

Improving Access to Resources, Services and Markets

**Agricultural Programmes
as a Comprehensive Approach
to Rural Poverty Reduction?**



Synopsis of Findings

Désirée Dietvorst
dd@salamandernet.de



MAHRH
Ministère de l'Agriculture
de l'Hydraulique et des
Ressources Halieutiques



Executive summary

The 9th Africa Forum on Programme-Based Approaches organised by the Sector Network Rural Development in Africa (SNRD) was held from 19 to 23 September 2005 in Burkina Faso. The SNRD has promoted the regional debate on Sector Programmes and (more recently) Programme-Based Approaches in rural and agricultural development since 1997. The 2005 Africa Forum was hosted by the Ministry of Agriculture in Burkina Faso and supported by GTZ, BMZ, InWent, DEZA, CTA, European Delegation and IFAD.

The fact that the majority of the poor live in rural areas as well as the fact that GDP is closely linked to growth in agriculture (so clearly illustrated by presentations from Burkina Faso and Kenya) makes that ***the agricultural sector is (re)gaining importance***: not only in national policy making, but also in international development thinking, as was testified by the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development. However, although the highest political levels increasingly state that the Millennium Development Goals will not be met unless rural poverty is reduced; actual funding to the sector is in sharp decline. So, as a rural development community, we seem to be in something of a dilemma. The importance of our sector is acknowledged, but at the same time, public funds towards its development are being reduced.

What does this mean? It seems as though there may be a missing link: The relation between growth in agriculture and growth in GDP is obvious. But what we need to establish more clearly is ***the link between investment in agriculture and growth in agriculture***. Unless we can prove that it pays to invest in agricultural growth, we will not reverse the downward trend of public fund flow to this sector.

Several presentations during the forum showed that proving this link may be tricky

indeed. Mozambique, Burkina Faso and South Africa offered examples of where considerable public investment had not been translated into an impact on the ground, either in terms of food security or reduced rural poverty. Thus, the call for a demonstration of impact grew ever louder as the forum went on: In the words of one participant: "We keep talking about what we have done and what we still plan to do, but where does it all lead to? What have we achieved?"

Thus, the clear message is that we have to pay ***more attention to measuring impact***. A situation as was presented for Mozambique, where a next programme phase is planned with a budget of US\$280 million but without an adequate monitoring system, is clearly in need of repair. However, in assessing impact, we have to be clear on what exactly should be measured. As long as the effect of agricultural programmes is summarised predominantly in terms of food security or rural poverty, it is difficult to shake off the image of a sector in which investment doesn't pay. Measuring impact has to be ***based on programme objectives***: If a programme is about building capacity and developing institutions, then monitoring indicators have to reflect that. A good example was offered by Kenya where investment in agriculture is presently being controlled by over 100 pieces of legislation. To make the environment for (private) investment more attractive, the Ministry of Agriculture intends to transform this plethora of fragmented legal pieces into an umbrella legislation based on between three to five main laws. So, if this is a programme objective, then it also has to become a monitoring indicator: And when we measure not only food security, but also issues like ownership, use of local procedures or institutional change, then the programmes in Mozambique and Burkina Faso have a lot of positive to report as well. Donor

coordination and their use of local procedures is far advanced in Mozambique. Likewise, institutional and political environments in Burkina Faso benefited from the earlier phases to the present rural development programme.

Under **access to resources**, the forum looked at land, labour and capital. Improving **access to land** often requires land reform initiatives and these tend to be highly political. This is the case for agriculturalists versus pastoralists (West Africa) but also for white commercial versus black landless farmers (Namibia). The fact that land is so political makes some of the principles of the Programme Based Approach (PBA) even more relevant. Any support measure in land, has to ensure that it takes serious note of issues like leadership by the host country and efforts to increase the use of local procedures over time.

With respect to labour, the forum focussed on **mitigating the loss of labour** as a consequence of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Encouraging results with mainstreaming a response across sectors were reported. In Zambia, multi-sector teams are highly effective at grassroots level, but their acknowledgement at higher levels remains a challenge. In South Africa, a workshop of provincial departments managed to trigger and consolidate a multi-sector response at a higher level.

Improving **access to capital** among smallholder farmers is as crucial as it is complicated. Nevertheless, Uganda and Burkina Faso showed that with the right government support such schemes can really mobilise local rural economies. An innovative approach is necessary and the success of initiatives such as Financial Extension Workers or insurance schemes for agricultural loans should be closely watched. As these initiatives have great potential to generate local economic growth, the question is: Should we aim for them to become financially sustainable at all? Or is ensuring access to rural finance part of government's responsibility towards

disadvantaged or isolated areas and resource poor farmers?

The session on **access to inputs and services** very much followed up on the findings of the last (8th) Africa Forum in Nairobi, 2004. Time and again, the importance of clarity on public and private sector roles is emphasised. To date, this division of public and private roles may well be the biggest bone of contention in agricultural programmes and it may have been one of the reasons why donors have turned away from this sector, to the more clearly public sectors of health and education. So, in our own interest and that of the farmers, the issue of **public and private roles** has to be taken by the horns because: Unless there is a clear definition of roles, consolidated in a policy that is (allowed to be) implemented, service provision in agriculture will suffer, agricultural programmes will fail to deliver expected results and public funding to the sector continues to be under threat (and quite justifiably so).

The forum discussions highlighted two more main challenges under service provision in agriculture: That of alignment and that of farmer organisation. Experiences towards a better **alignment and coordination** were illustrated by three examples: The first one was at the policy level between agricultural sub-sector and between the government and donors (Tanzania); A second looked at the level of the service providers between agriculture and local government (Malawi) and, finally, a third presentation at the level of the farmers themselves through participatory extension (South Africa). Interestingly, all three presentations showed that whatever the entry point for alignment and coordination, important is that policy and implementation levels ultimately connect. The huge investment undertaken in Tanzania to align policies and programmes will have been worth the effort when it translates in a more coordinated service provision on the ground. The case of

South Africa illustrated the potential role of projects in a PBA context: By successfully connecting implementation to policy, a project-piloted approach has now been institutionalised within the work-plan and budget framework of the province as a whole.

The degree to which farmers and producers are organised is a strong determinant of the success of service provision. Three case studies looked at the role of **farmer-based organisations** (FBOs) in improving access to inputs and services. Support to these FBOs was at a different entry level for each of these. In Zambia, FBOs are supported in the context of the PRSP. This allows for some cross-sector action and we heard of how an improved access to land under one scheme was linked to an improved access to services under another (parallel) scheme. In Ghana, support comes from within the Agriculture Sector Programme, which has a component devoted entirely to the development of FBOs. Though it is difficult to establish sustainable FBOs in such a top-down manner, individual FBOs have registered significant successes already. An example of a truly grassroots based and bottom-up evolved FBO came from Burkina Faso. Starting small, this union has grown from strength to strength and is a clear example of how farmers stand to benefit by organising not only their supply of produce but also their demand for inputs and services.

Finally, there is no better incentive than **access to markets**. A good connection to a profitable market will motivate farmers to get organised and make optimum use resources and services. Yet, even where farmers are organised, they may still need a little help to bridge the gap to the urban markets. In West Africa, encouraging experiences are made with **private local enterprises as intermediaries** between farmer groups and local urban markets. Using this model, confidence between producers and consumers was increased so much as to stimulate market-

demand for certain products even to a point where export becomes a possibility for the smallholders involved. Sometimes, domestic markets are protected against imports, to allow local producers get a foothold. However, as the Senegal case showed, **domestic market protection** becomes a relevant strategy only after certain structural obstacles in the domestic market have been solved and local producers have been enabled to actually meet the available demand in their country.

At a grassroots level, where people are poverty stricken, food relief is often the operation of choice, but quite frequently with negative repercussions on (an already) fragile local economy. Experience from Zambia showed that a possible alternative to this scenario is that of 'cash-transfer' instead of food handouts as this serves the dual aim of averting starvation and boosting the local economy at the same time.

With respect to **global markets**, smallholders are under increasing threat from what can be called an avalanche of EU regulations, many of which are costly or complicated to meet. The extent to which these regulations can (or even should be) contested is limited. Some are consumer driven (e.g. related to food safety, the environment or ethical standards) and not negotiable. Other regulations are in the interest of the producers themselves (e.g. living wages) and even if these are difficult to meet, it is better to keep them than to fight such regulations. Still, what can be done is to bring down **the cost of meeting market regulations**. Examples towards that end came from Kenya and included the accreditation of Kenyan certifying agents and the negotiation of a grace period for compliance.

Fortunately, the global market not only poses challenges; it offers chances too. One of these is the 'Fair Trade' an initiative whereby a social premium is offered where certain conditions towards equitable opportunities for market access amongst marginalised producers are

met. **The Fair Trade initiative** started small (and somewhat amateurishly) but has now grown into a competitive and mainstream retail market, offering distinct opportunities for small-scale farmers in Africa.

In conclusion, this 9th Africa Forum discussed the concept of the Programme-Based Approach from the perspective of the farmers and their farming systems. By looking at the entire production process (from resources, via inputs & services, through to the sale of produce) we attempted to highlight what agricultural programmes need to take into account, at what stage of the production process. This approach was undoubtedly ambitious; too ambitious maybe. Nevertheless, it did clarify some of the **particular challenges of the agriculture and rural sectors**. By the end of the forum, participants agreed that the Ministry of Agriculture and public investment are only part of the puzzle towards rural growth. Therefore, a single, sector wide Agricultural Programme in the classic sense, with a focus on the government and on public expenditure and generally limited to the action radius of the Ministry of Agriculture, may not be the best support modality. Instead, for equitable rural growth to happen there is need for **a complement of activities, focussing on different actors**, public and private ones.

Naturally, this does not mean a return to the fragmented support of a wide range of projects. For activities to be actually complementary, they have to be coordinated within a coherent policy framework. For government to become the true owner of the process and to assume leadership in the development of the country it serves, it needs transparent information on different support measures: A single programme and budget framework would be a valuable tool to help government allocate resources according to its policy priorities.

This policy framework would have to be clear on what public roles are and what private roles are and the government needs to actively contribute towards a political, legislative and institutional environment that allows and enables these different actors take on these roles.

What we are looking for may be a coherent set of complementary Programme Based Approaches: in support of a nationally owned development strategy; addressing multi-sectoral concerns; with implementation by local actors and organisations; using (and strengthening) local structures and procedures; and balancing support to state and non-state actors.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACF	Agriculture Consultative Forum (Zambia)
AgSSIP	Agriculture Services Support Programme (Ghana)
ASCU	Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit (Kenya)
ASDP	Agriculture Sector Development Programme (Tanzania)
ASSP	Agriculture Services Support Programme (Tanzania)
CET	Common Exchange Tariff
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIDR	Centre Internationale de Developpement et Recherche
CTA	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
DASCU	District Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit (Kenya)
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ERS	Economic Recovery Strategy
ESOP	Entreprises de Services et Organisation de Producteurs
EU	European Union
EUROGAP	European Retailers Code of Good Agricultural Practices
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FBD	Farm Block Development
FBO	Farmer Based Organisation
FCFA	Franc de la Communauté Financière Africaine
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDPRD	Global Donor Platform for Rural Development
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
InWent	Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung gGmbH
LDC	Least Developed Country
MASIP	Malawi Agriculture Sector Investment Programme
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFI	Micro Finance Institute
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OSP	Outgrower Support Programme
PASA	Programme d'Ajustement du Secteur Agricole (Burkina Faso)
PBA	Programme Based Approach
PEA	Participatory Extension Approach
PMA	Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (Uganda)
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSO	Plan Stratégique Opérationnel (Burkina Faso)

PTT	Permanent Technical Team (Namibia)
Q&A	Question and Answer
SDR	Stratégie Développement Rural (Burkina Faso)
SIP	Sector Investment Programme
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SNRD	Sector Network Rural Development
SP	Sector Programme
SP	Special Products (trade agreement)
SPA	Strategic Partnership with Africa
SRA	Strategy for Revitalising Agriculture
SSM	Special agricultural Safeguard Mechanism
SSWG	Sector Support Working Group
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
UEMOA	West African Economic and Monetary Union
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Table of contents

Background	4
Day One: Setting the Scene	
Opening of the 9 th Africa Forum	3
Agriculture and the Programme-Based Approach.....	5
Agriculture Sector Programmes	7
Policies and Platforms.....	10
Day Two: Improving Access to Resources	
Access to Land.....	12
Access to Labour.....	13
Access to Capital.....	15
Day Three: Improving Access to Inputs and Services	
Access to services in the context of Programme-Based Approaches.....	17
Coordination and Alignment of Service Provision	19
Farmer Based Organisations	21
Day Four: Improving Access to Markets	
Access to Domestic Markets	23
Access to International Markets	25
Open Space	27
Day Five: Wrapping Up	
Summary of Forum Findings	28
Annex 1 Overview Africa Forum 1997 - 2004	29
Annex 2 Programme of the 9 th Africa Forum, Ouagadougou, 2005	30
Annex 3 Descriptions of Fieldtrips.....	35
Annex 4 List of participants	37
Annex 5 Evaluation	46

Background

Since their inception in the mid-90s, Agricultural Sector (Investment) Programmes have been concerned with market liberalisation, a re-division of public and private roles and, often, extensive institutional reform. Whilst this may have improved the legal and administrative environment for reform, these efforts have not yet resulted in significant poverty relief: Rural poverty still is severe, especially in disadvantaged regions where producers were unable to profit from free markets or from a privatisation of services.

Multi-sectoral Poverty Reduction Strategies were introduced in the late 90s and have since become a main policy framework towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals. In many countries, however PRSPs struggle with their “rural growth” component with no more than vague strategies on how (the much needed) rural growth is to be generated. Thus, sector wide agricultural programmes continue to have an important role to play as one of the ‘implementation-pillars’ for national PRSPs.

However, their shortcomings in fulfilling this role have become evident during the past decade. A focus on government and the national level is often quoted as one reason for their limited impact: Often, barriers to rural growth are not addressed under the agricultural programme as they fall outside the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. On the other hand, rural development programmes struggle with the difficulty of coordinating the required multi-sector activities. Therefore, this Africa Forum centred on the question: *Can agricultural programmes improve access to resources, services and markets in a way that stimulates rural and pro-poor growth?*

This is already the 9th forum organised by the Sector Network Rural Development of GTZ. Africa Forums are organised by SNRD’s Working Group on Sector Reform and Rural Development (see also www.gtz.de/snrd).

Previous African Forums were held in Lusaka (twice), Lilongwe, Harare (twice), Accra, Nairobi and Pretoria (see overview in annex 1). Over the years, these forums have brought together more than 700 people from over 20 African countries. Each of these forum deals with a particular theme in the context of programme-based approaches that was identified by participants as being of particular concern. This continuity in the discussion, as well as the growing group of ‘core-participants’ has turned these forums into a true regional debate.

Over the years, the structure of the forum has evolved: The first day is used to ‘set the scene’ with an introduction of concepts and a stock-taking of experiences. The last day of the forum is set aside to reflect on its findings, but also to look ahead towards the next forum and allow participants to propose a theme (see the forum programme in annex 2).

Traditionally, one afternoon is spent in the field. In recent years, the importance of these field trips has become increasingly evident. Though they always were a programme highlight, this year’s field trips must have been the best ever. The organising team in Burkina Faso has certainly set the standard very high for subsequent events (see annex 3).

The forum was financed by German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), InWent (a German development cooperation initiative for capacity building), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), CTA Netherlands, the Swiss Cooperation and the European Union.

For the first time in the African Forum series, the forum was held in francophone Africa. This year, 141 participants from 22 countries attended the forum. A detailed participants list is attached as annex 4. The table below offers a breakdown by country.

Participants by country

Benin	2	Senegal	1
Burkina Faso	69	South Africa	5
Cameroon	3	Tanzania	1
Ethiopia	1	Uganda	2
Ghana	11	Zambia	4
Ivory Coast	1	Sub-total Africa	125
Kenya	10		
Malawi	1	Belgium	1
Mali	3	Canada	1
Mauritania	1	Germany	14
Mozambique	1	Sub-total non-Africa	16
Namibia	5		
Niger	2		
Nigeria	1	Total participants	141

On the last day of the forum, participants received a CD-Rom containing all the forum presentations, abstracts and background papers, as well as a host of other material on programme-based approaches including the proceedings of all previous Africa Forums. Additional CD-ROMs can be ordered from psda@gtzpsda.co.ke

This Synopsis of Findings has been kept brief and provides an overview rather than an in-depth discussion of individual presentations. Main findings are discussed by session and along key questions that formed the basis of the presentations.

Presently, a website is under construction that compiles all the information collected during the Africa Forum series 1997 to present. Once

this *Africa Platform for Rural Development* website is completed, it will offer access not only to all the forum proceedings, individual presentations, abstracts and papers, but also to useful background information such as Agricultural Sector Programmes, relevant studies and management tools.

As soon as the website is accessible, all participants will be informed. This report can then be downloaded from the website, complete with hyperlinks to all presentations, abstracts and background documents mentioned.

