should be empowered.
5. **More effective and appropriate technology generation and dissemination.** CSOs noted that agricultural research does not in general reflect the needs and interests of small farmers and therefore can not adequately address the complexities inherent in local agricultural systems. The need for closer collaboration between farmers and researchers was emphasized.
6. **Implementation of more effective systems for land management,** to counter land degradation, which has been compounded by a lack of land use planning and natural resource management systems.
7. **Expand and better utilize irrigation facilities.** CSOs suggested making better use of existing facilities through their rehabilitation and extension to benefit local farmers. They also encouraged support for small to medium irrigation schemes, controlled by local communities, to support diversification and a range of high value crops.
8. **Appropriate food security safety nets.** Food security safety nets, with food aid as a development resource, may be positive interventions if they are timed and targeted so as not to contribute to dependency. These strategies need to be used as a temporary measure. Self-reliance, carried out within a clear timeframe, needs to be the ultimate goal (which is one of the weaknesses mentioned by CSOs in the current Safety Net Program).

6.3 Assessing CIDA-Supported Agriculture Development in Ethiopia

Canada's total aid to Ethiopia in 2003/04 was Cdn \$87.6 M, with bilateral aid amounting to \$30 M. Berhanu's overall assessment of CIDA's bilateral initiatives in agriculture and food security is highly positive when measured against the priorities articulated by Ethiopian CSOs. In particular, CIDA's support for gender sensitive programming, the program of the New Coalition for Food Security, the linkages between environmental issues and sustainable agriculture, Disaster Mitigation Support, Improved Productivity and Market Success, and CHF's Partnership for Food Security Project was judged to be closely aligned with CSO priorities. With respect to natural resources and the environment, he noted that women and girls, "as the primary food producers and water and fuel collectors...are particularly hard hit by environmental degradation". [Berhanu, 2006b, 4]

Berhanu provided, however, some important comments on various initiatives and missing areas:

1. While CIDA's support for water harvesting was welcomed and focused on those areas that suffer water scarcity, the approach to date has been to dig ponds in all villages, even where villagers sought different and more appropriate solutions for their villages. Depending on local circumstances, "water harvesting technologies should be diverse and adaptable, not one solution everywhere". [Berhanu, 2006b, 2]
2. CSOs in Ethiopia have questioned the exclusive focus of donors and government on food insecure regions, ignoring in their view "whether food security in Ethiopia [can] be achieved without equal attention and adequate support given to the rest of the country", particularly the linkages with high potential agricultural areas of the country. [Berhanu, 2006b, 2]
3. CSOs question whether government is backing its commitment to give priority to agriculture with adequate national resource allocations. CIDA, even as a modest donor, should provide additional resources for the agricultural sector.
4. Donors and government's strategies to improve the productivity of the agricultural sector should take better account of the need for an integrated approach. "There has been a growing concern that unless adequate and equal emphasis is given to the development of the non-farm sectors of the economy in order to create employment opportunities for the surplus rural labour, the [agricultural] sector will remain in a vicious circle of low productivity and widespread rural poverty". [Berhanu, 2006b, 3]
5. CIDA support for food security should emphasize a better integration of food security programming by the government with those parts of the government responsible for agricultural development. [Berhanu, 2006b, 4]
6. Professor Berhanu noted that the efforts to strengthen the capacity for policy analysis with the Coalition on Food Security worked with government institutions alone, without actively engaging NGOs except when invited to conferences and seminars.
7. CHF's Partnership for Food Security program promoted a shift away from dependency on food aid and involved significant collaboration with various actors, including local NGOs, Community Based Organizations and other donor-sponsored projects to maximize synergies in the area. [Berhanu, 2006b, 6]

8. Donors should give more emphasis to the role of the private sector and NGOs in agricultural service provisions, marketing functions and food production, leaving to government the important tasks of infrastructure development, regulatory functions and policy matters. Their (CSOs) interventions should be supported as they bring in new ideas and innovative practices albeit on limited scale compared to the government agricultural extension services.” [Berhanu, 2006b, 7]

Several areas which have been given high priority by CSOs were not covered by CIDA’s program in Ethiopia – namely, the demand side of marketing for agricultural development, (including employment and income for consumers), facilitating access to capital in rural areas, livestock development, and interventions related to pastoral areas.

