



PRO-POOR INVESTMENT IN AGRICULTURE?

A FIVE-COUNTRY ASSESSMENT OF FEED THE FUTURE

Summit on Global Food
Security and Health, George
Mason University

Emmanuel Tumusiime &
Marc J. Cohen

October 15, 2015



OXFAM
America

ORIGINS OF FEED THE FUTURE

- Food price spike of 2007-08
- G8 L'Aquila Food Security Initiative
- US pledge of \$3.5 billion in aid to agriculture

PROGRAM APPROACH

- Quantum break from traditional US ag assistance
 - Traditional emphasis on monetized in-kind food aid
- Ownership
 - Paris Principles of Aid Effectiveness (2005)
 - Country Investment and Implementation Plans
- Inclusivity
 - Inclusive Agriculture Sector Growth
 - Women's Empowerment
 - Broad partnerships and participation
- Sustainable results

OXFAM ASSESSMENT

- Examined FtF in five countries
 - Ethiopia
 - Ghana
 - Haiti
 - Senegal
 - Tanzania
- Qualitative research methods
 - Aimed at understanding process
 - 125 key informant interviews
 - 69 focus group interviews with male and female farmers
- Funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

DATA

Country *	Data collection period	Focus of intervention
Ethiopia	Sept 2013 – Jan 2014	Wheat, teff, livestock value chains
Ghana	June/July, September 2014	Rice & horticulture value chains
Haiti	March, June-July, 2013	Natural resource management; improved productivity of domestic food and export crops (rice, maize, beans, plantains, mangoes)
Senegal	April/May, July 2012	Climate change adaptation; natural resource management; productivity; access to markets
Tanzania	February/March, May-early July 2013	Rice, maize, horticulture crops

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK



OXFAM
America

OWNERSHIP

- Alignment with national agricultural plans
 - Use of country systems
 - Donor coordination
- Interactions and stakeholders involved
 - Stakeholder engagement in program design
 - Beneficiary engagement in implementation

INCLUSIVITY

- The food security model
- Beneficiaries
- Gender equity and women's empowerment

FINDINGS



OXFAM
America

USE OF COUNTRY SYSTEMS

- All study countries have medium-term agricultural development plans
- Ethiopia, Ghana, & Tanzania have donor coordination platforms for agriculture
- FtF heavily project oriented
 - Can undercut national strategic plans
 - Little direct budget support provided to local institutions or development agents

INTERACTIONS & STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

- Prior consultation pre-implementation
 - Mostly at national level
 - Mainly engaged government officials
 - Heavy emphasis on process
 - Very time consuming
 - Little engagement of local officials
 - No involvement of farmers and beneficiaries
- Farmer involvement only at implementation
 - Put choices from pre-cooked menu into place
 - Not seen as partners in strategic priority setting
 - Does not mean projects do not meet needs
 - Many low-income farmers welcome *any* support

FOOD SECURITY MODEL

- Increased production in high-potential areas
 - Ethiopia: little focus on pastoral or resource-poor areas
 - Haiti: Artibonite Valley (rice bowl)
- Areas with high numbers of poor and hungry people not targeted
- Ghana the exception
 - Focused on more marginal areas and poorer farmers
- Market-oriented approach
 - Targets potential commercial farmers
 - “See agriculture as a business, not a social activity”
- Key goal: reduce consumer prices

BENEFICIARIES

- All farmers in project villages invited to participate
- No minimum land holding or level of education
 - In Haiti, “master farmer” candidates must be literate
- Participation via groups
 - New or existing farmer associations
 - New or existing cooperatives
- Training in marketable skills
 - Tractor operators
 - Veterinary technicians
- Lack of access to credit major constraint on participation
 - Poorer farmers cannot afford purchased inputs

PRODUCTIVITY GAINS

- Increased productivity in all study countries
- Mix of high-external input & agroecological approaches
 - Conservation farming
 - Agroforestry
 - Systems of Crop Intensification
- High-input the default
- Questions of sustainability
 - Do gains continue in the absence of FtF resources?
 - Does high-external input agriculture contribute to already substantial natural resource degradation?

EMPOWERING WOMEN?

- Significant number of women beneficiaries in all study countries
- Women have less access to land & credit than men
- Haiti: most training resources (73%) to men
- FtF did not reduce women's workloads
- USAID-supported tools on women's empowerment do not appear to drive program
 - Gender research
 - WEAI
 - Contrast with Bangladesh

CONCLUSIONS

- Ownership
 - FtF generally well-aligned with national plans
 - Limited stakeholder participation in program design
 - Northern NGOs or consulting firms generally lead implementation
 - Projectized approach does not build institutional capacity
- Inclusivity
 - Focus on sustainable intensification in high potential areas tends to be exclusionary
 - Main food-security pathway is indirect

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Broaden stakeholder engagement in all phases of program, including design, implementation, & evaluation
 - Can enhance sustainability of results
 - Treat farmer groups as active citizens, not just program implementers
- Greater focus on less-favored areas and more marginalized farmers for direct impact on poverty and hunger
- Improve access to credit to increase inclusivity
- Better integrate gender empowerment tools like WEAI into programming
- Provide direct budget support to local institutions