Opening of the 9th Africa Forum

Participants were welcomed to the forum by **Peter Conze**, Director General of the Africa Department of GTZ. In his address, he presented a background to the Africa Forum series. He emphasized that the Africa Forum developed out of a concern that insufficient information was available to decision makers in Africa with respect to the (then) Sector Investment Programmes in Agriculture. To help donors and government representatives understand the concept, a first international workshop was held in 1997 in Lusaka, Zambia. Although it started as an ad-hoc initiative, the forum soon evolved into an annual event to keep policy makers and implementers abreast of the latest thinking on programme-based approaches in the agriculture and rural development.

With much of the policy discussion on new aid instruments (still) taking place at international donor meetings, the Africa Forum offers a platform of learning for managers of such instruments in Africa. The information discussed at forums helps participants in programme design and implementation. And the creation of awareness on the concept of Programme-based Approaches hopes to make them more equal partners in PBA negotiating processes, at national or international level.

Africa Forums are hosted by the partner country, usually the Ministry of Agriculture whilst the organisation and financing is a joint effort by GTZ (on behalf of BMZ) and others that have included the World Bank, IFAD, FAO and several bilateral donors.

What sets these forums apart from other (more donor dominated) events is that they are not only *for* but also *by* African managers and implementers of PBAs. Most of the papers and

studies presented are by national resource persons and offer detailed implementation experience. The aim is to provide a platform where countries can learn from each other's mistakes and successes; where Francophone and Anglophone colleagues can compare experiences; where planners from one Ministry of Agriculture can learn from their counterparts in another country. Underpinning this formula is the realisation that whereas donors have many occasions to compare notes across countries, opportunities for developing partners to do the same are very limited.

Mr Conze thanked the co-financers, InWent, IFAD, CTA, Swiss Development Cooperation and the EU; he praised the organising team in Burkina Faso on a job well done and wished all delegates an exciting and successful week with lots of new insights.

The German Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development was represented by **Christoph Kohlmeyer**. He began his speech by extending best wishes of Mrs. Wiezorek-Zeul, the German Minister of Economic Co-operation and Development; Thomas Albert, Director of Africa Division and Hans Schipulle, the Director of Sector Policies. He thanked the organizers and financial contributors and most of all the Government of Burkina Faso, for accepting the responsibility of hosting this event.

Mr Kohlmeyer pointed out that the two questions at the centre of the forum are extraordinarily relevant at the moment, namely "how to promote agricultural production as the driving force for growth, especially for African economies?" while addressing "how to improve the effectiveness of development initiatives in this sector?" These questions are especially

important as we are faced with a situation where more than three-quarters of the poorest in Africa live in rural areas, while at the same time public investments rates in this sector are steadily decreasing, a trend followed by the fund donors.

This trend is observed even outside our rural development community. More and more declarations from the highest political level express concern about the future of African agriculture. But these declarations are not strong enough. Action is needed, which is shown in investment figures, national budgets as well as in concrete and visible commitment to integrate agricultural development strategies in poverty reduction programmes. A favourable environment is needed, to ensure that investments together with agricultural knowledge are translated into growth for small agricultural businesses.

Mr Kohlmeyer ended by saying that we set ourselves ambitious targets to tackle and he assured the participants that the results of the forum would receive utmost attention and consideration.

His Excellency **Salif Diallo**, Minister of State in charge of Agriculture, Hydraulics and Fisheries presented the official opening speech of the forum. He told delegates that his country is honoured to be the first francophone country to have hosted an African Forum. The aim of the forum is shared by senior authorities in Burkina, namely to support national decision makers play an increasingly significant role in initiatives undertaken in our countries in partnership with the international development community.

The Minister of State reminded us of the Millennium Development Goals, aiming to half hunger and poverty in the world by the year 2015. He pointed at the crucial role of agriculture in meeting this objective with an account of the situation in Burkina Faso.

Like most of the countries in the sub region, Burkina Faso's economy depends on agriculture and livestock. The country's rural sector accounts for nearly 40% of GDP; more than 70% of total exports; and provides jobs to 85% of the country's population. After a decade of structural and sector-based reforms, some notable achievements were made thanks to the efforts by the Government and the courage of the hard-working rural populations. According to a World Bank study of July 2004, Burkina Faso experienced a substantial reduction in poverty, which is most significant in rural areas where the incidence decreased from 61% in 1998 to 52% in 2003.

Over the same period, GDP has grown by about 5.5%, predominantly through agricultural growth, accounting for an average of 10.5% per year, despite unfavourable climatic conditions. With respect to food security, Burkina Faso has even grown from a situation of structural deficit to one of surplus. The agricultural season of 2004/2005 recorded 400,000 tons, despite poor rainfall and locust invasion.

To reinforce the achievements and to further foster conditions for sustainable development in the agricultural sector, the Government of Burkina Faso adopted in 2003, a new nationwide rural development strategy as the foundation of a sustainable development of the sector.

The Minister of State thanked the Sector Network Rural Development of GTZ for having initiated and sustained the Africa Forum initiative since 1997. He expressed his appreciation to all the financial and technical partners; to the organisers; the interpreters; and the press, for their contribution to make this meeting successful. He ended by welcoming participants from across the continent and looked forward to a successful South-South dialogue among African countries.

Agriculture and the Programme-Based Approach

What is the status of agriculture in the Millennium Development Goals? How is the agricultural sector supported? What are Programme-Based Approaches? What are the specific challenges of agricultural programmes?

The forum began by looking at the role of agriculture in the Millennium Development Goals. Of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), eradicating extreme hunger and poverty (MDG 1) depends on agriculture the most¹. In 2001, about 1.1 billion people or 21% of the world's population lived on less than a dollar a day. About 880 million people or 17% are identified as undernourished. In much of Sub-Saharan Africa, the poor are mainly rural and it is here that agricultural development can have the greatest impact on inclusive growth and poverty reduction.

In line with this, **Christoph Kohlmeyer**, in his presentation on **the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development** (or GDPRD) said that there is a growing recognition that the Millennium Development Goals will not be met unless rural poverty is reduced. However, he warned that the consensus on strategies towards rural poverty reduction is fragile. Currently, differences in rural development policies coupled to an ineffective 'learning from experiences' leads to a duplication of efforts and a replication of mistakes.

The ultimate objective of the GDPRD is to reduce poverty and enhance economic growth in rural areas through improved donor cooperation and coordinated dialogue with partner countries. It currently counts 24 members; the Secretariat is hosted by BMZ in

Bonn. The GDPRD serves as a learning network between countries as well as between donors. Information on ongoing activities and available documentation can be accessed under www.rdxl.org.

Presently, the GDPRD is in the process of compiling and comparing the rural development strategies of its 24 members. Kohlmeyer explained that the initial intention to synchronise these strategies has appeared virtually impossible, as they are so widely diverse. One reason for this is that 'Rural Development' is not a sector, but a concept. It has to do with agricultural policy frameworks, but goes beyond the confines of the public sector and doesn't even stop at the border. Nevertheless, international standards with regard to rural development do exist but Kohlmeyer emphasised that controversies, such as the role of supermarkets or the use of genetically modified material, will remain.

The form of aid to the agricultural sector in recent years was discussed by **Désirée Dietvorst** in her presentation on **Supporting Agriculture: the Programme Based Approach**. The early 90s saw the introduction of the Sector Investment Programme (or SIP), followed by the Sector Wide Approach (SWAP) some five years later. Whereas the SIP was a fairly strictly defined form of investment lending, the SWAP emphasised the process of government-to-donor partnership ultimately aiming for the use of local government procedures by donors.

The Programme-Based Approach (PBA) is a concept that was introduced only around 2001 following the introduction of Poverty Reduction Strategies. It covers both SWAP and 'SWAP-like' interventions such as Poverty Reduction

¹ The eight MDGs are: 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, 2. Achieve universal primary education, 3. Promote gender equality and empower women, 4. Reduce child mortality, 5. Improve maternal health, 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases, 7. Ensure environmental sustainability, 8. Develop a global partnership for development.

Strategies; programmes at sub-sector or sub-national levels but also programmes in support of non-state actors or organisations. The need for local ownership continues to be a pillar of PBAs, but rather than asking for 'ownership by government' the PBA focuses on 'ownership by the host country or organisation'. This means that, not only can the PBA be cross-sector or sub-sector in scope, it also allows for support to non-state actors².

This flexibility of the PBA concept, vis-à-vis that of the SIP/SWAP, lends itself well to the agriculture and rural development sectors. The engine of rural growth is the private sector which means that (often) policies on exchange and interest rates, trade regulations, norms & standards, taxes & levies are more important to agricultural producers than direct investment by the ministry. In addition, much of what is needed may be outside the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture, e.g. taxes and levies may fall under Local Government, roads under Transport, even land and water often fall under other ministries.

That programme-based support (in the form of a SWAP or PBA) should not be confused with budget support per se was illustrated by a series of graphs based on the *Sector Programme Tracking Report 2004* by the Strategic Partnership with Africa. In general a mix is used of budget support, common basket (or pool) funds and specific procedures in the form of a project (or non-pooled) funds.

It is important to note that budget support is not necessarily limited to well-functioning systems. In fact, one of the aims of budget support is to understand and strengthen local

² The definition of a PBA is 'a way of engaging in development cooperation based on coordinated support for a locally owned programme of development, with four main principles: (i) leadership by the host country or organisation; (ii) a single programme and budget framework; (iii) donor coordination & harmonisation of procedures and (iv) increased use of local procedures over time (see Lavergne and Alba, 2003, *CIDA Primer on PBAs*)

systems. Dietvorst compared the local structure to a system of pipes (with ourselves as plumbers) and said that when we want to find out where leaks and blockages are, it is necessary to pump water through the system. However, where the system is leak, a continued pumping of water at high pressure may make existing leaks bigger and ultimately lead to a bursting of the pipes.

Realising this means two things: (i) budget support should not be abused as a 'quick disbursement' mechanism, even where donors are under spending pressure and (ii) in countries where systems are weak, budget support should not be the only funding modality but be complemented by other modalities and a targeted effort to strengthen 'the pipes'.

Between 2002 and 2006, fund flow to agricultural programmes in Africa has gone down, while that to health, education, water and environment has gone up³. This may be related to the fact that social sectors receive a lot of importance in PRSPs and MDGs; but it may also be related to the specific challenges of the agricultural sector itself. A classical sector programme with a public expenditure focus and corresponding to the area of budget responsibility of a single ministry may be not as effective in agriculture. Dietvorst hypothesised that, at some point, the aid-instrument may have become more important than the sector: With donors wanting to support a SWAP turning away from agriculture to health and education where the challenges were not quite so daunting.

³ This trend is based on figures of the SP Tracking Exercise 2004 by SPA. However, it should be noted that these figures only include those agricultural programmes that meet the SPA criteria of a Sector Programme, e.g. having a single sector policy and a medium term budget framework.

Agriculture Sector Programmes

What is the status of current Agriculture Sector Programmes in Africa? Are they at risk of being written off as failed instruments or can they help rescue the PRSPs "rural growth" component?

In preparation for this 9th Africa Forum a comparative study was started by GTZ that aims to capture not only classical Agriculture Sector Programmes, but PBAs in agriculture and rural development more generally. An overview of initial findings was presented by **Samuel Asuming-Brempong** in cooperation with **Helmut Albert** in the presentation **PBAs in Agriculture and Rural Development: Synthesis of Findings from across Africa**.

For this study, policy documents, programmes or strategies in agriculture and rural development were collected from 12 countries; Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. For each country, a one page Country Fact Sheet was prepared presenting an overview of the policy, programme or strategy in question. The individual documents were then screened against two sets of questions: The first set of questions related to the four principles of a PBA, i.e. (i) leadership by the host country; (ii) single programme and budget framework; (iii) coordination and harmonisation and (iv) use of local procedures. The second set of questions related to the topics discussed in the present forum, i.e. (a) access to resources (b) access to services and (c) access to markets.

With respect to the first set of questions, the presentation concluded that although all PBAs are locally owned, there appears to be a lack of high level political commitment, as seems to be the case in Malawi, Tanzania and South Africa. Encouragingly, sector objectives seem coherent with a clear link to PRSPs. Only few documents give any information on donors' funds and to what extent donors use local structures and procedures. The role of

technical assistance is still considered important, in an advisory capacity during the planning and in a facilitating role during the implementation phase.

Interesting findings in regard to the second set of questions were that, although access to resources is generally addressed; many policies and programmes have insufficiently mainstreamed coping strategies in response to HIV/AIDS. Access to services is often a central issue and the role of the private sector and privatisation is discussed in this context. Somewhat worrying is that there hardly seems to be a mention of the specific challenges of disadvantaged areas. And this, after a decade of agricultural programmes in Africa has shown that when government withdraws from service provision, the private sector often does not manage to fill the 'service-gap' in remote and not commercially viable areas and food security in these areas is threatened.

Agricultural Sector Programmes from three countries were presented during the overview session on the first day. The presentation on **Agriculture Sector Programme in Burkina Faso: Processes and Perspectives** by **Salif Guigma** opened the series and gave an overview of the different stages and lessons learnt.

Between 1992 and 1997, Burkina Faso implemented the Agriculture Sector Adjustment Programme (or PASA: *Programme d'Ajustement du Secteur Agricole*). Under this programme widespread institutional reform was accomplished including a refocusing of the government on core functions coupled to a privatisation of parastatals and a liberalisation of the wider market. However, only limited impact was achieved on the ground either in

terms of rural growth or poverty reduction. In that sense, the PASA was more 'process' than 'result' oriented.

Nevertheless, the PASA did contribute to the institutional foundation of its successor, the Strategic Operational Plan (or PSO: *Plan Stratégique Opérationnel*) from 1997 to 2000. The PSO offered a framework for action with five sub-programmes (including soil fertility and the modernisation of agriculture) each of which are broken down into specific activities in relation to Burkina Faso's main agricultural commodities such as cotton; rice; maize-sorghum-millet; and fruit & vegetables.

The PSO managed to build a consensus among main actors on what needs to be done in the agricultural sector and helped clarify the role of the private sector as well as the core functions and tasks of government. However, coordination between actors and the harmonisation of activities continued to be a major challenge. This was aggravated by the fact that only three out of 15 action plans received their full funding commitments.

Presently, Burkina Faso has developed a Rural Development Strategy (or SDR: *Stratégie Développement Rural*) which is the rural development component of the national poverty reduction strategy and which builds on the lessons from PASA and PSO. Of particular importance are (i) comprehensiveness, whereby the SDR includes also fisheries and forestry (ii) coordination between actor and activities and (iii) a consensus reached on the objectives, the principles and the orientation of the SDR. Guigma said that after years of learning, a consensus was now firmly established and the political commitment to moving towards a true sector wide approach raises hopes for the SDR.

The second country case came from Mozambique and was presented by **Rodney Reviere** in **ProAgri: Mozambique's Agriculture Sector Support Programme**.

The first stage of the programme, or ProAgri-I, was one of the earliest agricultural programmes in Africa. It started small, in 1999, with only two donors (USAID and EC) and a relatively narrow focus on strengthening capacity within the Ministry of Agriculture. During the five years of its implementation, it grew to include 16 donors and channelled over \$200 million into the agriculture sector in Mozambique. Whilst ProAgri I managed to harmonise the support of numerous donors around basic principles and achieved a streamlining of many of the operations of the ministry, its impact on the rural economy and the rural poor has been minimal

At present, the second 5-year stage, ProAgri-II, is being prepared with six key areas for action: (i) markets (ii) rural finance (iii) rural infrastructure including roads (iv) technology (v) natural resource management and (vi) enabling business environment. ProAgri-II has a budget of over \$280 million.

Reviere then presented a "mini-SWOT" analysis of ProAgri-II, looking at its main **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats**. Some of the strengths of ProAgri-II are that it enjoys a high recognition in general and a high level of ownership and commitment within the Ministry of Agriculture. Despite the many donors involved, common principles between government and donors have been adopted and the use of government procedures by donors is far advanced.

Interestingly, Reviere listed the high level of funding as both a strength and a weakness. The high level of funding is a potential weakness as it makes prioritizing less necessary and leads to waste. Other weaknesses of ProAgri II are that it is highly centralized with the majority of funds disbursed at national level and within the ministry itself. As of yet, the impact in rural areas continues to be limited and although an effective monitoring system is sorely needed, this has not yet been put in place.

This inadequate monitoring of the programme has led to some donor dissatisfaction taking into account the lack of overall impact after five years and \$200 million under ProAgri I. These factors can turn into threats to the current programme and Reviere suggested that a response to these threats should include a revised dialogue structure between donors and the Ministry of Agriculture; a gradual shift by donors away from the ministry's core functions to strategic activities and investments (with core functions to be financed from the general budget) as well as a further working on an improved monitoring system (financial and impact) for the programme as a whole.

Experiences from Kenya were presented by **James Ongwae** in the **Strategy for Revitalising Agriculture: the Kenyan way towards a Sector Wide Approach**.