7 Mozambique

7.1 An Overview of Government Strategies and CIDA Programming

CIDA's Program Framework for 2004 to 2009, *Canada and Mozambique: In partnership for development*, identifies three main priorities for agriculture and rural development – support for agricultural development, other rural development initiatives in water supply and agro-forestry, and short-term measures to support farmers in under-serviced regions. CIDA programs are consistent with the poverty reduction plans of the Government of Mozambique, which have been expressed in its first *Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty* (PARPA). In June 2006, the Government launched its second Plan, or PAPRA II, for the period, 2006 – 2009.

PAPRA II is the result of a highly participatory consultative process in 2005 on how poverty in Mozambique should be tackled, including four national “Poverty Observatories” and related regional events. It identifies six national priorities, one of which is agriculture and rural development. The government seeks to transform the agricultural system in which it “gradually turns family producers into commercial farmers”. [Republic of Mozambique, 2006, 526; Massingue, 2006, 4] The government expects that approximately 50% of the budget to finance PAPRA II will come from international donors.

Agricultural Priorities in PAPRA II

- transform the department of agriculture into a modern institution to support the agricultural sector
- increase agricultural production and productivity for smallholder agriculture – for income and food security, and
- protect, conserve, develop and ensure public access to natural resources.

Responding to contributions from Mozambican civil society, PAPRA II explicitly defines “poverty” beyond a measure of income, but also includes “lack of access to education, health, water and sanitation” and “social exclusion, lack of power and vulnerability”. It goes further to situate the Government's actions within acknowledged rights to health and well being. Food security must take account of quality, diversity and sustainability, and must respect cultural conditions. Moreover, it identifies roles for the state in increasing regulation of agricultural and rural markets, creative alternatives for rural credit, access to technology and extension services, as well as investments to stimulate agro-industries. Going beyond PAPRA I, it calls for the creation of rural development and industrial strategies by the Government. [Hanlon, 2006]

The Government of Mozambique has been working with a national food security and nutritional strategy (ESAN) adopted in 1998, which is now under review. The focus in ESAN has been on food security and nutritional needs of the most vulnerable populations. There are two related issues – rapid improvement in the food economy to supply local needs and improvement in the management of assistance to people suffering transitory or chronic food insecurity. [Massingue, 2006, 12-15]

Canada, along with 17 other donors, has been collaborating in the Programme Aid Partnership (PAP) with the Government through general budget support and sector wide programs. More than 20 civil society organizations in Mozambique have also been increasingly collaborating

through the G20 coalition⁸. The coalition is broadly supportive of PAPRA II, but has sought greater attention to employment creation, small and medium enterprise development (which include cooperatives for smallholder agricultural production and processing). The group also proposed the creation of a financial institution to mobilize rural savings and credit. The latter is particularly important in light of the abandonment of rural areas as a result of the privatization of the banking system under earlier terms of structural adjustment. [Hanlon, 2006; Waeterloos, 2005]⁹

CIDA's aid modalities for agriculture and rural development have a balanced approach, with approximately 50% of resources devoted to program-based approaches and 50% in targeted projects¹⁰. CIDA also has a good record on engaging with Canadian NGOs – including Aga Khan Canada, CARE Canada, Oxfam Canada and CODE, etc – in support of their partner priorities for agriculture and food security in Mozambique.

National Program for Agricultural Development (PROAGRI), \$20 million, 2004 – 2008. With 9 donors, Canada is contributing to a pooled funding program to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in support of PROAGRI. Since its initiation in 1999, donors have contributed more than US\$200 million to PROAGRI, while Canada joined the initiative in 2004. In 2005 PROAGRI began a second 5-year phase. One review recently noted that donors intend to reorient PROAGRI II away from core support for the Ministry of Agriculture functions to focus “on strategic activities”¹¹, while investments in core functions would be managed through other general budget support by the donors. The intent is to increase the real impact of donor sector resources on farmers on the ground (the lack of a visible impact on the ground has been a criticism of the first phase of PROAGRI). CIDA has noted that inclusion of civil society is another (perhaps related) weakness of PROAGRI and that they intend to promote the involvement of civil society. [Reviere, 2005; Desjardins, 2006; Massingue, 2006]

Sustainable and Effective Economic Development, \$8 million, 2005 – 2012. The goal of the SEED project, implemented by CARE Canada, is to increase access to and control over a diversified portfolio of farm and non-farm income-generating activities in Mozambique's northern Inhambane province.

