

SSA Chapter 5 Tables and Figures

Table 5.1 Identified challenges, options and examples

Challenges	Suggested Options	Examples in application in Africa and ROW
Lack of good governance	Political, Economic and Corporate	<p>NEPAD has shown that the need for a continental level of good governance was useful to ensure that pressure is put at the national level . APRM</p> <p>Sectoral peer review OECD and African governments</p>
<p>Ad hoc policy formulation resulting in disconnected and contradictory policies and programs at the national and regional levels.</p> <p>Lack of coherence of donor policies</p>	<p>Harmonisation of policies at the regional level</p> <p>Policy regulation, institutional and capacity building initiatives</p> <p>Networks or social groups validating innovations</p> <p>Effective collaborations or linkages for generation of knowledge</p>	<p>Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (FAO)</p> <p>AU is engaging in the rationalization of RECs</p> <p>National efforts are being made to try and harmonise the laws e.g. in Ghana</p> <p>Standardisation of laws and regulations through regional organisations like IGAD and COMESA for agricultural trade</p>
<p>Resources constraints, thus competition for various uses</p> <p>Poorly structured and poorly funded regional research and development</p>	<p>Collaboration amongst African partners, also with donors and policy makers from outside Africa</p> <p>Establishment of African Centres of Agricultural Research Excellence</p> <p>Decentralised management of public investment.</p> <p>Aid should be untied</p>	<p>AERC, Kigali Institute of Science and Technology, BioSciences Facility for Eastern and Southern Africa, NEPAD/CAADP, Maputo Declaration, FARA, ASARECA</p>
Spreading successful local and national experiences in food and agriculture	Increased investments in public institutions, public private partnerships, policy reforms	ADB, ASARECA, RUFORUM, ACBF
<p>Lack of effective frameworks and institutional infrastructure to govern generation, access and application of AKST.</p> <p>Failure to translate macro-economic policies to the grassroots level</p> <p>Weak institutions supporting smallholder farmers through research, extension and training</p>	<p>Collaboration of all actors</p> <p>Strengthening institutions in from of laws and regulations</p> <p>Social networks</p> <p>Indigenous institutions</p>	<p>Cartagena Protocol, AU Model Law on Biosafety, Sub-Saharan African Challenge Program</p>

Table 5.2 Contribution of African women to family livelihoods. Source: FAO, 2002a

Activity	Percent
General workforce	33
Agricultural workforce	70
Labour to produce food	60-80
Processing of food stuffs	100
Housing water and fuel wood collection	90
Food storage and transport	80
Hoeing and weeding	90
Harvesting	60

Box 5.1 Land Policy in Africa: A framework for Action. Source: [AU-ECA-ADB, 2006](#)

Under the leadership of the African Union (AU) and in close collaboration with the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and the African Development Bank (ADB), the Pan-African land initiative on land policy aims to develop a land policy and land reform framework and guidelines with a view to facilitating the formulation and implementation of land policies. The process of developing the framework and guidelines involves a series of sub-regional consultations that will ensure that regional realities and initiatives inform the continental framework. This consultative process, involving key stakeholders in land and natural resource issues, is vital to ensuring the necessary political will to the adoption and implementation of the framework and guidelines. It is envisioned that the framework and modalities for its implementation will be adopted by the AU Heads of States and Government Summit in 2007, and a mechanism for monitoring put in place, within the NEPAD/APRM framework.

Box 5.2 Traditional pastoralists approaches to managing grazing lands. Source: Ashby, 2001

“A classic example of a paradigm shift lies in the history of the management of African pastoral systems (Ellis and Swift 1988). Recommended methods of reducing overgrazing in these pastoral systems included group ranches, grazing blocks, and associations in which pastoralists were confined to particular tracts of land to better regulate the interaction between animals and plants and raise productivity. Over time, these new management methods were found to destabilize grazing systems that are characterized by intra-annual variability resulting from frequent drought. In contrast, pastoralists using traditional methods cope with multiyear drought by dispersing into small herds and groups over a wider area, thus expanding the spatial scale of exploitation. In nondrought periods, pastoralists ensure that unused space or an ungrazed reserve is available for periods of drought by stocking some areas in the ecosystem well below their average carrying capacity (undergrazing) while overgrazing others. This stabilizing mechanism relies on mobility, whereas the modern management strategy is based on confinement. In other words, recommendations that do not factor in variability and disturbance in the ecosystem often lead to long-term failure. Research had to define alternatives to conventional management of grazing systems that functioned at the ecosystem level, took into account hierarchies of interdependent subsystems, and were effective over the long term. Technical packages designed for a reduced spatial scale and short time horizon could not cope with the variability in the system, and indeed became associated with increased degradation in the long run (Ellis and Swift 1988).”