Trends in agricultural and economic growth in Kenya since the mid-sixties show a decline of both GDP as well agricultural gross domestic product. From a high Agric-GDP of 5% in the second half of the 70s, the trend has gone down to 2% in the late 90s. The trend in national GDP follows that of agriculture as national GDP in Kenya is heavily dependent on agriculture growth.

To reverse this trend, the Government of Kenya launched the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) in March 2003 which emphasizes the productive sectors of Agriculture, Tourism, Trade and Industry. Interventions foreseen in these sectors should help create an enabling environment for investment and growth. For agriculture this means among others that the accumulation of over a 130 pieces of legislation in the sector is replaced by an umbrella legislation based on less than five main laws.

In 2004, the Strategy for Revitalising Agriculture was launched as a response and contribution to the overarching ERS. The SRA is a sector based approach, implemented by

three ministries. It was developed through consultation processes with stakeholders and with support from development partners. Vision of the programme is to transform Kenya's agriculture into a profitable, commercially oriented and internationally competitive economic activity. The programme has six Fast-Track-Interventions, which include the legislative framework; delivery of research and extension; privatisation and improving access to inputs, services and markets.

Priorities of the SRA were based, in part, on the results of a four-day 'SRA Conference' which was attended by around 1000 people, 200 of which were farmers. The conference was opened by the President and high level participation by several ministers further consolidated political ownership and commitment to the SRA process. Institutionally, the SRA is steered by an advisory platform in the form of the ASCU, or Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit. Four officers per each of the three participating ministries sit in the ASCU as well as stakeholder representation. At present, the ASCU exists only at national level but plans exist for a district level platform, or DASCU.

Financing of the programme remains problematic. Ongwae explained that although the agricultural sector is acknowledged as the motor of economic growth in Kenya, the required government funding is difficult to secure: whereas the sector contributes to more than 12% of public revenue, it only accounts for less than 6% of public expenditure. Different priorities make the coordination of donor funding complicated; and funding of implementation at grassroots levels continues to be a problem. While increased overall funding of the agricultural sector through the national budget remains a priority, Ongwae recommended that more effort should be made to mobilize resources locally for implementation at those levels.

Policies and Platforms

What are main international platforms with respect to agricultural policy in general and Programme Based Approaches in Agriculture in particular? What is the relevance of their policies to implementers of agricultural programmes?

Three main platforms were presented during the forum: the West African Economic and Monetary Union and two donor platforms, the Global Donor Platform for Rural Development (presented in the morning session) and the Strategic Partnership with Africa.

Roger Kaboré presented the **Agricultural Policy of the West African Economic and Monetary Union**. The West African Economic and Monetary Union has been in existence since 1994 and is composed of eight states share the currency French CFA, *i.e.* Benin, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Guinée Bissau, Mali, Niger, Togo and Senegal.

In 2000, the Commission of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (or UEMOA⁴) formulated the broad orientation of the Union's Agriculture Policy. The process was based on a close dialogue between the Commission and the different national and regional participants and the policy was officially adopted in Dec 2001. It has three year duration (2003-2005) and contributes to the regional poverty reduction strategy of the UEMOA.

The policy considers the agricultural sector of outstanding importance and identifies three priority areas (i) improvement of productive systems and their environment (ii) realising a common market of member states and (iii) the integration of the agricultural market of the UEMOA into regional and global markets. For each of these three priority areas, programmes were developed. With respect to market access, development and integration, this includes a harmonisation of regional norms and standards, a joint system of control and

surveillance and a strengthening of negotiating capacities vis-à-vis international and global markets. The 'Cotton-Initiative' is an example of an intervention in this context and demonstrates clearly that joint action *can* pay off!

To further implement the programme several instruments and tools have been developed and will soon be put in place, such as a Regional Fund for Agricultural Development, a Regional Agricultural Information System, Agricultural Sectors Consultation Frameworks as well as a mechanism to prepare for international trade negotiations on agriculture.

A further platform, 'the Strategic Partnership with Africa' (or: SPA) was represented by **Georg Schäfer** discussing some of the work on **Alignment of Sector Programmes with National Poverty Strategies: Findings of the Sector Support Working Group of SPA**.

The SPA began in 1988 as the 'Special Programme of Assistance for Africa', a donor platform to mobilise quick-disbursing aid. In 2000 the platform was renamed to Strategic Partnership with Africa. Work of the platform is organised 3-year phases, the current one of which is SPA 6 (2003-2005). The SPA has two working groups: one on Budget Support and one on Sector Support. The SPA secretariat is held by the World Bank.

Two activities of the Sector Support Working Group (SSWG) are of particular relevance to the Africa Forum. The first is the annual Sector Programme (SP) Tracking Exercise. This exercise compiles quantitative and qualitative information about sector programmes across Africa based on a survey among donors. In 2004, information was collected from 37

⁴ See also www.uemoa.int

programmes, divided over 15 countries and six sectors. Only two of the programmes were in the rural sector; Uganda's Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) and Mozambique's ProAgri. One reason why agricultural programmes are under-represented is the rather strict criteria for a SP⁵ that SPA has adopted. Nevertheless, the SP Tracking is the only existing comparative analysis of qualitative and quantitative information on African SPs: Or as Schäfer put it "not ideal maybe, but the best we have".

Major findings of the *SP Tracking 2004* are that resource flow to SP has increased between 2002 and 2006, with a tendency towards more budget support in favour of project support. The sectors of transport, education and health account for the bulk of fund flow, with agriculture/rural development, water and environment following far behind.

A second activity of the SSWG concerns the *Alignment Checklist*. Its aim is to come to a better alignment of SPs to national PRSPs. The list was developed on the basis of learning missions to Mozambique (Education and Agriculture) and Uganda (Education) as well as workshops in Kenya and Burkina Faso. The current checklist helps analyse the degree of existing alignment and offers guidelines for proper alignment of sector strategies with the national poverty reduction framework.

⁵ SPA criteria for a SP are: Comprehensive sector policy; Annual expenditure programme or medium-term expenditure framework; Consistent with the macro-economic framework; Donor co-ordination is government-led and; Major donors participate in the programme.

Day Two: Improving Access to Resources

Access to Land

How can government provide for secure access to land? What are the available instruments? (How) can land reform and tenure be addressed under an agricultural programme?

The first presentation under this session was by **Hubert Ouédraogo** and discussed **Access to Land and Poverty Reduction: Towards new reforms in West Africa?** He explained that factors that necessitate land reform can be divided into internal and external factors. Internal factors include high population pressure, migration and environmental degradation. External pressure comes from the emphasis on the MDGs and poverty reduction coupled to a need for greater access to sub-regional markets to stimulate much needed rural growth.

To effectively address land reform, a complementary approach is needed that includes legal, technical and institutional interventions. Appropriate legislation should be the framework as well as the foundation of any approach: Especially where land reform is initiated in relation to poverty reduction. Poverty is not simply the result of a lack of assets, but also the result of vulnerability and insufficient security of assets. Experience from West Africa showed that even where appropriate laws were instigated, urban and administrative elites used their advantages to obtain easier access to land.

Thus, Ouédraogo concluded, land reform is foremost a political issue, before it is a technical issue. To ensure legitimacy and effectiveness of the process, it has to be based upon widespread consultation and participation. To ensure that the process is pro-poor, it has to be closely linked to poverty reduction strategies.

Whereas in West Africa, conflicts between agriculturalists and pastoralists are typical; in Southern Africa the land dispossession under colonial rule makes the issue even more politically sensitive. A good example was presented by **Eric Ndala** and **Sam Kapiye** in their presentation on **Equitable Access to Land and Efforts towards Policy-based Support in Namibia** where the ongoing land reform programme is steeped in a historic and political context that spans all the way from early German colonial rule (1184 to 1915), apartheid under South Africa (1915-1990), the struggle for political emancipation (from the mid 60s) to independence in 1990.

After independence, comprehensive land reform initiatives were kicked off by the National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question. Since then a legal and policy framework has developed based on the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act and the Communal Land Reform Act. Until now, the land reform process in Namibia is based on the 'willing seller - willing buyer' principle.

In 2003 the Government of Namibia established the Permanent Technical Team (PTT) on Land Reform, with support from development partners. In November 2004, the PTT presented its findings in *Recommendations, Strategic Options and Action Plan on Land Reform in Namibia*. This document forms the basis for the current process towards a PBA on Land Reform. In line with PBA principles, the programme will be

implemented within national policy frameworks, it will be financed jointly by donors in accordance with the Namibian financial administration regulations and procurement procedures. The Ministry of Land Reform will have overall implementation responsibility, which includes the contracting of external auditors and the monitoring of programme impact.

That land reform is a highly emotive issue was clear from the animated question & answer session following the presentations. A lot of people were concerned with issues of sustainability and productivity. Ndala agreed that this question has to be addressed where large commercial farms are dismantled and cut up into smaller plots for poor landless people

with hardly any farming experience. Therefore, the process in Namibia places a lot of emphasis on capacity building and training.

With respect to West Africa, participants asked about the challenge of developing legal and policy frameworks in situations where land-use patterns dissect several international frontiers, such as is the case with agriculturalists throughout southern West Africa and pastoralists migrating between countries in a more northern belt. Ouédraogo felt that precisely because of these cross-border conflicts, international platforms and agreements are so important.

Access to Labour

The loss of labour and skills as a result of the HIV/AIDS pandemic threatens the sustainability of production systems. What are rural coping strategies? (How) can these be scaled up into a national programme? What cross-sectoral and public-private linkages are essential?

During previous Africa Forums the importance of combating HIV/AIDS was made clear, but participants felt this was discussed too much in isolation without addressing the important issue of mainstreaming. This forum was able to report encouraging experiences in that regard.

The first presentation by **Petronella Lubasi** discussed **HIV/AIDS coping strategies as part of a national programme in rural development: the case for Zambia**.

Zambia has been particularly hard-hit by the pandemic, with adult infection rates hovering around 20% and life expectancy having dropped to less than 40 years. This has led the Government of Zambia to officially declare HIV/AIDS a National Disaster.

Under the agriculture sector programme, a Participatory Extension Approach was developed with the original objective to allow a more cross-sectoral discussion of constraints

to agricultural production. Under this approach, multi-teams were set up with staff from different line ministries, NGOs and private sector. Over time, these multi-teams also began to be used to tackle *general* cross-cutting concerns such as wife battering, polygamy and the problems associated with HIV/AIDS.

The reason for the success of this approach, according to Lubasi, is that communities themselves not only identify problems themselves, but solutions too. This increases ownership and commitment and has made the multi-teams a very valued tool in grassroots development.

Lubasi said that the coordination of activities at the implementation level was difficult at first, but has been much improved over time, certainly helped by the fact that the multi-teams are so highly appreciated by

communities as social and technical service delivery structures. The remaining challenge is at higher political levels. This is further complicated by the fact that the multi-teams are not a formally established structure. Thus, she concluded, it is important that all development partners (government and donor) are sensitised so that multi-teams can become an integral (horizontal) component of sector-based extension programmes.

In what way policy makers higher up the decision making chain can be sensitised and coordinated across sectors was illustrated by **Charles Magagula** in his presentation on **Multi-Sectoral Mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS Mitigation Measures in Provincial Government in South Africa**.

As is the case in Zambia, HIV/AIDS has pervaded South African society, with adult infection rates around 20% and up to 70% of adult deaths related to HIV/AIDS. In Mpumalanga, in the East of the country, the provincial government initiated a process of mainstreaming HIV/AIDS mitigation measures involving all departments. Magagula explained that initially several departments felt that HIV/AIDS was an issue to be taken care of by the health department alone. However, in a workshop all departments were asked to not only assess how HIV/AIDS affected their goals, but also to answer the question: "What does your department do that *contributes* to the spread of the virus?"

This question opened eyes: First, departments realised that they unwillingly do contribute to the spread of HIV/AIDS and, second, they understood that that measures to prevent that spread are not necessarily costly. Examples include: the Department of Public Works can ensure that condom distribution points exist in the vicinity of building sites; Department of Mining can ensure that where workers are based far away from home, they are allowed to take their wife or family with them and Department of Roads and Transport can look

at peer education among workers and mobile clinics (including condom distribution) near taxi ranks and truck stops.

This example from South Africa clearly demonstrates that inter-sectoral coordination is possible, in the sense that every sector can understand their part in combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Magagula said that although inter-departmental workshops proved very useful in awareness creation, detailed departmental planning in response to this needs to be done at a technical sector level. He concluded by saying that the approach piloted in his province can be up-scaled and introduced in other provinces in South Africa, although financial support for such a mainstreaming action has yet to be assured.

The third and last presentation looked at mainstreaming again, but this time from the side of the donor under **Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS Mitigation Measures within the SNRD Sector Reform Programmes** presented by **Joseph Grimm**.

The presentation is based on a survey carried out among rural development programmes supported by GTZ in five countries (Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa).

To gauge the effect of the pandemic on agriculture and development in the Southern African region, Grimm looked at the estimated loss of labour as a consequence of HIV/AIDS and then superimposed the remaining labour availability over a typical farm calendar. He clearly illustrated the effect of HIV/AIDS by saying that "in countries with prevalence rates of 10% among adults, the growth of national income is reduced by up to one third" and that "HIV/AIDS has a footprint of ca. 100 - 140 years on our planet".

The second part of the presentation looked at in what way GTZ supported programmes have mainstreamed their response to HIV/AIDS. Grimm distinguished between responses on

four levels: (i) institutional, (ii) policy (iii) technical and (iv) the service delivery level. Although these experiences clearly show that mainstreaming is possible and can be measured along clear indicators, Grimm concluded by pointing at some remaining challenges. Important among these are that a lack of staff capacity makes it difficult to address the full complexity of mainstreaming issues and that mainstreaming often requires an inter-ministerial initiative whereas projects/programmes are sectoral and may be limited to only one partner institution.

Participants asked what was known about the impact of mainstreaming. Since HIV/AIDS is a complicated issue, it needs interventions that are not only cross-sectoral, but that also have a long time horizon. Issues like stigmatisation and behavioural change cannot be tackled in the space of a few years. Grimm pointed out that South Africa pioneers a lot of useful initiatives and that its international image of a country where HIV/AIDS is denied or misunderstood is not justified. One such initiative is an employment assistance programme, which makes sure that infected people get a job or do not lose a job when they come out as being HIV-positive.

Some time was spent on the issue of resistance of the virus: At the level of the individual, an anti-retroviral treatment does not protect against second time infections with the HIV-virus. Thus, even when on anti-retroviral drugs, patients should protect themselves (as well as others!) with condoms. On the level of a population: When anti-retroviral drug are not taken as prescribed, the virus may be able to mutate into more drug-resistant strains which will considerably complicate disease control.

To the question on whether there is such a difference in prevalence rates between Western and Southern Africa, presenters could only offer hypothesis. One possible explanation may be that there was a lot of immigration in Eastern and Southern Africa, as well as a lot of displacements during the freedom struggles and under the Apartheid regime. Polygamy may offer less of an explanation as that is prevalent in Western as well as in Southern Africa.

Participants also felt that other factors impacting upon access to labour, such as migration or a lack of skills, also should have addressed under this session; a point taken on-board by organisers.

Access to Capital

What are innovative and successful approaches to pro-poor rural and micro-finance and (how) have these been integrated in agricultural programmes?

Limited access to rural finance often curtails the scope of development among smallholder farmers. Unfortunately, smallholders and subsistence farmers continue to be unattractive to private financial institutions. Therefore, ensuring access to rural finance is still seen as a government responsibility, particularly in remote areas and among resource poor farmers.

In Burkina Faso, the government, with support from the World Bank, initiated a direct financial support programme for the initiatives of Farmers Associations (FAs). The results of this intervention were discussed by **Christophe Yaméogo** in his presentation on **Experiences with Rural Finance at the level of local Farmers' Associations in Burkina Faso**, a programme that supplies subsidised micro-credit directly to producers.

The programme achieved a number of important results: Farmer Associations responded well to the increase in the options of financing activities in rural areas, they learned to mobilise and negotiate better which led to an increase in rural people's revenues. Also the more active micro-economic finance climate allowed more women to gain access to finance than used to be the case under the bigger private credit suppliers.

However, Yaméogo emphasised that prior to this success, a number of important hurdles had to be taken, both on the side of the FAs, who were often illiterate and had little economic insight, but also on the side of the field workers, who had to get used to an innovative approach. Challenges that remain include the monitoring of micro-projects which is difficult and costly, as well as the issue of high overhead costs: When individual loans are small and widely spread as is the case in micro-finance, then it becomes doubtful whether overhead costs can ever be financed out of the proceeds of the venture itself (e.g. from interest payments).

The second example on rural finance came from **Carol Laker** with **A Framework for Addressing Poverty through the Transformation of the Agricultural Sector and Rural Finance in Uganda**.

Laker's presentation discussed experiences under the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA), which is Uganda's national programme for the agricultural sector. The PMA has adopted a multi-sector approach and is implemented by nine (!) ministries. Since its objective is to transform subsistence farming into farming as a business, the need to increase access to rural finance is a crucial element of the programme.