⁸ The G20 coalition is a group of 20 national representative CSOs. Its aim is to promote civil society participation in policy debates. The G20 has become one of the main contact points in civil society for both external partners and government, and has made a significant contribution to the institutionalisation of the dialogue between Government and civil society on poverty and broader development issues.

⁹ The Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) in September 2006 elaborated its priorities for the next five years and put forward criteria to prioritize its activities for agrarian development: 1) Impact potential for poverty reduction, for food security and asset creation; 2) competitive increases in agrarian production for domestic, regional and international markets; 3) diversification of production to reduce food insecurity, agro-climate and market risks; and 4) increased impact of technology adoption. [Massingue, 2006, 11]

¹⁰ A summary of CIDA bilateral programming in Mozambique related to agriculture and rural development can be found in Appendix Three to this report.

¹¹ PROAGRI has adopted criteria to assure local benefits from PROAGRI project funds: proposed by associations or community organizations, small or medium agrarian enterprises, local development organizations, experienced in implementing agricultural development and basic financial management. [Massingue, 2006, 11]

Coastal Rural Support Project, \$9.5 million, 2004 – 2012. Implemented by Aga Khan Canada, the Coastal Rural Support Program (CRSP) uses a sustainable livelihoods approach to help reduce rural poverty in the northern province of Cabo Delgado.

Sustainable Livelihoods and Agriculture Project, \$6.5 million, 2005 – 2011. The Sustainable Livelihoods and Agriculture Project is implemented by Oxfam Canada with civil society organizations at the national, provincial (Tete and Manica Provinces) and community levels. It is strengthening their capacity to improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers. The project uses a sustainable livelihoods and a rights-based approach, while integrating gender equality, HIV/AIDS, and environmental sustainability into its project activities.

7.2 Small-Farmer Agricultural Development Priorities

Jaqueline Massingue, on behalf of the Canadian Food Security Policy Group, surveyed seven CSOs active in the agricultural sector and collated their views on current priorities to strengthen livelihoods for small-scale farmers in Mozambique. Those surveyed included UNAC, the largest farmers' organization in Mozambique¹².

Poverty is deeply rooted in Mozambique's rural regions, where 70% of the population lives. One third of the rural population experience chronic difficulty meeting their basic food needs. Rural areas are also highly vulnerable to alternating floods and droughts.

Mr. Massingue pointed to a strong consensus among CSOs, government and donors that "increasing crop production and productivity and improvements in marketing systems" are key to poverty reduction and rural family well-being. [Massingue, 2006, 6]. He summarized ten development priorities for small-scale farmers:

1. **General and specific infrastructure to strengthen agrarian production.** Rural agriculture suffers from a general lack of basic infrastructure of rural roads, bridge rehabilitation, communications and other agrarian-related infrastructure. Communities are isolated when transportation costs are too high to access local markets. Rural women, involved in food production, will benefit from investments in reducing distances to potable water, health services as well as rural electrification.
2. **Timely inputs distribution system.** Farmers are unable to access needed inputs (seeds, inputs and tools) on a timely basis and are often unable to afford these inputs even when available.
3. **Land tenure insecurity.** CSOs and farmers report inadequate community consultation in the application of a law that is limiting their access to and utilization of land. UNAC points to a "process of privatization of land and other natural resources" as a barrier for small-scale farmers [Massingue, 2006, 7].
4. **Emphasis on market development.** Small-scale farmers are adversely affected by fluctuating prices that do not cover production costs, as well as smuggling and unfair competition from subsidized products. Farmers would benefit from timely market information to balance seasonality.

¹² Several representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and the donor community resident in Mozambique were also interviewed.