Box 5.3 New agricultural initiatives that seek to address AKST and natural resources

NEPAD Agriculture is one of NEPAD’s ten sectoral priorities, within which activities at the national and international level include protecting natural resources through proposed interventions such as integrated land and water management, on-farm and small-scale irrigation development, land improvement, and the upgrading and rehabilitation of existing large-scale irrigation projects (Njobe, 2003).

IFAD In west and central Africa, IFAD’s priorities include raising agricultural and natural resource productivity; and improving poor rural people’s access to, and management of, land and water. <http://www.ifad.org>.

FARA FARA’s Sub Saharan Africa Challenge Program (SSA CP) “aims to address the most significant constraints to reviving agriculture in Africa which it identifies as failures of agricultural markets, inappropriate policies and natural resource degradation with a new paradigm, Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D)”. FARA hopes further to “foster synergies among disciplines and institutions along with a renewed commitment to change at all levels from farmers to national and international policy makers.”

AHI The African Highlands Initiative (AHI), a collaboration among National Agricultural Research Institutes (NARIs), International Agricultural Research Centres (IARCs) and various NGOs, focuses on key natural resource management and agricultural productivity issues in the intensively cultivated highlands of East and Central Africa. The initiative aims to “development approaches and partnerships to develop and institutionalise effective and efficient approaches for sustainable integrated natural resource management (INRM) and enhanced productivity.... promoting integrated, inter-institutional research and development efforts with strong community participation to solve critical issues of soil productivity, water and land-use. (<http://www.africanhighlands.org/>).

DMP The Desert Margins Program (DMP), a collaborative effort convened by ICRISAT, aims to analyse the root causes of dryland degradation in Africa; document indigenous knowledge of sustainable practices; develop more sustainable practices; help governments design policies that encourage sustainable practices; enhance African institutional capacities for land degradation research and outreach; facilitate the sharing of technologies, knowledge and information; and forecast possible climate change scenarios for land use planning (the countries involved are Botswana, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Senegal, South Africa and Zimbabwe, <http://www.dmpafrica.net/index.htm>.)

Box 5.4 Lessons from South Africa. Source: Kamara and Sally, 2004

The 1998 National Water Act in South Africa aimed reach a balance between efficient and equitable water allocation, using a pro-poor “some for all” approach. Improving the productivity of water use in the agricultural sector – the biggest user of water – was seen to determine the extent to which the efficiency, equity, and sustainability objectives could be reached (Kamura and Sally, 2004). In 2000 the government decided that households would all get a 6000 litre per month allocation free, then water would be allocated to domestic uses such as smallholder livestock and small-scale gardening. After these needs were fulfilled, compulsory licensing was introduced to allocate water among other needs including larger-scale agriculture and forestry. Moreover, rather than considering conventional measures of agricultural water productivity such as “crop per drop” or “monetary value per crop”, other measures are included such as “jobs per drop”.

Box 5.5 Applying an “HIV lens”. Source: Gillespie, 2006

“An HIV lens would, for example, cause an agricultural commercialization policy to take account of the extra risks posed by evening markets and the need for people to travel far to sell their produce. In another example, in Lesotho, instead of pursuing an add-on activity such as distributing condoms along with agricultural extension messages, the Ministry of Agriculture and CARE are now focusing on improving the food and nutrition security of HIV-affected households and those struggling with other shocks and stresses of poverty. Another interesting example is Swaziland’s Indlunkhulu initiative. Indlunkhulu refers to the tradition of distributing food from the chief’s .elds to members of the community who are unable to support themselves. In Swazi law and custom, chiefs are responsible for the welfare of orphans within their area. Agricultural policy has built on this practice to provide a sustainable mechanism for delivering food to orphans and vulnerable children, providing initial agricultural inputs for the Indlunkhulu .elds, and developing the agricultural skills of older children who work in them. Agricultural knowledge can also be preserved through the development of HIV-aware and gender-proactive agricultural extension capacity. Farmer life schools, as pioneered in Cambodia and adapted in Kenya and Mozambique, can be developed to bridge gaps in intergenerational knowledge transfer. Capacity constraints may be bypassed through better communications, such as rural radio. There is clearly tremendous scope for agricultural policy to become more HIV-responsive, both to further AIDS-related objectives and to help achieve agricultural objectives. Yet there are no magic bullets. Land-labor ratios and the relative degree of substitutability between household resources, among other factors, will determine the possible responses to HIV/AIDS. If policy becomes more HIVresponsive, it will stay relevant and effective. By mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into the policy process and carefully monitoring the results, policymakers will help build up evidence of what works in different contexts, enhance learning, and ultimately leave people better equipped to address the multiple threats of the pandemic.”