In pursuit of this, the government focussed on Micro Finance Institutions, but with an emphasis on expanding *existing* MFIs, rather than establishing new ones. This required that

first an 'MFI Mapping' exercise was carried out that took more than six months. Laker reminded us that an MFI can take many forms, from a man with a briefcase to an office with a computer and an internet connection.

Trying to get these MFIs interested in investing in agriculture raised a number of problems that relate to the specific nature of the sector (e.g. seasonal income, risk of disease and natural disasters). To address this, capacity building was offered to MFIs. Farmers too, need capacity building in view of their limited business experience. The Ugandan Government came up with an innovative idea of Financial Extension Workers, who resort under the Ministry of Finance, but go out into the field to advice and support not only farmers, but any local business entrepreneur.

Laker suggested a further intervention that may considerably increase farmers' access to credit is an insurance scheme for agricultural loans (under the Bank of Uganda), which is, understandably, quite a complicated issue and therefore still under discussion.

Several questions were raised related to the sustainability of the micro-finance initiatives in view of the high overhead costs. The presenters answered that seeing that these initiatives have great potential to generate local economic growth, should we really aim for micro-finance ventures to become financially sustainable? Or should we see it as part of the development responsibility of government with regard to disadvantaged areas or resource poor farmers? Laker reminded us that in the days of government supplied credit, repayment was nearly nil, since a government loan was generally considered to be a gift. At least, even if MFIs are partially subsidised, they are in a better position to wean farmers' off from the dependency on government and create more of a business attitude to farming.

Day Three: Improving Access to Inputs and Services

Access to services in the context of Programme-Based Approaches

What are characteristics of optimal agricultural service provision? How can 'best practices' of service provision be integrated into a programme-based approach? What is the role of non-state actors in a PBA context? Can Public-Private Partnerships be supported under a PBA?

When discussing the various experiences with agricultural services, it is useful to start with a vision of an ideal form of service provision and this was presented by **Andrea Wetzler** in **Improving Access to Service Provision in the Context of the Programme Based Approach**.

In offering an ideal scenario, she distinguished between three levels: (i) the national, policy level, (ii) the service providers themselves and (iii) the local level of demand, by farmers, producers, farmer organisations etc. Of crucial importance at the national level is that there exists clarity about the role of the state and which is reflected in a policy framework that takes account of public and private service provision in rural areas. At the local level, a strong determinant of success is the degree to which farmers and producers are organised. Once demand is organised at the local level and a clear policy exists at the national level, then demand and supply can be matched at the intermediate (service providers) level: For that matching process to happen optimally, there is a need for (i) information on services and markets and (ii) competition between different providers.

However, to what extent this scenario can be realised depends on geographical factors too: in disadvantaged or remote areas, demand for services may be so thin and widely spread, that commercial providers fail to take over from government. Alternatively, competition between providers may be so minimal that farmers end up paying dearly for low quality

services. Wetzler therefore advocated that government needs to develop separate service strategies for disadvantaged regions. This may include a wide range of options besides government subsidised services such as the use of PPPs, service vouchers to consumers or government tendered contracts to commercial providers.

These issues and suggestions were explored in more detail in the second presentation on **Public Private Partnerships in the context of agricultural programmes: What have we learned and what is left to do?** by **Hartwig Rupp**. His presentation built up on the findings of the 8th Africa Forum in Nairobi, which dealt with the role of the private sector in the context of national agricultural programmes⁶.

Rupp began by an interesting comparison between the PBA and PPP instruments: Whereas the PBA tends to be driven by the public sector, the PPP is driven by the private sector and development partners. As a consequence, the private sector is merely a stakeholder in the PBA, but a contractual partner in the PPP. And whereas the development of a PBA tends to largely be a top-down process, the PPP tends to evolve from the bottom upwards. But despite these differences in the instruments, there is real scope for PPPs within the PBA frame, in

⁶ See: Dietvorst (2005) 8th Africa Forum: *The private sector as a Partner in the Fight against Poverty: Non-State Actors in Agricultural Programmes*. 6 to 10 September 2004, Nairobi, Kenya

particular with respect to their potential role in remote or otherwise disadvantaged areas. Important is, said Rupp, that after a PBA strategy is clear on public and private responsibilities, the role for PPPs should immediately be explored and integrated into programme design at the earliest possible stage and not as an add-on or an afterthought.

Rupp concluded by some 'Left to do' suggestions such as the need to match African supply and international demand and to focus also on local PPPs, instead of only international ones. Of help here may be the 'PPP Facility Africa', a web-based platform currently being developed. Other suggestions are to clarify the private sector's role in poverty reduction strategies as well as in budget funding, for example through the use of Trust Funds as a half-way house between project and budget funding.

After this introduction, **Geneviève Compaoré** presented the government's perspective on PPP in the **Importance of Public Private Partnerships in the Agriculture Sector in Burkina Faso**. She explained that Burkina Faso is very committed to the development of the private sector at the highest level of government. Since 1991, the Ministry of Trade has been in the process of setting up a 'one-stop-shop' for private investment. This means all that is involved in getting the required licenses for setting up a business enterprise is put under one roof. Other government initiatives include a fund to address labour conflicts, an alleviation of taxes in the informal

sector and the development of proposals for agriculture and private sector development. She emphasised that despite the huge potential of agro-businesses in Burkina Faso, private investment in the agricultural sector remains small compared to investments in industry and trade. Thus, the government needs to continue improve the enabling environment for agriculture investment, and pay more attention to the role of PPPs as a bridge towards pure private investment.

One successful example of a partnership between the public and the private sector was presented by **J. B. Zoma** in **Public Private Partnership in the Production of Shea Butter in Burkina Faso**. Shea butter is an ingredient of cosmetics with a fast growing market. It is extracted from nuts, which grow on self-seeding (not cultivated) trees. Burkina Faso is one of only 15 countries in the world where these trees grow. In the particular example of Zoma, women group collect the nuts and extract the butter. They manage to tap into the international market via the French company Occitane who buys and exports the butter. The women groups are assisted by development organisations in improving their organisational capacity and strengthening business and negotiating skills. At present, Occitane is satisfied with the quality produced in Burkina Faso, the international market for shea butter is growing and there is scope for more women groups to enter this profitable venture.

Coordination and Alignment of Service Provision

How can the various activities that are needed to promote rural growth be coordinated: Between sub-sectors within one ministry but also between different ministries? Can improved coordination of demand at farmer or producer level, be translated into better coordinated services at provider level or even at policy level?

In comparison to other classical sector programme sectors, such as health, education and transport, the agriculture sector is by far the most challenging sector with respect to the need and the difficulties of coordination and alignment. To meet the ultimate objective of rural growth, policy and programmes have to be aligned between sub-sectors within the line ministry, even between different ministries. On the ground, activities need to be coordinated not only amongst public sector actors, but also between the public and the private sector. How this may be achieved was illustrated in three presentations.

The first of these looked at different sub-sectors in **Alignment and the Programme Based Approach: the Case of the Agriculture Sector Programme in Tanzania** presented by *Hirofumi Hoshi*.

In Tanzania there existed two main agricultural programmes, each with their own policy framework and each with their own donors. The first is the Agriculture Sector Development Programme (ASDP) developed by four line ministries, one of which is the Ministry of Agriculture. A second major programme in the agricultural sector was the Agriculture Service Support Programme (ASSP), focusing on research and development at the central level, and agricultural service delivery (including extension) at the local level. After discussion among the Government and development partners for ASDP and ASSP, it was decided to align ASSP into an integrated ASDP.

At the district level, implementation channels for the activities under the integrated ASDP are Local Government Authorities, based on

their District Agricultural Development Plans, which in turn are part of the broader District Development Plans. Coordination between ministries, the government and development partners to the ASDP is aimed at the development of District Agricultural Development Plans: Implementation of the district plans is to be funded from an ASDP basket fund.

It is expected that this alignment of sub-sectors within one overall agricultural programme reduces management costs. At the farmer level, it is hoped that service provision will improve as lack of coordination of activities has proven to be problematic in the past.

Participants asked after the mechanisms for donor coordination. Hoshi agreed that with so many donors, there is a need for effective instruments. In Tanzania there are two main coordinating panels: (i) the agricultural development partners (with 8 to 9 members) and (ii) the direct budget support group (with 6 members). In addition there is a coordinating body that is led by government and includes public and private representatives.

While the above presentation discussed alignment at policy and overall programme levels, a second presentation looked at coordination among service providers at service provision levels: **The Challenges of Decentralised Service Management: Experience from the Malawi Agricultural Sector Investment Programme** was presented by *Ian Kumwenda*.

Malawi has been grappling with decentralisation for a long time: In 1998 a Decentralization Policy as well as a Local

Government Act was passed by parliament with the intention of integrating all sectors of the economy into the District Assemblies. In response to that, a series of studies as well as a round table conference with stakeholders resulted in report *The Role of Agriculture Sector Decentralization Process in Malawi* which has become part of the framework for the Malawi Agriculture Investment Programme (MASIP). In 2001, Local Government sensitized Agriculture on how to prepare sector devolution. On this basis, the Ministry of Agriculture prepared guidelines in 2003; study tours were held to prepare for a re-drawing of agricultural area boundaries in line with administrative district boundaries.

However, the process of devolution is still incomplete; there is insufficient clarity over roles and mandates at the district level, with a clear conflict of interests between Ministry of Agriculture staff and the District Assemblies under Local Government. A change process is needed, but the capacity to lead or undertake this process at the district level is limited. In addition, there continues to be a general resistance from line ministries in general, to have the District Assemblies assume responsibilities in health, education and agriculture.

During the question and answer session it became clear that the Malawi example shows how in the absence of high level political commitment and leadership, a decentralization process can easily get entangled in a quagmire of overlapping and unclear mandates, conflicting orders and guidelines and unclear authority hierarchies. Even a cascade of acts, rules, guides and directives fails to bring order and structure to a process that is built on a shaky foundation.

A third presentation looked at service coordination from the bottom up: **Institutionalising Demand-led Approaches to Service Delivery in South Africa** was presented by *Ephenia Kganyago*.

South Africa is not an aid dependent country and doesn't share some of the problems that the programme based approach intends to solve, e.g. lack of recipient ownership, lack of donor coordination and high aid delivery transaction costs. Nevertheless, even when a country is in charge of its own development investment, issues like political leadership and commitment and efficient resource use are crucial determinants of success.

Since independence in 1994, South African development policy is geared towards redressing the unequal socio-economic development of the apartheid era. Huge government investments were made in rural infrastructures and agricultural enterprise development: In Limpopo Province alone more than US\$200 million was spent, without (as of yet) having a clear impact on poverty.

Thus, it seems that despite advanced national policy frameworks as well as high level political ownership and commitment; implementation is still a major challenge. Major obstacles are the lack of coherence in the delivery of the different provincial departmental programmes and the limited capacity among both provincial departments and local government on how to provide services to poor people. To address this, a Participatory Extension Approach (PEA) was developed in Limpopo Province, that allowed for community based development plans to be integrated into provincial departmental work programmes and budgets.

The encouraging results of the pilot programme (in 20 municipalities) led to the process being institutionalised in the Department of Agriculture and anchored in a three-year change management plan that aims to fully integrate this approach. Kganyago explained that although PEA is more expensive than the classical (more top-down) extension practised before, the investment pays off as it leads to a more demand-led and therefore effective service provision. For this reason, the Limpopo Department of Agriculture

has allocated funds from within its budget to up-scale the approach across the entire province. Meanwhile, the project that piloted the approach will be phased out in 2006.

During the question and answer session, the issue was raised why donor support to this process was phased out completely. Under a PBA, the logical progression of the process would be that after successful institu-

tionalization of an approach developed under a project modality, the process can henceforth be supported through a budget support modality. In this case, when the PEA approach is incorporated into the government's budget, why not support the up-scaling process via direct sector budget support to the Department of Agriculture?

Farmer Based Organisations

How have demand orientation and service quality been organised? What are experiences with disadvantaged areas and resource poor clients?

Time and again, experiences in agricultural programmes point at the importance of the organisation of farmers as a basic structure and network, not only to better access inputs and services but also to have a voice in planning and negotiating rounds during programme design. Three presentations looked at the issue of Farmer Based Organisations (FBO). In Zambia and in Ghana, FBOs were set up in the context of national policy frameworks, *i.e.* the poverty reduction strategy and the agricultural development strategy. From Burkina Faso came an example of an FBO, evolved out of a grassroots felt need into a profitable venture.

Klaus Droppelmann and **Masiye Nawiko** discussed the experiences under the Poverty Reduction Strategy in **Farming is (not yet) a business in Zambia** with respect to two sub-programmes: the Outgrower Support Programme (OSP) and the Farm Block Development Programme (FBD).

Under the OSP, farmers are linked to outgrower schemes in an effort to increase their access, not only to inputs and services but also to profitable markets. Outgrower schemes exist predominantly along what is known as 'the line of rail', *i.e.* the belt across Livingstone in the South, via Lusaka to the

Copperbelt in the North. In the remote provinces of Zambia, such as Western and Northwestern, outgrower schemes play less of a role. Most of the outgrowers produce cotton, though tobacco is popular also in view of its high rate of revenue per hectare.

Interestingly, there appeared to be an almost one-to-one relation between the quality of extension and the revenue per hectare. While this may be a factor that may be controlled by agricultural policy or programmes, the success of outgrower schemes is also very dependent on factors outside the remit of the Ministry of Agriculture. Most important among these in Zambia are the commodity price stability and infrastructure. Outgrowers themselves see an important government role also in ensuring that there is transparency in the sector, with respect to public and private roles, business conduct and ethics including a clear legislative framework to uphold contracts and avoid side-selling.

To improve access to land among smallholders, a Farm Block Development programme was started under the PRS. In Zambia, only 6% of land belongs to the state, with 94% belonging to traditional chiefs. The government now is trying to sensitise local chiefs to give up

part of their land to serious commercial producers, wherever possible local farmers.

The two sub-programmes, OSP and FBD, are connected: Within farm blocks, part of the land is planned to be made available to smallholders who are linked, through outgrower schemes, to core estates and their processing facilities.

In Ghana, the Agricultural Services Sub-Sector Investment Programme (AgSSIP) has a component specially aimed at the creation and development of FBOs. **Emmanuel Dormon** and **Kwame Amezah** presented the achievements to date in the **Development of Farmer Based Organizations in Ghana**.

Under this component, the government wants to help develop 300 autonomous grassroots-based FBOs that are able to manage themselves and provide services to their members to improve business, income levels and living standards.

To create an enabling legal framework, the government has already revised the Cooperative Law and is in the process of developing a law to regulate non-cooperative FBOs. A major stumbling block is the capacity of FBOs; in terms of organization and leadership as well as business and management skills. A five week (!) course was held attended by 300 executives from 130 FBOs, covering a membership of 14,000 farmers. The Ministry of Agriculture places great hopes on the potential of FBOs as entry points for access to inputs, services and markets.

Some positive impact can already be recorded: Production levels have gone up for certain rice farmers; another FBO has been able to meet export demands in terms of quantity and quality and in other cases, the processing of raw produce has led to a spin-off of other economic activity (the provision of a mill enabled the manufacture of soap). In yet

another case, farmers' managed to increase their income five-fold in a short time.

However, whether this positive trend will be consistent across the whole spectrum of established FBOs remains to be seen. The Ghana example should be given credit for not only acknowledging the need for farmer organization, but also supporting it on a wide scale and as part of a national programme. However, the best FBOs are those that have evolved gradually from the bottom upwards and that are characterized by a strong sense of ownership and commitment among their members. This scenario is difficult to replicate in a short time and on a wide scale, so some compromise is needed between quality and quantity of the process.

An example of a grassroots based FBO was given by **Bonzi Nonyeza** in experiences with **Commercialisation of cereals through the Union of Farmers Associations in the loop of Mouhoun** referring to a conglomeration of farms that are grouped together within a curve of the river Mouhoun.

In 1993, these farmers created a union which today is composed of about 1500 producers (men and women), covered over 70 grassroots associations from across six provinces. The union assists its members with the marketing of cereals and bissap leaves. An important achievement of the union is that it has become a reference point in setting the cereal price leading to price stability, enabling its members to plan and manage more effectively.

Following participants' questions, Nonyeza said that, at present, the union is supported by CIDA, the World Bank and the Government of Burkina Faso and works towards sustainability; However, he warned that even if production and marketing increases, the union would still be vulnerable to external influences, such as past government measures that curtailed the export of cereal and caused a loss of FCFA 200 million.

Access to Domestic Markets

What are appropriate measures to support and protect domestic markets? How can producers be helped to better access domestic markets? What are lessons for agricultural programmes?

Programmes in agriculture and rural development need to develop strategies that allow smallholder producers a better access to markets in their own country. This may be achieved by a protection of the domestic market from imports. Alternatively, a restructuring of the domestic market may help create an enabling environment for smallholder market access.