5. **Agrarian services, including extension and rural credit and finance.** Extension services should pay particular attention to increasing female extension technicians to improve support to female farmers. Much more attention must be given to rural credit facilities that meet the needs of both male and female small-scale farmers. Micro-finance programs are run mainly by international NGOs and have problems of sustainability related to the time-limited project modalities of aid delivery [Massingue, 2006, 18]. Agricultural loans account for only a small fraction of the total micro-finance loan portfolio. While women benefit proportionately from micro-finance across the country, the balance in rural areas is highly skewed towards male beneficiaries. [Massingue, 2006, 20-21]
6. **Programs for the prevention of HIV/AIDS in rural areas.** The high prevalence of HIV/AIDS in rural areas affects the rural agrarian labour force and agricultural productivity.
7. **Improved agricultural technology appropriate to the realities of small farmers.** The emphasis should be on promotion of drought and pest resistant crops, sustainable technologies to improve soil fertility in zones where land is limited, technologies to improve the labour productivity of women in food crops where they do much of the work.
8. **Improved agro-processing,** to capture greater returns from agricultural production and service local and regional markets.
9. **Improved storage to reduce post-harvest losses** (about 30% losses are reported across the country); and
10. **Water management through small-scale irrigation and dams** to reduce effects of droughts and flooding.

UNAC has promoted greater inclusion of farmers in policy dialogue with government to address these priorities. Another CSO working at the grassroots level welcomed the government's recognition of the need to meet the needs of rural populations in their communities. These CSOs were constrained by the slow release of funds to partners for work at this level and by low levels of education of the target population (small-scale farmers). With respect to the latter, improvements in rural agriculture will benefit from an emphasis on girls' education at all levels and the introduction of basic notions of production, conservation and food preparation in the curriculum. The link between gender and poverty in rural Mozambique is key to understanding the best approaches to reduce poverty through support to small-scale farmers.

7.3 Assessing CIDA-Supported Agriculture Development in Mozambique

CSOs are hopeful that PROAGRI will strengthen the Ministry of Agriculture's connections with the needs and interests of small-scale farmer producers. It is now widely recognized by donors and civil society observers that the first phase of PROAGRI focused almost exclusively on building the capacities of the Ministry. There was little evidence that these efforts had resulted in real change and economic improvements for small farmers (resulting in some donors such as USAID concentrating on projects in which the direct impact on rural households could be measured). CIDA, however, has continued to be a major investor in PROAGRI II.

PROAGRI II has strong potential to link interventions by the Ministry to the key priorities for small-scale farmers in Mozambique. It will target improved services in rural extension support, research and new technologies appropriate for small-scale producers, support market information systems, rehabilitate and build small rural and agricultural infrastructure, support agro-processing to add value to local production, and review legislation (such as land law and biotechnology) that protect the interests of small scale farmers. All these areas are very important for initiatives that affect livelihoods in rural communities.

CSOs note, however, that only donors can join the PROAGRI Working Group, which reviews, monitors and evaluates the program. Both government and donors would be more effective if they had mechanisms to connect directly with CSO representatives of small-scale farmer interests as well as CSOs with strong knowledge of the impact of government strategies at the community level.

Bibliography

Amedofu, Vera, 2006a. “Small Farmer Agricultural Development Priorities: Analysis of Civil Society Views [Ghana], a summary report prepared for Inter Pares.

Amedofu, Vera, 2006a. “Commentary on CIDA Supported Agricultural Development Activities in Ghana”, a summary report prepared for Inter Pares.

Berhanu, 2006a. *Agricultural Development Priorities in Ethiopia: Views of Local Civil Society and National Network Views*, a summary report presented to the Canadian Food Security Policy Group.

Berhanu, 2006b. “A Commentary on the CIDA-Supported Agricultural Development Activities in Ethiopia”, a summary report presented to the Canadian Food Security Policy Group.

Canadian Food Security Policy Group (FSPG), 2004, A Food Security Perspective on Canada’s International Trade and Development Assistance Policies -- A Discussion Paper for the Government of Canada’s International Policy Review”, accessible at http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/003_food_2004-10_fspg_ipr_recs.pdf.

Canadian Food Security Policy Group (FSPG), 2002, “Sustainable Rural Development: The Role of Agriculture in Canada’s International Assistance Program, A Response to CIDA’s Discussion Paper”, accessible at http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/002_trade_response_to_cida_agriculture_discussion.pdf.

CIDA, 2003a. *Promoting Sustainable Rural Development through Agriculture*, accessible at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/REN-2181377-PRU>.

CIDA, 2003b. *CIDA Food Security Support in Ghana: Moving towards full Ghanaian Leadership and Management, 1999/00 – 2009/10*. Discussion Document, Africa Branch.

CIDA, 2004a. *Ethiopia Country Development Program Framework, 2004-2009*. accessible at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/JUD-222103825-LCK#pdf>

CIDA, 2004b. “Program Framework: Canada and Mozambique in Partnership for Development Cooperation, 2004 – 2009”, accessible at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/JUD-22211732-LWS>.

Department for International Development (DFID), 2006. “DFID Ethiopia Country Assistance Plan, 2006-11”, Consultation Draft, accessible at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/cap-ethiopia-draft.pdf>.

Development Assistance Group (DAG), Ethiopia, 2005, “PRSP in Ethiopia”, published at <http://www.dagethiopia.org/PRSPProcessinEthiopia1.aspx>.

Development Assistance Committee (DAC), 2006. *Promoting Pro-Poor Growth Agriculture*. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, accessible at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/43/46/36427716.pdf#search=%22Promoting%20Pro-Poor%20Growth%20Agriculture%22>.

Desjardins, Rene, 2006. “Program Based Approach Mozambique”, CIDA Africa Branch Knowledge Fair, June 27th 2006, Powerpoint Presentation.

Diao, Xinshen and Gabre-Madhin, Eleni, 2005. *A Review of “Millennium Development Goals Based Need Assessment: The Rural Development and Food Security Sector” (prepared by MoARD 2005)*. International Food Policy Research Institute, for the Development Agencies Group (Ethiopia), accessible at http://www.dagethiopia.org/pdf/Review_of_MDG_NA_Rural_Development.pdf

Dittoh, Saa, 2006. *Civil Society Views on Small Farmer Agricultural Development Priorities in Ghana*. Final Research Report submitted to the Canadian Food Security Policy Group.

Government of Ethiopia, 2005. “Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (Draft)”. Chapter IV, 4.1.

Hanlon, Joseph, 2006. “PAPRA II: Key quotes and comments”, accessible at <http://www.open.ac.uk/technology/mozambique/pics/d61972.doc>.

Khor, M. 2006. *The Impact of Globalization and Liberalization on Agriculture and Small Farmers in Developing Countries: The Experience of Ghana*. (With the assistance of Tetteh Hormeku), Third World Network, accessible at http://www.twinside.org.sg/title2/par/Ghana_study_for_IFAD_project_FULL_PAPER_rev1apr06.doc.

Massingue, Jaqueline, 2006. “Agricultural Research Project: Views on Agricultural Development Priorities [Mozambique]”, a summary report presented to the Canadian Food Security Policy Group.

Oxfam International, 2006. *Causing Hunger: an overview of the food crisis in Africa*, accessible at http://www.oxfam.org/en/policy/briefingpapers/bp91_africa_food_crisis.

Partnership Forum (Ethiopia), 2005. “Proceedings of Partnership Forum on the Second Annual Progress Report of SDPRP”, Addis Adaba, February 2005, accessible at [http://www.dagethiopia.org/pdf/Proceedings_Second_APR_Forum_\(Feb_05\).pdf#search=%22Partnership%20Forum%2C%20Ethiopia%2C%202005%20proceedings%20%22Second%20Annual%20Progress%20Report%20of%20SDPRP%22%22](http://www.dagethiopia.org/pdf/Proceedings_Second_APR_Forum_(Feb_05).pdf#search=%22Partnership%20Forum%2C%20Ethiopia%2C%202005%20proceedings%20%22Second%20Annual%20Progress%20Report%20of%20SDPRP%22%22).

Poverty Action Network (PANE), 2005. “Response from the Poverty Action Network Ethiopia (PANE) and the Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA) to the Draft Plan to Accelerate Sustainable Development and End Poverty”, accessible at <http://www.pane.org.et/Advocacy.pdf>.

Republic of Mozambique, 2006. “Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty, 2006 – 2009 (PAPRA II)”, Maputo, accessible at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mozambique-parpaii.pdf>.

Reviere, Rodney, 2005. “ProAgri II: Building on achievements made and lessons learnt in Mozambique”. Ninth Africa Forum, September 2005, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, Accessible at <http://www.africaforum.info/documents/9AFAfricaForum2005abstractsenglish.pdf?PHPSESSID=f1a9ef820c38f63c8b835e2159755c0b>.

Rodenberg, Birte, 2003. “How a PRSP is Produced – the Case of Ghana”, Magazine for Development and Cooperation (Germany), 11, 2003.