The presentation from Senegal by **Cheikh Tidiane Dieye** looked at the issue of domestic market protection versus structural reform under **Trade policies and agricultural development in Senegal: does domestic market protection work?**

By looking at the Senegalese rice and groundnut oil sectors, Dieye illustrated the scope of two trade agreements in this context: (i) the Special Products (SP) agreement, which offers medium to long term protection from imports, to allow a country address food security, rural development and poverty alleviation concerns; and (ii) the Special agricultural Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) which offers short-term protection against import surges and fast falling prices.

He said that the long-term protection under SP is not immediately relevant for Senegal. The reason is two-fold: First, Senegal is a least-developed country (LDC) which, under WTO rules, does not have to reduce its agricultural tariffs anyway, even if it applies tariffs well below set levels (*i.e.* 'bound tariffs'). Second, the SP agreement can not be applied other than in a very limited way as Senegal is a member of the West African Economic and

Monetary Union which has its own maximum common external tariff (CET) of 22.7%.

Regarding the short-term protection under the SSM agreement; the use of such a facility requires the ability to diligently monitor trade and market development. This, unfortunately, is very difficult in an under-developed (and also corrupt) country like Senegal.

Senegal is not yet competitive, domestically, in both the rice and the groundnut oil sectors. Although domestic rice production has increased, it still does not meet potential. In addition, producers have difficulty competing with imported rice mainly because consumers prefer the imported variety over the local rice. Thus, at this stage, structural market problems seem more of a priority than market protection.

In conclusion, Dieye said that developing the two sub-sectors (rice and groundnuts) can only be tackled through a long-term strategy. Only once production and competitiveness increases can (sub) sector-specific safeguard measures be considered.

The question and answer session highlighted the fact that it was usually very difficult to address food security by modification of the CET through regional trade bodies such as ECOWAS and UEMOA. Dieye also pointed out that Senegal, as an LDC, is more constrained by regional commitments than by WTO rules. Moreover, national authorities are very often to blame for failing to impose adequate national trade policy measures.

An encouraging example of linking local enterprises to markets was presented under

Promoting Market Access by Supporting Local Enterprises and Producers' Associations in Burkina Faso by *Vincent Duermael*.

Central element of the presentation was the so-called ESOP, or *Entreprises de Services & Organisations de Producteurs*. These ESOPs are private local enterprises which act as intermediaries between local farmers' groups and urban markets. This close working relationship with small producers lifts them out of isolation with ESOPs being the link between small and medium enterprises (SME) and the urban market.

The key prerequisite for an ESOP is the existence of a sustainable market. Then they help developing business and investment plans, diversification strategies, and provide quality assurance and advisory services. ESOPs negotiate fixed prices with both farmers and consumers. Focus within local urban markets is on niche products such as health products, child nutrition, and high quality products. Also some organic products are being exported. Farmers are being encouraged to become shareholders of their respective ESOP.

So far, ESOPs have been established in Mali, Togo, Benin and Burkina Faso with support from CIDR or the *Centre Internationale de Developpement et Recherche*. In Burkina Faso, the initiative was particularly successful in the soy-bean sub-sector. In four years four enterprises were set up and because ESOP helped create confidence between the market and producers, market demand for soybean has also developed considerably. In Togo, a similar success was achieved with maize and ginger, to the extent that enterprises have begun thinking of exporting.

During the question and answer session, the contribution of farmers to the ESOPs was discussed, as well as to what extent the initiative was demand-driven. Duermael explained that ESOPs are independent actors

which set their own agenda. ESOPs operate on a fee basis, but co-funding is required in the start-up phase. In terms of sustainability there is no need for an exit strategy for ESOPs as there is no involvement in farmers' daily business. ESOPs can be said to be fully demand driven in that they orient their activities to market demand. Where there exists a market demand that local production can tap into, the ESOP acts as a bridge to bring the two together.

With regard to the PBA approach, Duermael said that ESOPs currently operate within the PRSP frameworks, these being the national framework for investment in development. In addition, the ESOP model corresponds to PBA principles such as ownership and the use of local actors and structures, and as such could be integrated into agricultural or rural development PBAs (as well as in the PRSP)

Where people are poverty stricken, food relief is often the operation of choice to ward off starvation. However, this can have negative repercussions on an (already fragile) local economy, with staple prices falling and farmers' income declining even further. A possible alternative to this scenario is that of 'cash transfers' in place of food handouts. Experiences from Zambia suggest a range of positive effects as was presented by *Mwape Walumba* in **Cash Transfers as a Means to Increase Food Security whilst Supporting Local Maize Markets**.

Under Zambia's Public Welfare Assistance Scheme, a Cash Transfer Scheme is currently being implemented in the Kalomo District in Southern Province on a pilot project basis. The area is a drought and HIV/AIDS stricken region, and cash transfers are being made to some 1000 households. Preference is given to the old, children, sick or disabled as well as to marginalized women.

Every household (with children) receives the sum of US\$ 8 per month which is largely being used for consumption, some investments and

few savings. The scheme reaches those most in need and lifts them out of extreme poverty while mitigating food security problems. Also, it positively impacts on the local economy by boosting consumption of (and even investment in) locally produced food and livestock products. In the pilot area, this resulted in higher production levels. Furthermore, as the cash was also used for hiring labour force this had additional pro-poor and food security impacts by way of a chain reaction.

Participants questioned the sustainability of the scheme and whether it would meet the key requirements of a PBA. Walumba stressed that

the Cash Transfer Scheme was very demand-driven and uses existing actors, structures and procedures. He further mentioned that funding had been assured for the next couple of years (for the pilot area), and that even covering all extremely impoverished 200,000 households is manageable by Zambia itself in the long-run. He further pointed out that this demand-led scheme was economically viable as it led to an increase of production in the response to higher domestic consumption and that this could ultimately prove more sustainable than many other approaches directed at the ultra-poor.

Access to International Markets

How can African smallholders access international markets? What are examples of successful use of niche markets? What are the risks and opportunities of regional trade agreements such as the Economic Partnership Agreements between Africa and the EU? Who benefits?

Sometimes, smallholder farmers can access niche markets, even at an international level. Examples discussed during the 8th Africa Forum included organic products or products collected in the wild (e.g. honey). During this 9th Africa Forum the scope of 'Fair Trade' was discussed by **Andrew Charman** in **Fair Trade: A sustainable trade and development solution for smallholders?**

He began by pointing out that fair trade is not about developing countries per se; rather it is about marginalised producers from these countries and offering these producers sustainable and equitable opportunities to participate in global markets through a consumer driven trade and development agenda. Fair trade labels began to emerge in the late 80s: After the initial 'Max Havelaar' coffee at the beginning, the market has rapidly diversified and now includes around 850 products, including bananas, cocoa, tea, sugar, rice, fruit, wine, crafts and even tourism.

Fair traders are committed to reward producers with a 'social premium' that is often around 10% of the cost price of the goods. During the last five years, fair trade goods have entered mainstream markets, especially in America and Europe. The approach followed by fair traders has also evolved: Initially it was very 'supply-led' with fair traders simply looking at what was being produced and then attempting to sell it. Now, supply and demand are more effectively matched and fair-trade goods become increasingly competitive in mainstream retail markets with global sales of fair trade produce amounting to US\$ 800 million in 2003.

In Africa, smallholder involvement in fair trade initiatives has concentrated on agricultural produce. Success stories are reported from Zambia (honey), Malawi (sugar and ground nuts) and Mozambique (nuts and rice) and Tanzania (coffee).

In South Africa the fair trade approach differs significantly from elsewhere: In the wine and horticultural sectors, the fair trade approach has been aligned with the government's policy of black economic empowerment and has thus become a vehicle for transforming agribusiness through broadening ownership and ensuring ethical working and good environmental practices.

Though the fast growing market for fair trade produce definitely opens opportunities for smallholders in Africa, Charman raised a number of concerns that need to be addressed: the risk of commodity dependence, the fact that producers have hardly been involved in defining terms of trade and so far, there has been little support or engagement by the public sector. He concluded by saying that although fair trade alone cannot redress global market constraints for poor smallholders, it can act as a catalyst for initiating change and empowering producer organisations to become competent players in a competitive market.

The honour of the last presentation fell to **Agayo Ogambi** with **Small Holders on the Way to the Global Market; the Role of Government, Donors and Associations; the case of Kenya.**

Consumers in the international market are increasingly concerned about food safety, the environment or social and ethical aspect of production. The response to these consumer concerns has been a wave of legislative and regulatory activity. Producers in developing countries and smallholder producers in particular, often fail to meet these regulations and standards. In Kenya, the trend poses a serious threat to smallholder marketing.

Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary Standards (such as traceability and maximum residue levels) as well as the European Retailers Code of Good Agricultural Practices (EUROGAP) represent ever higher quality and food safety standards that are difficult but also costly to meet.

Ogambi stressed that certain regulations, *e.g.* those related to labour conditions (*e.g.* the right to a living wage) are in the interest of smallholders themselves, and although maybe difficult to meet, we do better in retaining these standards, then to fight for their being abandoned. Then there are regulations that are driven by consumers and not negotiable so non-compliance is not an option.

What can be done, however, is to bring down the cost of compliance. Right now, certification of products is done by expensive EU certifying agencies that have to be paid to come out to Kenya. The intention is to achieve accreditation for Kenyan companies so that, in future, certification can be done by them, which will make the compliance process more flexible and much cheaper. Another alternative is to fight for an extended 'grace period for compliance' saying that regulations are accepted, but the date at which they need to be achieved is negotiated. In that way the market is not lost to the producers during the time they work towards meeting the agreed regulations.

During the discussion, one participant posed the idea of creating another label simply saying 'Small-scale Farmer Product'. Seeing that donors have already done much to support developing countries and their producers in retaining a foothold in international markets, this idea may not be as far-fetched as it at first sounds.

Open Space

The last part of the afternoon of day four was used as an 'Open Space': Participants were asked to advertise any issues they would like to discuss further and see if they could get a small group going to do so. After a very enthusiastic, somewhat turbulent and very noisy 'advertising of issues' phase, seven discussion groups were eventually formed. These were:

1. Making Economic Partnership Agreements work for ACP countries
2. Public Private Partnerships and local entrepreneurs
3. Policy formulation processes in preparation for Programme-Based Approaches
4. The fate of small African producers in a world dominated by global multinationals
5. The role of sub-national organisations with regard to market access
6. Supporting poor farmers access to rural finance
7. Inter-forum support of Agriculture Programme coordination units

The idea of this session was to allow participants an opportunity to simply get together and discuss an issue at heart in a bit more detail with like-minded people. Reporting back to plenary took place on the morning of the last day in the form of a 'market place' during which groups presented their findings to the forum. No specific reporting format was given and most groups simply presented their flipcharts. One group prepared a slide presentation on **Poor Farmers Access to Rural Finance** integrating lots of field experience and beautiful pictures of Burkina Faso farmers.

Interestingly, whilst the group on PBA policy formulation concluded that it was important that experiences from other countries is fed into the policy process, this group on Agriculture Programme coordinating units discussed exactly that and how this inter-country exchange may be better structured and supported.

On the whole, it is worth to point out that five out of seven groups dealt with either markets or support to private entrepreneurs, which goes to show how important these issues are in the agricultural and rural development sectors.

The last day of the forum is traditionally set aside to reflect on the discussions so far and to look at the way forward. Participants are asked to propose not only themes for the next forum, but also to offer whatever suggestions they have for future forums (see forum evaluation in annex 5). This active and constructive feedback over the years has helped the organisers to learn from experience and to better meet participants' needs.

Summary of Forum Findings

An overview was presented in **the 9th Africa Forum, Ouagadougou 2005: A summary of Findings** by Désirée Dietvorst. A lot of discussion was spent on what she termed 'the Agricultural Dilemma' referring to the fact that whilst the agricultural sector is increasingly recognised as crucial to poverty relief, actual funding (by governments and donors) to the sector is in sharp decline. To reverse that trend, we have to demonstrate that investment in agriculture leads to growth in agriculture.

This argument brings us again to the importance of measuring the impact of agricultural programmes (and those in the rural sector more generally); a clear recurrent theme in the discussion. However, although we

should not lose sight of ultimate objectives like food security and reduced rural poverty, agricultural programmes should not be measured in those terms alone. To ensure that a programme is on track, it has to be measured against its objectives. And when these include a strengthening of the political, institutional and legislative environment, then monitoring indicators have to reflect that.

The remainder of the presentation offered an overview of main findings under each of the three main themes of the forum: access to resources, inputs & services and access to markets. These findings are presented in the Executive Summary at the start of this report.

Next steps

The need for a demonstration of impact so clearly crystallised out of this year's debate that the organisers agreed to make it the central theme of next year's forum. Location of the next, 10th Africa Forum, will be Namibia.

Then, the organisers of the forum are working towards developing a 'support-package' in response to participants' requests of recent years. According to participants, the Africa Forum helps to launch innovative ideas and to get country delegations rally around

resolutions. However, after the forum participants feel on their own again, whereas they could do with some help in implementing these resolutions. The last forums in Pretoria (2003) and Nairobi (2004) included sessions on how this support may be organised. Most people mentioned, in one form or another, discussions at country-levels, on specific programmes and an 'inter-forum' networking on specific issues between experts from different countries. To respond to these

requests, initiatives to complement the Africa Forum are currently being developed.

One initiative concerns support to a more structured exchange between countries. This will be based around support to existing programme coordinating units or stakeholder platforms at country level (such as sector programme secretariats, -desks, -consultative forums, - advisory platforms etc). The aim of this support would be to enable these units to better advise and coordinate the implementation of the agricultural (or rural development) programmes which they support. To discuss this, an informal round table discussion was held among representatives from existing advisory platforms (*i.e.* PMA Secretariat Uganda, MASIP Desk Malawi, AgSSIP Ghana, ACF Zambia and ASCU Kenya). It was found that although support is much needed, it is difficult to package this in the form of a standardised training, as not only the needs, but also the institutional context and mandate of different platforms varies considerably. More appropriate forms of

support were proposed and include country exchange visits and moderated workshops.

Another component is the website called *Africa Platform for Rural Development*, mentioned earlier in this report (page 2). This website will be based on the experiences and the information collected during the Africa Forum years. A rough outline of the homepage was presented during the summary presentation. The website will be interactive, in the sense that users can download, but also upload information. It will have an Africa map as a navigation tool. Users will be able to get automatic updates and the site will provide links to other relevant websites. It is expected that the website will be operational by early 2006. All participants to the forum will receive an email with the relevant link as soon as the site is accessible.

Participants to the forum will automatically be informed of news regarding the website or any other Africa Forum related activities.

Annex 1 Overview Africa Forum 1997 - 2004

<p>8th African Forum</p> <p>The Private Sector as a partner in the fight against poverty: Non-state actors in Agricultural Programmes 6-10 September 2004, Nairobi, Kenya.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD – InWent</p>	<p>The issue of “non-state actors in a PBA context” was explored in response to the growing recognition of the role of the private sector in poverty reduction. The forum looked at how the PBA may offer a framework in which private operators are supported, and what this means to the way donors operate. The role of the commercial producer was discussed and the commodity approach was brought back as a means to tackle production hurdles.</p>
<p>7th Africa Forum</p> <p>The Struggle for pro-poor growth: Linking national strategies to local priorities. 8-13 June 2003, Pretoria, South Africa.</p> <p>GTZ – CTA</p>	<p>In response to a concern over the re-centralising tendencies of nation-wide SWAp and PRSPs the forum discussed how to integrate local priorities into national programmes and how to ensure that resources reach lower levels and poor people. For the first time, the issue of trade was discussed and ways in which this may be better addressed by SWAp and PRSPs.</p>
<p>6th Africa Forum</p> <p>Sector Wide Approaches: Do they really help the poor? 13-16 Nov 2001, Accra, Ghana.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD</p>	<p>The forum presented a overview of the SWAp and PRSP processes so far and tried to address the scope for sector programmes as implementation pillars of over-arching PRSPs. Special attention was given to experiences under SWAp of involving civil society in planning and implementation and to what extent these good and bad practices can act as lessons for PRSPs’.</p>
<p>5th Africa Forum</p> <p>Sector Wide Approaches: Still on course or heading for collapse? 13-17 Nov 2000 Harare, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>GTZ</p>	<p>Along with an accelerated rate of SP implementation across Africa, the disappointment with the actual results seemed to be growing. Based on an analysis of winners and losers of the SWAp process, special attention was given to how to make SWAp work better for non-state actors and at decentralised levels.</p>
<p>4th Africa Forum</p> <p>Participation in Sector Programmes. 20-23 Sep 1999, Lusaka, Zambia.</p> <p>GTZ – IFAD</p>	<p>The scope was expanded from a focus on agriculture to a focus on cross-sector operational challenges based on a realisation that many of the practical constraints to implementation (eg institutional reform, decentralisation) are not experienced by agricultural sector alone, but are common also in health and education.</p>
<p>3rd Africa Forum</p> <p>Training Workshop on Sector Programmes in Agriculture. 28 Sep– 1 Oct 1998, Harare, Zimbabwe.</p> <p>GTZ – WB</p>	<p>This workshop built on the capacity of practitioners with respect to implementing Agricultural SPs. Participants came from countries with ASIPs in progress and from countries where these were only at a planning stage in order to make optimum use of lessons learned.</p>
<p>2nd Africa Forum</p> <p>International Workshop on Agricultural Sector Investment Programmes. 12-14 Nov 1997, Lilongwe, Malawi. WB – GTZ</p>	<p>This meeting focussed on the institutional framework and institutional reforms as part of the ASIP process. Stakeholder participation was addressed and the majority of participants were from ASIP implementing countries.</p>
<p>1st Africa Forum</p> <p>International Workshop on Sector Programmes in Agriculture. 12-14 Feb 1997, Lusaka, Zambia.</p> <p>WB – IFAD – GTZ</p>	<p>This was the first international meeting on ASIPs held in sub-Saharan Africa. Most of the discussion revolved around definitions of SPs and required pre-conditions. The meeting stressed the need for further networking and thus provided the impetus for the subsequent annual event.</p>

Annex 2 Programme of the 9th Africa Forum, Ouagadougou, 2005

Monday 19 September 2005		
Background and introduction	8:30	Peter Conze, Director Africa Division, GTZ Eschborn, Germany
A Word of Welcome	9:00	Christoph Kohlmeyer, German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), Germany
Official opening of the 9 th Africa Forum	9:30	Hon Salif Diallo, Secretary of State and Minister of Agriculture, Burkina Faso
Introduction		
The role of agriculture in the Millennium Development Goals	10:30	Christoph Kohlmeyer, for the Global Donor Platform on Rural Development
Supporting Agriculture: the Programme Based Approach	10:50	Désirée Dietvorst, consultant, Namibia
A synthesis of key findings from agriculture PBAs in Africa	11:10	Samuel Asuming-Brempong, University Legon, Accra, Ghana
<i>Round tables discussion and Q&A with presenters</i>	11:30	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
LUNCH		
Agricultural Programmes		
The Agriculture Sector Programme (CPSA) in Burkina Faso : processes and perspectives	13:30	Salif Guigma, Head of the Agricultural Policy Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Burkina Faso
ProAgri II: Building on achievements made and lessons learnt in Mozambique	13:50	Rodney Reviere, advisor to the Ministry of Agriculture, Mozambique
The Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture; the Kenyan way towards a sector wide approach	14:10	James E.O. Ongwae, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya
<i>Round tables discussion and Q&A with presenters</i>	14:30	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Policies and platforms		
The Agricultural Policy of the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA)	16:00	Roger Kaboré, Director Agriculture Division, West African Economic and Monetary Union
Alignment of Sector Programmes with National Poverty Reduction Strategies - Findings of the Sector Support Working Group of SPA	16:20	Georg Schaefer, for the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA)
<i>Round tables discussion and Q&A with presenters</i>	16:40	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Cocktail		

Tuesday 20 September		
Introduction	8:00	Moderators
Access to land		
Access to land and poverty reduction strategies: experiences from francophone West Africa	8:30	Hubert Ouédraogo, consultant, Burkina Faso
Equitable access to land and efforts towards policy or programme based support in Namibia	8:50	Eric Ndala, Dir Planning and Sam Kapiye, Department Dir Land Use and Planning, Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, Namibia
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel with presenters 'Land'</i>		<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Access to labour		
HIV/AIDS coping strategies as part of a national programme in rural development; the case of Zambia	11:00	Petronella Lubasi, Social and Technical Extension Specialist, Southern Province, Ministry of Agriculture, Zambia
Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS mitigation measures: Part A: the case of Mpumalanga Province in South Africa	11:20	M.C. Magagula, Director Strategy, Planning & Policy, Office of the Premier, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa
<i>Round Table session</i>	11:40	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
LUNCH		
Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS mitigation measures: Part B: approaches and achievements by the Sector Network Rural Development.	13:30	J. L. Grimm, GTZ-Adviser, Office of the Premier, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel with presenters 'Labour'</i>	13:50	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Access to capital		
Access to rural finance for farmers' associations at local levels in Burkina Faso	15:30	Christophe Yameogo, CPCE (Provincial Frame of Cooperation and Exchange) / World Bank
The Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture: the case of rural finance in Uganda	15:50	Carol Kego Laker, PMA Secretariat, Uganda
<i>Round Table session and Q&A Panel presenters 'Capital'</i>	16:10	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>

Wednesday 21 September		
Introduction	8:00	Moderators
Access to services and inputs		
Improving access to services in Programme-Based Approaches	8:20	Andrea Wetzler, GTZ, Eschborn
PPPs in the context of Agricultural Programmes: What have we learned and what is left to do?	8:40	Hartwig Rupp, PPP Regional Coordinator Africa, GTZ; Geneviève Compaoré Ministry of Trade and Promotion of Private Sector; J-B Zoma, PAF
<i>Round Table and Q&A session</i>	9:10	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Parallel Session A (plenary room)		
Aligning agricultural initiatives under the Agricultural Sector Development Programme in Tanzania ; implications for service provision	10:30	Hirofumi Hoshi, JICA, Tanzania
Empowering farmers to access inputs and markets - the case of the Farmer Based Organisations Development Fund in Ghana	10:50	Emmanuel Dormon, FBO Coordinator and Dr. Kwame Amezah, Director; Agricultural Extension Services, Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ghana
Managing the cereal chain: supporting the production, purchase, storage and sale of cereals through a union of farmers' associations in Burkina Faso	11:10	Nonyeza Bonzi, Union of Associations for the Commercialisation of Agricultural Products in the Mouhoun River Region (UGCPA-BM), Burkina Faso
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel</i>	11:30	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Parallel Session B (break-away room)		
The challenge of decentralised service management: experiences from Malawi's Agricultural Sector Investment Programme (MASIP)	10:30	Ian Kumwenda, MASIP Desk, Malawi
Farming is a business: Commercialisation of Smallholders and expansion of large-scale farming in Zambia	10:50	Masiye Nawiko and Klaus Droppelmann, Agriculture Consultative Forum, Zambia
Institutionalizing demand-led service provision systems in South Africa	11:10	Ephenia Kganyago, Senior Manager, Limpopo Department of Agriculture, South Africa
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel</i>	11:30	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
LUNCH	12:30	
Field Trips	13:30	

Thursday 22 September		
Introduction	8:00	Moderators
Feedback from the Field trips	8:30	
Domestic marketing		
Trade policies and agricultural development in Senegal : does domestic market protection work?	9:30	Cheikh Tidiane Dieye, editor of 'Passerelles Enda Tiers Monde', Senegal
Cash transfers as a means to increase food security whilst supporting local maize markets; experiences from Zambia	9:50	Mwape Walumba, Provincial Social Welfare Officer, Southern Province, Min of Social Welfare and Community Development, Zambia
Promoting market access by supporting local enterprises and producers' associations in Burkina Faso	10:10	Vincent Duermael, Entreprise de Services aux Organisations de Producteurs (ESOP), Burkina Faso
International trade policies		
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel</i>	11:00	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
Fair trade initiatives: are they sustainable and do they offer a solution to resource constraints? Evidence from Southern Africa	12:00	Andrew Charman, consultant, South Africa
Small Holder Farmers on the Way to Global Market: the role of Development Partners and Governments, the case of Kenya	12:20	Agayo Ogambi, National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Kenya
<i>Round Table session and Q&A panel</i>	12:40	<i>All participants, moderators and rapporteurs</i>
LUNCH		
Open Space		
The "Power of One" ; "Two is a Debate" and "Vote with your Feet"	15:00	<i>All participants</i>
Social Dinner		

Friday 23 September		
Introduction	8:00	Moderators
Open Market: Reporting back from Open Space	8:30	<i>all participants</i>
Wrapping up and linking up		
Summary of findings of the forum	9:30	Desirée Dietvorst
Where do we go from here? Linking the Africa Forum to national and international discussions on PBAs and rural development	10:30	Plenary discussion
Evaluation and next steps		
Suggestions for theme and topics for the 10 th Africa Forum	11:15	<i>all participants</i>
Forum evaluation	11:45	<i>all participants</i>
Closure		
Merci, Merci! Thank you to all organisers and assistants	12:00	Reimund Hoffman, WG Speaker, WG Sector Reform and Rural Development, SNRD
A few last words...	12:15	James E.O. Ongwae, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya
Official closure of the 9 th Africa Forum	12:30	Salif Guigma, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, Burkina Faso
LUNCH		
<i>Participants depart</i>		

Annex 3 Descriptions of Fieldtrips

Fieldtrip 1: Livestock Production and Breeding (Loumbila)

The slaughterhouse of Ouagadougou

Times are not easy at present for the refrigerated slaughter house of Ouagadougou: a process of privatisation is taking place and the slaughter house is still facing the competition from butchers who slaughter secretly. We will visit the slaughter house's facilities (renewed recently) and have a discussion with the director.

The insemination centre in Loumbila

The Ministry of Animal Resources has a centre of insemination in Loumbila, some 15 km north of Ouagadougou. The objective is to develop breed producing more milk and meat, but being adapted to the climate of Burkina Faso. The director of the centre will make a tour with us. Near the insemination centre, the Ministry of Agriculture has an experimental seeding farm. We will make a stop there before going to the last destination of the field trip.

Le « Cabri de Loumbila »

The Cabri de Loumbila is not only a bar-restaurant and a tourist site just outside Ouagadougou, but it is also a farm producing mainly sheep cheese that can be bought there or at the big supermarkets of the capital. At this place we will end our fieldtrip.

Fieldtrip 2: Shea-butter (Tanghin-Dassouri)

« Karilor »-Entreprises

Karilor is one of the biggest producers of shea-butter cosmetics in Burkina Faso. We will visit their principal shop and their production chain in the quarter called « Gounghin » in Ouagadougou. The director will guide us and answer our questions.

Association « Ragoussi » at Tanghuin- Dassouri

Tanghuin-Dassouri is a nearby village of Ouagadougou. The women of this village have founded the association « Ragoussi » to better organise the collection and transformation of shea-nuts and to strengthen their capacities in commercialisation. They will give us a presentation of their activities and they will discuss with us.

The crocodiles of Bazoulé

The pond of Bazoulé is one of the well known cultural and tourist attractions in the Ouagadougouarea . The crocodiles in this pond are considered as sacred. The youth of the village has founded an associa-tion to better organise the marketing of the pond. They control the access; they run a handcraft store and a small bar-restaurant. There, we will end the field-trip.

Field trip 3: Cotton (Saponé / Possomtenga)

« Fasocoton »-Entreprise at Ouagadougou

The « FasoCoton »-enterprise took over the activities of the former state company "SOFITEX" in 2004. « FasoCoton » concentrates its activities in the area around Ouagadougou. « FasoCoton » organises the production of cotton by giving inputs and credits to producers' associations. Then, it organises the transport of the cotton from the villages to the headquarters in Ouagadougou and it ensures the processing. We will speak to the director and visit the facilities (even if they are still under repair).

The Association of Cotton Producers in Saponé

This association is one of many that work with « Fasocoton ». The farmers have cotton fields of 1 or 2 hectares. They started cultivating cotton only in 2004, when Faso-Coton began its activities. We will visit a cotton field near the road and discuss with the president and members of the association on their practical experience.

Association « Etoile de Coton » (« Cotton Star »)

The « Etoile de Coton » is an association of women of different villages producing cotton and weaving cotton cloth. The association manages a shop in Possomtenga, a little village at the fringes of Ouagadougou. We will visit the weavers' workshops, discuss with the women and make a tour to the shop...

Home cooked and open-air meal

After our visit, the women will prepare a little meal that will be served under a shed.

Fieldtrip 4: Land Tenure and Land Rights & Fish-breeding (Rapadama – Ziga)

The Project for Rural Tenure Rights in Mogtedo

Le « Projet du Foncier Rural » (Project for Rural Tenure Rights) is an institution of the Ministry of Agriculture to manage problems of tenure rights. The most burning questions are the equitable access to land (between young and old, men and women) and conflicts between shepherds and farmers. We will meet beneficiaries of the project and we will discuss with them.

The Dam of Ziga and the fish-breeding-station

The Dam of Ziga has been one of the biggest constructions realized in Burkina Faso in recent years. It is situated some 30 km east of Ouagadougou and it should ensure in the first place the water resources of the capital. But at the same time, lots of activities are starting around the dam. We will visit the fish-breeding-station near the dam, built by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2004.

Camping le Pharaon

On our way back to the capital, we will make a little stop at a simpatico restaurant: the Camping le Pharaon.

Annex 4 List of participants

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
Charman Andrew	Afrique du Sud	Consultant	Consultant	Tél : +27-21-7625177	ajec@zsd.copa
Grimm L. Josef	Afrique du Sud	GTZ-MRDP (Mpumalanga Rural Development Programme)	Program Coordinator	Tél : +27-82-881-5917 Fax : +27-82-881-5917	gtz@gtz-mrdp.co.za josef.grimm@gtz.de
Kganyago Ephenia	Afrique du Sud	Limpopo Department of Agriculture	Senior Manager : District Services & Agriculture	Tél : +27-15-632-5529 / 082-809-5630	ephenia@agricho.norprov.gov.za
Magagula M. Charles	Afrique du Sud	Mpumalanga Provincial Government	Directorate Macro Policy & Planning Unit	Tél : +27-13-766-2386 / +27-82-822-6065 Fax +27-13-766-2499	cmagagula@.mpg.gov.za
Ramaru Johannes Malose	Afrique du Sud	Limpopo Department of Agriculture	Deputy Manager	Tél. : + 27-15-295-7090 Fax : +27-15-295-7028/27	ramarujm@agricho.norprov.gov.za pier-paolo.ficareli@gtz.de
Albert Helmut	Allemagne	GTZ	Coordinator Trade Program	Tél.: + 49-6196-7980-1480	helmut.albert@gtz.de
Conze Peter	Allemagne	GTZ	Director General, Africa Department	Tél : +49-6196-791901 Fax : +49-6196-797175	peter.conze@gtz.de
Graefen Christian	Allemagne	GTZ	Project Manager	Tél :+49-6196-791481	christian.graefen@gtz.de
Kessler Christoph	Allemagne	KFW		Tél.: +49-6967430 Fax.: +49-69-7431-2944	christoph.kessler@kfw.de
Kohlmeyer Christoph	Allemagne	BMZ	Chef du Departement Agriculture	Tél.: +49-1888-535-0 Fax: +49-1888-535-3500	christoph.kohlmeyer@bmz.bund.de
Kressirer Robert	Allemagne	GTZ Head Office	Priority Area Manager Rural Development	Tél : +49-6196-791429 Fax : +49-6196-796103	robert.kressirer@gtz.de
Mohr Ulrich	Allemagne	GTZ	Chef du Departement Agriculture, Sécurité Alimentaire et Pêche	Tél : +49-6196-7914-20 Fax : +49-6196-7961-03	ulrich.mohr@gtz.de
Orphal Jana	Allemagne	GTZ, Sector Project Land Management	Project Officer	Tél : +49-6196-791482 Fax : +49-6196-796103	jana.orphal@gtz.de
Rupp Hartwig	Allemagne	GTZ-PPP-Project	Regional Coordinator PPP-Africa	Tél : +49-6196-791043 Fax : +49-6196-801043	hartwig.rupp@gtz.de
Sackniess Lutz	Allemagne	INWENT	Chef de Projet	Tél : +49-8157-938105 Fax : +49-8157-938777	lutz.sackniess@inwent.org
Schäfer Georg	Allemagne	GTZ Eschborn	Gruppenleiter OE 1002, Economist,	Tél : +49-6196-791556 Fax : +49-6196-	georg.schaefer@gtz.de