Swiss Coalition of Development Organizations (SECO), 2003. “Civil Society’s Perspective on the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Process, Experience, Criticism and Suggestions”, Bern, Switzerland, accessible at http://www.alliancesud.ch/english/files/T_EgDyCa.pdf#search=%22Civil%20Society's%20Perspective%20on%20the%20Ghana%22.

Tomlinson, Brian, 2006. “The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Donor Commitments and Civil Society Critiques”, Canadian Council for International Cooperation Background Paper, accessible at http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/002_aid_2006-05_paris_declaration_backgrounder.pdf.

Waeterloos, Evert, 2005. "Mozambique's PRSP process: Explorations in participatory monitoring", Institute of Social Studies (The Hague), accessible at http://www.iss.nl/devissues/articles/mozambique_s_prsp_process_explorations_in_participatory_monitoring.

Appendix 1 - CIDA Agricultural Program in Ghana

Principal Focus	Intervention Name	Total Budget (CAD)	Start-End Dates
Sectoral	Sector Wide Approach with MoFA (FABS)	\$ 85,000,000	Mar 2004-Mar 2009
	Farmer-Based Organizations Fund (FBO)	\$ 1,700,000	Oct 2002-Mar 2008
	Food Security Advisory Services	\$ 3,000,000	Apr 2002-June 2007
	Measuring Impact in Food Security	\$ 1,100,000	Apr 2001-Sept 2009
	Land Administration Project (LAP)	\$ 1,500,000	Feb 2004-Dec 2009
	Ghana Environment Management Project (GEMP)	\$ 8,000,000	Sept 2006-Dec 2011
	Ghana Support to Food Security	\$ 500,000	Sept 2001-Dec 2006
	Hydrogeological Assessment	\$ 3,000,000	May 2004-Sept 2008
Regional level	Farmer Responsive Mechanisms for Extension and Research (FARMER)	\$ 10,000,000	June 2002-June 2007
	Food Security and Environmental Facility (FSEF)	\$ 15,000,000	Under reconsideration
	GRATIS III	\$ 5,000,000	Aug 2000-Dec 2008
	Developing Rural Entrepreneurs (NSAC)	\$ 2,180,000	Mar 2004-Jan 2009
District and Sub-District level	District-Wide Assistance Program (DWAP) ¹³	\$ 15,000,000	Mar 2004-Sept 2009
	District Capacity Building (DISCAP) ¹⁴	\$ 7,700,000	Nov 2000-Mar 2006
	Community-driven Initiatives in Food Security (CIFS), Comp 2	\$ 5,000,000	Apr 2004-Oct 2010
Total:		\$256,680,000	

¹³ These are largely governance initiatives which are aimed to address development issues in the rural districts of the northern regions, including food security.

Appendix 2 - CIDA Agricultural Program in Ethiopia

Intervention Name	Total Budget (CAD)	Start-End Dates
Disaster Mitigation Project	\$ 5,000,000	2002-2007
Therapeutic feeding in Ethiopia - UNICEF appeal	\$ 500,000	2005-2006
Ethiopia Strategy Support Program	\$ 500,000	2005-2009
Improving Productivity and Market Success	\$19,900,000	2004-2010
Water Harvesting and Institutional Strengthening in Amhara	\$16,900,000	2005-2011
Water Harvesting and Institutional Strengthening in Tigray	\$ 7,500,000	2002-2007
World Bank Food Security Project	\$19,500,000	2004-2010
Support to Ethiopia Productive Safety Net Program	100,000	2006-2008
Productive Safety Net Project (PSNP)	in development	
Multi-donor Fund for Civil Society	In development	
Total	\$69,900,000	

Appendix 3 - CIDA Agricultural Program in Mozambique

Summary - Current CIDA Food Security Program Interventions in Mozambique (Bilateral)

Intervention Name	Total Budget (CAD)	Start-End Dates
Coastal Rural Support Project	\$ 9,500,000	2004-2012
Input Trade Fairs	\$ 500,000	2005-2006
Sustainable Livelihoods and Agriculture Project	\$ 6,500,000	2005-2011
PROAGRI Common Fund	\$20,000,000	2004-2008
Sustainable and Effective Economic Development	\$ 8,000,000	2005 -2012
Total	\$44,500,000	