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
			Regional Project "Support to African Initiatives"	796148	
Wetzer Andrea	Allemagne	GTZ, SV "Wissenssysteme im ländlichen Raum"	Assistante Technique	Tél : +49-6196-791442 Fax : +49-6196-797162	andrea.wetzer@gtz.de
Werner Jutta	Allemagne	GTZ/Tchad	Conseillère Technique	Tél : +49-3044-718881	jutta.werner@gtz.de
Wilcke Angelika	Allemagne	redaction "Entwicklung & ländlicher Raum"	Editor	Tél : +49-6924-788465	a.wilcke@dlg.org
Sturesson Peter	Belgique	European Commission	Sr. Administrative Officer	Tél : +32-2-2991540 Fax : +32-2-2995734	peter.sturesson@cec.ev.int
Fandohan Sylvestre	Bénin	CIDR		Tél : +229-30-44-15/ 30-70-08 Fax : +229-30-44-16	procgrn@leland.bj
Mutlu Petra	Bénin	GTZ	Coordinatrice ProCGRN	Tél : 229-30-44-15	petra.mutlu@gtz.de
Bayala B. Stephane	Burkina Faso	FIAB	Secrétaire Permanent	Tél : +226-50-36-82-09 / 76-61-10-13 Fax : +226-50-36-82-09	fiab@zcp.bf / fiab@cenatrin.bf
Badolo Adolphe	Burkina Faso	PNDSA II	Nutritionniste	Tél : +226-50-31-78-20 Fax : +226-50-31-25-27	adbado@ yahoo.fr
Badolo Gaspard	Burkina Faso	Assemblée Nationale	Président CODE	Tél : +226-70-21-00-46	pas de e-mail
Bagué Daouda	Burkina Faso	SAME	Directeur	Tél : +226-40-55-06-72 / 70-25-58-75	pabo@fasonet.bf
Bahm Andrea	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDA	Coordinatrice	Tél : +226-50-33-19-10 / 70-21-45-30 Fax : +226-50-31-08-73	andrea.bahm@gtz.de
Banaon Sary	Burkina Faso	CEFRAP	Chef de Service Etude et Prospection	Tél : +226 -50-37-85-94 Fax : +226-50-37-85-97	cefrap@zcp.bf
Bengaly Abdoulaye	Burkina Faso	Consult Conseil / Bureau d'étude	Consultant	Tél : +226-50-39-32-03 / 76 -60-94-09	bengalyazizl@ yahoo.fr
Biego Samssonna	Burkina Faso	CTRAPA	Directeur	Tél : +226-50-36-54-89 / 76-62-51-14	biegosamson@liptinfor.bf
Bikienga Issa Martin	Burkina Faso	CILSS	Secrétaire Exécutif Adjoint	Tél : +226-50-37-41-25 Fax : +226-50-37-41-32	issa.bikienga@cilss.bf
Bonzi Nonyeza	Burkina Faso	UGCPA / BM	Président	Tél : +226-20-52-01-90 / 70-27-27-68 Fax : +226-20-52-03-74	bnonyeza@ yahoo.fr
Compaoré Marie Genevière	Burkina Faso	Ministère du Commerce	Directrice de la Coordination et de l'Assistance	Tél : +226-50-30-73-42 / 50-38-21-67 /	compaoregenevieve@ yahoo.fr

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
			au Secteur Privé	70-23-23-93	
Compaoré / Koulibaly Placide Y.	Burkina Faso	Afrique Verte Burkina	Responsable Formation	Tél : +226-50-34-11-39 Fax : +226-50-34-36-24	afrique.verte@liptinfor.bf
Cupillard Matthieu	Burkina Faso	APB / DED	Assistant Technique	Tél : +226-40 77 95 08 / 76 68 55 30	apb@fasonet.bf
Dabiré A. Bernard	Burkina Faso	PAFASP	Assistant au Coordonnateur PAFASP	Tél : +226-50-30-42-79	atamanabd@liptinfor.bf
Dagano M. Joseph	Burkina Faso	FEPPASI	Président des Agriculteurs	Tél : +226-50-41-34-56/80 / 76-60-69-29	sissilivalakou@fasonet.bf
Delisle Yves	Burkina Faso	Coopération Autrichienne	Chargé de Programme DR	Tél : +226-50-31-28-44 Fax : +226-50-31-28-45	yves-delisle@coopaut.bf
Diallo Sabine	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDDC	Coordinatrice Pôle Concentration Décentralisation Coopération Allemande	Tél : +226-50-30-28-04	sabine.diallo@gtz.de
Djibo Ousmane	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDA	Conseiller Technique en Financement	Tél : 226-50-33-19-10 / 70-21-61-91 Fax : +226-50-31-08-73	ousmane.djibo@gtz.de
Duermael Vincent	Burkina Faso	Projet CIDR - Projet ESOP	Chargé de Programme	Tél : +226-50-36-34-52 Fax : 226-50-36-34-52	cidresop@liptinfor.bf
Furukawa Kae	Burkina Faso	JICA/JOCV	Chargé de Programme	Tél : +226-76-68-58-33 Fax : +226-20-97-12-00	jocv-bobo@fasonet.bf
Gentges Susanne	Burkina Faso	DED	Directrice	Tél : +226-50-34-28-44 / 50-34-22-81 Fax : +226-50-34-00-59	ded@fasonet.bf
Goungounga Justin	Burkina Faso	SP/CONEDD	Coordonnateur Technique et Administratif	Tél : +226-50-31-24-64 / 70-23-75-79	jgoungounga@yahoo.fr
Grell Hermann	Burkina Faso	MA CILSS/GTZ et Büroleiter	AP + AV	Tél : +226-50-31-16-72	hermann.grell@gtz.de
Guigma Salif	Burkina Faso	SP/CPSA	Directeur Departement de l'Agriculture (Ministère de l'Agriculture)	Tél : +226-76-65-32-86 Fax : +226-50-31-47-73	sguigma.sp-cpsa@cenatrin.bf salifg@yahoo.fr
Janus Hartmut	Burkina Faso	Projet Conseiller Technique en relation avec le MEF	Conseiller Technique Principal	Tél : +226-50-33-60-92 / 70-20-06-66	hartmut.janus@gtz.de
Kaboré Agnès	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDA	Assistante à la Coordination du Programme	Tél : +226-50-33-19-10 Fax +226-50-31-08-73	agnes.kabore@gtz.de
Kaboré Alexis	Burkina Faso	Agence CORADE	Directeur	Tél : +226-50-30-73-28 Fax : +226-50-30-73-	corade@fasonet.bf

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
				29	
Kaboré Roger	Burkina Faso	UEMOA	Chargé de l'Agriculture / Secrétaire Permanent du Programme Régional de Sécurité Alimentaire	Tél : +226-50-31-88-74 / 76-64-17-14	roger.kabore@uemoa.ent
Ki Charles Aimé	Burkina Faso	Mutuelle d'Epargne et Crédits de Toma	Tresorier	Tél : +226-20-53-61-07	pas de e-mail
Kogachi Aki	Burkina Faso	PNUD	Assistante de Programme Environnement	Tél : +226-50-30-67-62/64	aki.kogachi@undp.org
Konaté Adama	Burkina Faso	BUNASOLS	Directeur Général	Tél : +226-50-36-18-85 / 70-27-85-87	damuskonate@yahoo.fr
Koné Sibiri	Burkina Faso	Autorité du Liptako-Gourma	Ingénieur Agronome	Tél : +226-50-30-61-48/49 / 70-26-25-57	s_kone55@yahoo.fr
Koyara Marie-Noël	Burkina Faso	FAO	Représentante	Tél. : +226-50-30-60-67/58	fao-bfa@fao.org
Malgoubri M. Eugenie	Burkina Faso	STC-PDES / MEDEV	Chargée de Programme	Tél : +226-50-32-43-62 / 76-61-93-85	eugeniemalgoubri@yahoo.fr
Nana Issoufou	Burkina Faso	DEP/MRA	Chargé de Suivi Evaluation	Tél : +226- 50-32-60-49 / 70-29-14-10	issoufounana@hotmail.com
Nishiyama Noriyuki	Burkina Faso	Japon International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Expert de l'Agriculture	Tél : +226-50-34-65-23 / 78-83-36-75 / Fax : +226-50-36-65-20	nishiyama@cenatrin.bf
Ouattara Seriba	Burkina Faso	Ministère du Commerce	Directeur Général du Commerce	Tél : +226-50-32-60-04 / 70 27 21 87 Fax : +226-50-32-60-04	mcia@cenatrin.bf seouatt@hotmail.com
Ouédraogo Jacob	Burkina Faso	PICOFA	Coordonnateur	Tél : +226 40-77-11-72 / 70-21-62-40 Fax : 40-77-11-72	jacobouedra@yahoo.fr
Ouédraogo Albert	Burkina Faso	Premier Ministère	Attaché de Mission	Tél : +226-50-32-48-89/90/91	bertoued@yahoo.fr
Ouédraogo B. Oumar	Burkina Faso	MAHRH	Directeur DEP	Tél : +226-50-32-41-01 Fax : +226-50-30-81-13	depmahrh@fasonet.bf
Ouédraogo Hubert	Burkina Faso	Cabinet juridique DID	Consultant international	Tél.: +226-50-31-30-33 / 70-20-33-47	o.hubert@fasonet.bf hodrago@yahoo.fr
Ouédraogo Mahama	Burkina Faso	African Union - SAFGRAD	Chargé de Recherche et Programme	Tél : +226-50-30-60-71 Fax : +226-50-31-15-86	mahamao.safgrad@cenatrin.bf
Ouédraogo Nabyouré	Burkina Faso	SP/CPSA	Chargé d'Etudes	Tél : +226-50-31-84-61	onisnaby@yahoo.fr
Ouédraogo Saïdou	Burkina Faso	Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Burkina	Directeur du Réseau et Développement	Tél : +226-50-30-48-41 Fax : +226-50-30-49-10	fcpb@cenatrin.bf
Outmani	Burkina Faso	PDES II (MRA)	Conseiller	Tél : +226-40-56-	outmania@fasonet.bf

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
Abderrahmane			Technique	00-90 / 76-63-54-64 Fax +226-40 56 00 90	
Rouamba Pascal	Burkina Faso	Coopération Suisse	Chargé de Programme	Tél : +226-50-30-67-29 Fax : +226-50-31-04-66	ouagadougou@sd.net pascal.rouamba@sd.net
Sana Oumarou	Burkina Faso	MRA / DGPA	Chef de Service	Tél : +226-50-30-66-88 / 70-26-99-44	sanaoumarou@yahoo.fr
Sanon Boureima	Burkina Faso	U.N.P.C.B.	Coordonnateur	Tél : +226-20-97-33-10 Fax : +226-20-97-20-59	unpcb@fasonet.bf
Sanon Komo Bruno	Burkina Faso	DRAHRH -Hauts Bassins	Suivi Evaluation DRAHRH/HTS. BS	Tél : +226-20-97-11-48 / 76-68-58-77 Fax : +226-20-97-18-23	haubas@fasonet.bf
Sawadogo Boukary	Burkina Faso	Chambre de Commerce d'Industrie et d'Artisanat	Economiste	Tél : +226-50-30-61-14/15 Fax : +226-50-30-61-16	b_ksaw@yahoo.fr
Sawadogo Issa	Burkina Faso	DEP/Ministère des Ressources Animales	Chargé d'Etudes	Tél : +226-50-31-06-93 / 70-72-13-63	is.sepdep@mra.gov.bf
Sigouaida Martin	Burkina Faso	C.P.F.	Membre	Tél : +226-76-47-37-02	cbpf_apcf@yahoo.fr
Sissoko Keffing	Burkina Faso	CILSS	Expert Agro Economiste	Tél : +226-50-37-41-25 Fax : +226-50-37-41-32	keffings@yahoo.fr
Somda Marcel	Burkina Faso	Banque Agricole et Commerciale du Burkina (BACB)	Conseiller du Directeur Général	Tél : +226-50-33-33-33 Fax : +226-50-31-43-52	bacb@bacb.bf
Somé François De Sales	Burkina Faso	Conseil des Oléagineux du Burkina (COB)	Responsable de la Commission Technique	Tél : +226-50-31-13-01 / 70 21 52 63 Fax : +226-50-31-40-43	shekinfa@yahoo.fr
Somé Jules	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDA	Coordinateur Adjoint	Tél : 226-50-33-19-10 / 70-21-45-30 Fax : +226-50-31-08-73	jules.some@gtz.de
Sorgho Georges	Burkina Faso	DEP/MECV	Ingénieur des Eaux et Forêts	Tél : +226-50-32-40-74 / 70-26-50-04	georgesmo2@yahoo.fr
Tapsoba François	Burkina Faso	MACILSS	Economiste	Tél : +226-70-26-23-91 Fax : +226-50-31-16-72	francois_tapsoba@yahoo.fr
Tougma Eloi	Burkina Faso	ATC/B	Secrétaire Général		atcb@fasonet.bf
Tougma Yemdaogo	Burkina Faso	SP/PPF	Chargé d'Etudes	Tél : +226-50-30-12-64 Fax : +226-50-30-12-63	ytougma@hotmail.com
Traoré B. François	Burkina Faso	UNPCB	Président	Tél : +226-20-97-33-10 Fax : +226-20-97-20-	unpcb@fasonet.bf

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
				59	
Traoré D. Jules	Burkina Faso	APIPAC	Secrétaire Exécutif	Tél : +226-50-34-52-99 / 70-20-06-00 Fax +226-50-34-15-49	apipac@fasonet.bf
Traoré Félicité	Burkina Faso	GTZ/PDA	Consultante en Développement des Filières	Tél : 226-70-21-05-70 Fax : +226-50-31-08-73	felitra@yahoo.com
Traoré Sami	Burkina Faso	IFDC	Coordinateur	Tél : +226-76-68-50-70 Fax : +226-50-37-49-69	straore@ifdc
Yameogo Christoph	Burkina Faso	PNDSA II	Chargé de Conduite et évaluation de Projets de Développement Rural	Tél : +226-70-30-17-23 Fax : +226- 50-31-78-20	yachrist2@yahoo.fr
Yameogo Wilfried	Burkina Faso	SP / Suivi filière Coton	Secrétaire Permanent	Tél : +226-50-33-58-93 Fax : +226-50-30-77-41	yamwilfried@yahoo.fr
Zembo Daniel	Burkina Faso	Coopération Canadienne	Conseiller Technique	Tél : +226-50-30-76-77 Fax : +226-50-30-06-56	daniel.zembo@uap-burkina .bf
Zoma Jean Baptiste	Burkina Faso	Projet d'Appui aux Filières Bio Alimentaires (PAF)	Directeur	Tél : +226 50 31 40 52/57 - 50-37-14-29 / 70-20-02-82 Fax : +226 50 30 15 53	pafbf@cenatrin.bf jbszoma@hotmail.com
Zomahoun Gilbert Honoré	Burkina Faso	DED Burkina Faso	Coordinateur "Secteur Développement Rural"	Tél : +226-50-34-28-44 / 50-34-22-81 Fax : +226-50-34-00-59	dedkor@liptinfor.bf
Zoungrana Mahama	Burkina Faso	DGPSA - MAHRH	Directeur Général de la Prévision et des Statistiques Agricoles	Tél : +226-50-32-45-77 Fax : +226-50-30-80-04	mazoung@fasonet.bf
Gwinner Joost	Cameroun	Reorientation of the Plant Protection Strategy	AV	Tél : + 237-770-23-61	joost.gwinner@gtz.de
Medou Jean Claude	Cameroun	Ministère de la Plannification	National Coordinator	Tél : +237-223-28-59 / 237-751-81-16 Fax : +237-223-97-49	jcmedou@yahoo.fr
Ngaleu Polycarpe	Cameroun	Planning Network & Consulting (PMC Sarl)	Ingénieur-Conseil, Directeur	Tél : +237-221-5851 / +237-986-3274 Fax : +237-220-9198	pnc.ngale@camnet.cm ngaleu_polycarpe@yahoo.com
Henry Daniel	Canada	ACDI	Conseiller développement rural /Agriculture	Tél. +1-819-994-4189 Fax : +1-819-994-6174	daniel_henry@acdi-cida.gc.ca
Ouattara Mamadou	Côte d'Ivoire	URECOS-CI	Directeur - Formation et	Tél : +225-05-91-22-21 Fax :	ouattmam2004@yahoo.fr

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
			Appui Cooperatif	+225-36-86-00-03	
Agobia Charles	Ethiopie	Canadian Int. Dev. Agency	Senior Food Policy Advisor	Tél : +251-1-715600 Fax : +251-1-715744	charles.agobia@cida-ecco.org
Abena A. Michael	Ghana		Department Reform Director of Agriculture	Tél : +233-71-22-983	maaddeh@yahoo.com
Adda da Michael	Ghana	Ministry of Agriculture (MOFA)	Regional Director of Agric, Northern region	Tél : +233-244-509658	maaddeh@yahoo.com
Amezah Kwame	Ghana	Ministry of Agriculture (MOFA)	Directorate of Agricultural Extension	Tél : +233-244-231-521 Fax : +233-216-65-282	kamezah@hotmail.com
Asuming-Brempong Samuel	Ghana	University of Ghana	Professor	Tél : +233-21-502258 Fax : +233-21-500629	samasum@ug.edu.gh
Diehl Lothar	Ghana	GTZ	GTZ-Programme Advisor MOAP	Tél : +233-244-912967 Fax : +233-21-671415	lothar.diehl@gtz.de
Gagnon Michel	Ghana	Agence Canadienne de Développement International	Directeur Adjoint-Programme de Accra	Tél : +233-21-228555 Fax : +233-21-773792	michel.gagnon@international.c1
Hudu Inusa	Ghana	Ministry of Agriculture (MOFA)			
Koranteng Nana	Ghana	CIDA / PSU	Consultant Food Security Advisor	Tél : +233-21-70-11528 Fax : +233-21-70-11572	nanak@cidapsu.org
Kurinaah Daniel	Ghana	Ministry of Agriculture (MOFA)		Tél : +233-020-82-51-290	
Otoo Lena	Ghana	Ministry of Agriculture (MOFA)	Assistant Director PPMED	Tél : +233-0244-389-922 Fax : +233-2166-8245/8	lena-otoo@yahoo.com
Robert Roxanne	Ghana	High Commission of Canada - CIDA	Second Secretary Development	Tél : +233-21-228-555 Fax : +223-21-773-792	roxanne.robert@international.gc.ca
Hoeffler Heike	Kenya	GTZ Kenya	Programme Advisor PSDA	Tél : +254-20-2722419 / +254-722-345301 Fax : +254-20-2722424	heike.hoeffler@gtz.de
Hoffmann Reimund	Kenya	GTZ SNRD Working Group on Sector Reforms	Speaker	Tél : +254-20-2713417 / +254-722-803882 Fax : +254-20-2718044	reimund.hoffmann@gtz.de
Karuri Philip	Kenya	Promotion of Private Sector Development in Agriculture	Counterpart - Programme Manager	Tel : +254-20-2713417 Fax : +254-20-2718044	p.karuri@gtzpsda.co.ke
Kimenyi Elizabeth	Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture	AG. Deputy Director-Sgribusiness	Tél : +254-20-2718870 ext. 48289/48392 Fax : +254-20-2711149	ewkimenyi@yahoo.com
Muhindi	Kenya	Ministry of	Senior	Tél : +254-271-	sbarasam@yahoo.com

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
Simon		Agriculture	Economist Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit	8870	
Mwanza Rosemary	Kenya	Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries Devt	Provincial Poultry Officer	Tél : +254-722- 76-30-39	mdunge-r@yahoo.co.uk
Ogambi Agayo	Kenya	Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Manager / Trade Expert	Tél : +254 -722- 970936 / +254-020- 220867 Fax : +254-020- 318367	agayoo@yahoo.com
Ongwae James E.O.	Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture	Permanent Secretary	Tél : +254-722- 52-3844 Fax : +254-202- 710-816	psagric@wananchi.com
Onyango Anne Akinyi	Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture	Coordinator Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit	Tél : +254-271- 8870 Ext.48024 / + 254- 0722782492 Fax : +254-271- 3619	ma@edcnet.zzn.com
Orina Margaret	Kenya	Promotion of Private Sector Development in Agriculture	Program Officer	Tél : +254-20- 271-6990 Fax : +254-20-271- 8044	m.orina@gtzpsda.co.ke
Kumwenda Ian	Malawi	MASIP	MASIP Coordinator	Tel : 017-55202 / 088- 24861 Fax : 017-52186	inkumwenda@malawi.net
Diarra Aminata	Mali	ONG AMEDD		Tél : +223-64-39 079 Fax : +223-26-40-962	aski2003@yahoo.fr
Sogoba Bougouna	Mali	ONG-AMEDD	Chef de Programme	Tél : +223-26-40- 962 / 64-74-732 Fax +223-26-40- 962	amedd@afribone.net.me bsogoba@hotmail.com
Tall Adama	Mali	Afrique Verte		Tél : +223-221- 97-60 Fax : +223-641- 18-74	afrique.verte@afribone.net.ml coopbomma@yahoo.fr
Kirsch Jung Karl P.	Mauritanie	GTZ		Tél : +222- 542546 Fax : +222- 542570	kakirsch@gtz.mr
Reviere Rodney	Mozambique	GTZ Rural Development Program in Mozambique	Programme Coordinator	Tél : +258-21- 305-505 Fax : +258-21-305-472	rodney.reviere@gtz.de
Dietvorst Desirée	Namibie	GTZ	Consultante	Tél : +264-61-22- 90-50 Fax : +264-61-22-90- 49	dd@salamandernet.de
Kapiye Samuel	Namibie	Ministry of Lands and Resettlement	Deputy Director	Tel : +264-61- 2852111 Fax : +264-61-231770	skapiye@namibia.com.na
Ndala Eric	Namibie	Ministry of Lands and Resettlement	Director	Tél : +264-61- 285-2269 / 61-271-464 Fax : +264-61- 248093	endala@mlrr.gov.na

Name	Country	Organisation	Position	Phone / Fax	E-mail
Pickardt Tanja	Namibie	GTZ	Associate Expert	Tél : +264-61-222447 Fax : +264-61-252458	tanja.pickardt@gtz.de
Steenkamp Johannes G. S.	Namibie	Ministry of Agriculture Water and Forestry	Directorate Extension and Engineering Services : Acting Director	Tél : +264 -61-2087493	extnwdir@iway.na
Behaim Dorith Von	Niger	GTZ, Programme Régional "Lutte Contre la Pauvreté, Tillabéri"	Coordinatrice	Tél : +227-722043 / 724548 Fax : +227-732629	dorith.von-behaim@gtz.de
Lossner Michael	Niger	Programme LUCOP (Lutte Contre la Pauvreté Tillabéri et Tahoua Nord)	Directeur Bureau GTZ Niger, Directeur du Programme LUCOP	Tél : +227-72-25-51 Fax : +227-73-26-29	michael.lossner@gtz.de
Stolz Tobias	Nigeria	Employment-oriented Private Sector Development Programme (EOPSD) / GTZ	BDS Advisor	Tél : +234-9-3149010 Ext. 213 Fax : +234-9-3143910 Ext. 226	tobias.stolz@gtz.de t.stolz@eopsd.net
Laker Kego Carol	Ouganda	PMA Secrétariat MAAIF	Social Development Specialist	Tél : +256-41-252263/4 11-428718 Fax : +256-41-252262	socdev@pma.go.ug
Werth Alexander	Ouganda	FATNEA/GTZ	Food and Trade Network for East Africa	Tél : +256-78-519225	alexanderwerth@gmx.de
Dieye Cheick Tidiane	Sénégal	ENDA Tiers Monde	Socio-Economiste du Développement	Tél : +221-537-2549 / +221-821-7037	dieye@hotmail.com syspro2@enda.sn
Hoshi Hirofumi	Tanzanie	Japon International Cooperation Agency (JICA)	Project Formulation Advisor (Agriculture Sector Programme)	Tél : +255-22-2113727 Fax : +255-22-2112976	hoshi.hirofumi@jica.go.jp
Droppelman Klaus	Zambie	Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF)	Monitoring and Evaluation	Tél : +260-(0)1-263083 Fax : +260-(0)1-263083	acfs@zamnet.zm klaus@coppernet.zm
Lubasi Petronella	Zambie	GTZ- Support Decentralised Rural Development	Social and Technical Extension Specialist	Tél : + 260/03-220530 / 220522, 220048 / 097563105 Fax : +2603220048	p.lubasi@sdrd.com.zm petronellalubasi@yahoo.co.uk
Nawiko Masiye	Zambie	Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF)	Programme Officer	Tél : +260-(0)1-280383 Fax : +260-(0)1-280383	acfs@zamnet.zm
Walumba Mwape E. Clement	Zambie	GRZ/MCDSS - Department of Social Welfare	Provincial Social Welfare Officer- South province Zambia	Tél : +260/03-321696 / 095-780373 Fax : +260-3-323880	mwapewalumba@yahoo.com socwel@zamnet.zm

Annex 5 Evaluation

	5	4	3	2	1	
	very much	much	more or less	little	very little	Average
Logistics						
information before hand	22	30	16	10	10	3,5
accomodation	49	18	8	3		4,4
working environment	45	35	3	1	1	4,4
translation	29	29	17	2	1	4,1
Flow of forum						
strucutre of programme	30	37	17	2	1	4,1
sequence of topics	25	43	16	2		4,1
Q&A	27	48	8	3		4,2
Moderation	35	44	9	3		4,2
duration	23	38	16	8		3,9
Forum methodology						
presentation	23	43	18	3		4,0
discussions	26	49	15	1		4,1
Q&A	16	45	20	4		3,9
Field trip	33	32	15	1		4,2
Open space	21	41	17	2	2	3,9
Open market	16	35	16	5		3,9
cocktail	35	35	13			4,3
Contents of sessions						
introduction	20	28	3	7	2	4,0
agricultural programmes	30	37	9	3	1	4,2
policies	12	48	12	8	2	3,7
access to land	8	47	17	9		3,7
access to labour	13	35	28	10	1	3,6
access to capital	11	40	19	11		3,6
access to services and inputs	11	42	25	8		3,7
domestic markets	9	43	24	7		3,7
international trade policies	13	38	20	4	1	3,8
wrapping up and linking	24	34	8	8		4,0
Expectations						
Understanding PBA theory	18	46	13	3		4,0
Getting PBA practical tools	4	41	32	2	1	3,6
Exchange PBA experience	27	37	16			4,1
Overall average						4.0

Comments by Participants

Anglophone Participants:

1. Power Point presentations should be available either electronically to the participants before their presentations → we struggled to take notes during the presentations and to listen at the same time
2. now that a website will be available sharing of the presentation papers beforehand would be useful. So that the country forums prepare their case studies for effective discussions
 - a. do not spend very high resources on hotel
3. 4,5 days is very long but good to give time to develop new ideas and get people to know, field trips are necessary to break the routine
 - a. "Death by power point is an actual risk to loose the audience (too much bullet pointing) but how to make it better? → capacity building on presentations
 - b. round table discussion followed by plenary was very good and effective
4. I think it would be nice if the recommendations of the forum could be implemented, evaluated in the host country. So that the forum outcome is realized. Thanks.
5. overall topic was double: access to resources AND Programme Based Approaches:
 - a. majority of the presentations were related with either one of the other topics but not both.
 - b. For the next forum: more factual experiences, less methodology.
6. share information early enough through the web
 - a. more case studies
7. more practitioners and also representatives of farmers who have benefited from PPP.
8. avoid too many connection flights to get to and from host country.
9. some presentations were very long, too much details, they should be more focused.
 - a. Maybe 4,5 days are too long (?)
 - b. I would be very happy to meet some participants from the private sector on the next forum
10. lunch/meals to be part of the program on arrival day and not waiting until conference starts
11. keep it up
12. reduce air condition
13. we need to have more people involved in practical experiences - some presentations were almost theoretical
14. I suggest that countries be represented by team of technical staff as well as political representatives to ensure continuation of dialogue and implementation of forum recommendations.
 - a. More success stories and good practices shared by those countries that have successfully implemented PBA.
 - b. It is important to evaluate how forum has impacted way of doing things in participating countries.
15. presenters made it difficult for the translators by talking fast. Presenters to be told before have about their speed.
 - a. The forum methodology especially discussions at the tables with participants from different countries was appreciated. Please ensure that during the next forum people from the same country do not sit at the same table.
 - b. The field trips were appreciated
 - c. Desiree did an outstanding job as well as the facilitators,

- presenters and organizers. Keep it up.
16. the participant should have the content of the presentation before the beginning.
 - a. The discussion time is not sufficient
 - b. Try to invite high authorities to assist and take care of what is done.
 - c. The results are very satisfactory
 17. have one extra day for excursions to mix participants and have more insight into host country
 - a. give more space to open space/open market sessions
 18. it could be rotated between the francophone and Anglophone countries in Africa
 19. I would suggest that round table sittings should be pre-arranged, so that proper mixing of different nationalities
 - a. During the opens and open market interpretation was very poor, especially from French to English.
 20. only 3 days; not 8-18.00 presentations
 21. could you include beneficiaries in these meetings for first hand information on whether they are benefiting
 - a. funding for participants should be clearly defined and payment should be source (country of origin) and realistic.
 22. more info on achievements and clear conclusions on experiences being shared
 23. the forum should circulate the discussion papers to participants in advance so that considerable preparation can be done
 - a. field trips should be more elaborate
 - b. consider inviting producers (farmers), private sector and civil society in the meetings
 24. invite participants on time (\pm 5 months in advance)
 - a. invite more presentations from one country
 25. the organization was very good. The next Africa Forum should be held in Kenya
 26. too sophisticated hotel
 27. the way the forum was organized didn't allow to deepen very much certain questions/topics
 28. oblige presenters beforehand to report about impact
 - a. the open markets was not very efficient
 - b. round table discussions are good, but vary the discussion method at times
 - c. "Fish bowl" in between?
 29. such fora should be discussing results of the programmes
 30. conference room was too cold
 31. accommodation not applicable 2x

Francophone Participants:

1. excellente presentation synthese de Desiree -bravo!
 - a. Le website est und indisponsable et tres attendu. Le bulletin est une excellente idee. Merci!
2. Des discussions "podium" sur des sujets controverse pourraient enrichir le Forum.
3. Tenir compte de la necesite de particiopation des operations privs.
4. bonne satisfaction de facon general.
 - a. Cependent tenir compte de l'emplacement du lieu d'hebergement qui me paraît un peu exeutique.
 - b. Informer a temps les participants pour une bonne preparation
5. enviter de loger les participanst auf forum loin des lieux ou ils peuvent
 - a. Facilement trouver des enchats pour diner sans moyens des transport le soir.
6. bravo a tous pour vos efforts. Et au plaisir te vous revoir next time. Merci.
7. l'organisation est parfaite, toutes mes felicitations et c..... deation que le seigneur vous benisse. Amen.
8. je suis tres satisfait de ce forum mais je souhaite a le prochain forum pouse aussi le recherche developpement applique RDA Merci.
9. ils faut choisir des personnes ressources capables de mieux documenter les experiences des pays pour eviter des frastarations par rapport a certaines thematiques.
 - a. On n'a pas besoin d'un cadre comme celui de l'hotel Sofitel 2000 pour mettre les participants dans les meilleurs conditions des traivail. On put utiliser la moite des frais d'hotel pour faire participer d'autres personnes. Surtout que nous sommes venue discuter
10. les participants locuax on ete informes 48 hours avant l'ouverture des travaux du forum. Cela n'est pas juste car limite la participations pousse de ces derniers.
11. je donhaite que les organisatuers se jenchent maintenant sur les actions concrete a mener pour realiser les attentes des productuers qui attendent beaucoup de les rencontres.
12. peu d'informations pour pouvoir se preparer
 - a. bien structure, un peu longue, roles des tables rondes pas assez claire
 - b. conclusions par etappes manquaient
 - c. themes cruciaux bein choisis, manque de conclusions pertinentes
13. parler des moyen et des engagements a prendre pour la reduction de la pauvrete : distribution des richesses, equite des chances, le pouvoir des elites, les inegalites....
14. le probleme de traduction m'a enfeche de bein m'___preferer des themes developpes qui sont a ___ tres interessantes.
15. pour les participants ratinnaux prendre en change leur deplacement (carburant) vu la longueur du forum
16. _____ plus a la liason entre le presentation et le theme global du forum : etre plus _____ !
 - a. Je n'etais pas du tout a l'air avec le fait de loger ce forum dans un hotel en la chambre coute 110Euro et parler au meme temps de l'eradiction de la pauvrete Je trouve c'est cinique !!
17. voir la _____ en charge de tous les participacnts.

18. faire participer beaucoup plus de secteur privé
19. dans la fiche d'invitation certaines modalités étaient prévues (puis en change). Dans la réalité ces engagements n'ont pas été respectés (non prise en compte des résidents de Ouagadougou ne serait-ce que le carburant pour le déplacement)
20. J'ai trouvé qu'il y a trop d'_____ a qui n'a pas permis de mener des échanges plus _____
21. le problème de longueur se pose lors des exposés - la traduction n'est pas parfaite et il y a des déperditions - les documents doivent être traduits en français pour permettre une meilleure participation.
 - a. Dans le site web prévoir des traductions des différents thèmes en français pour permettre une meilleure exploitation de ce site
22. les thèmes sont bien préparés et bien présentés
 - a. fallait aussi montrer très bien l'enchaînement logique des différents thèmes
 - b. servir du thé ou café au déjeuner les participants _____ souvent durant la _____ de l'après-midi
 - c. bien préparer la visite de sites
23. faire attention à la qualité des _____ et au _____
24. réduire le nombre de présentations pour avoir plus de temps à des discussions plus
25. pour un forum africain impliquer plus d'Africains dans l'organisation
 - a. à quoi vont servir les États émergents par les nationaux alors qu'ils n'ont rien perçu ???
26. faire en sorte que plus de pays africains participent _____ au Forum

Africain des pays Afrique du Nord, Central et de l'Est

 - a. prendre en charge les participants nationaux des pays organisateurs
27. Dans les discussions : les diriger vers la question de savoir la pertinence de la présentation pour PBA
 - a. Limiter la durée des présentations, p.ex. en limitant le nombre de diapos à 15
 - b. Un programme un peu moins chargé serait bien...
 - c. Une très bonne organisation - merci beaucoup !
28. certains exposés n'avaient pas de bien perceptible avec le thème. Il serait bon de « faire le _ » des présentations avant le forum
29. merci
30. peut-être que c'est long 4,5 jours
31. il faudrait aussi prendre en compte le niveau régional, en plus du niveau national et international notamment en matière d'accès aux marchés
32. avoir par e-mail le programme et si possible les présentations
 - a. avoir des présentations plus pertinentes par rapport au thème du forum
33. concernant la table ronde je vous conseille de considérer des personnes anglophones et ceux de francophones.
34. bien expliquer le thème général dans les invitations
 - a. si possible organiser des forums nationaux de préparation du Forum Africain
35. pour le prochain Forum je souhaite qu'il y ait moins de présentations pour permettre de débattre des sujets et de poser plus de questions