

**Making CAADP Work for Women Farmers:
A review of progress in six countries**

April 2011

Introduction

The Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) aims to revitalize African farming in order to reduce rural poverty and hunger. This is a massively important undertaking for a continent where a third of the population continue to struggle with chronic malnutrition. But is CAADP getting the right strategies, policies and funding in place to deliver its vision?

This report, based on research into CAADP-aligned plans in six countries, carried out for ActionAid by Overseas Development Institute and the Future Agricultures Consortium, finds that the initiative is succeeding in generating renewed attention and ambition for agriculture - a sector that was neglected and close to collapse only a few years ago. Much-needed investments and important policy reforms are on the cards.

However, the CAADP plans we reviewed pay little attention to the needs and rights of women farmers, despite the fact that women grow up to 80 percent of the food in Africa. They are largely silent on the problem of climate change. In some cases, they lack a clear poverty focus. These gaps need to be closed: they could reinforce, rather than reducing, rural impoverishment. In addition, money for implementation is woefully inadequate. Both governments and donors need to act quickly to allocate the funds necessary to get the plans off the ground, or the momentum created in the first years of the initiative will never translate into practical gains for Africa's smallholder farmers.

Africa's agricultural development: Why women's rights matter

It is widely recognised that the agricultural sector has a crucial role to play in the long-term development of most African countries. With over 80 percent of the population in sub-Saharan Africa dependent on the sector for their livelihoods, equitable agricultural growth is the best chance of fighting poverty.

The vast majority of rural poor in Africa are smallholders and the majority of these smallholders are women. African farmers struggle with many constraints. Among them are lack of access to modern technologies, capital investments and supportive research; lack of participation in decision making; and vulnerability to ecological shocks.

Farmers who are women face the added burden of juggling multiple responsibilities and systematic prejudice in land rights and political representation. To boost the agricultural sector and reduce poverty requires us to understand the specific issues facing women farmers (and smallholder farmers in general) and develop policies that enhance their rights and meet their needs.

Closing the gender gap in agriculture could reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 12-17 percent, thereby reducing the number of hungry by at least 100 million people, according to the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).¹

Africa's agricultural development: Why climate adaptation matters

Global warming from climate change will hit African agriculture hard, as harsher, more frequent droughts and shorter growing seasons will reduce crop yields. Although some regions may benefit from warmer weather, crop yields are likely to fall by up to 50 percent in some African countries.² The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicts that climate change could put 50 million extra people at risk of hunger by 2020, rising to an additional 266 million by 2080.³

CAADP and the potential for change

According to the World Bank's 2008 World Development Report, new investment in African agriculture will not only help meet the demand for food, it will boost the continent's overall economic growth. GDP growth originating in agriculture is more than twice as effective in reducing poverty as growth deriving from other sectors, meaning that agriculture is also a long-term path out of poverty.⁴ For example, in Uganda, one percent growth in agricultural GDP leads to a reduction in poverty of between 0.64 and 1.38 percent.⁵

Despite the importance of the agricultural sector in tackling Africa's poverty and hunger, for decades the sector has stagnated due to chronic underinvestment, poor policies and incoherent strategies. The lack of investment and policy focus on women smallholders has been particularly acute. The impact of climate change and other ecological shocks on smallholder farmers and the implications this has for future food security in the region has also received insufficient attention.

Box 1: Closing the Gender Gap in Zambian agriculture

Zambia provides an excellent illustration of why closing the gender gap is crucial in tackling rural poverty in Africa. In Zambia, women farmers comprise around 70 percent of the agricultural workforce. They are the main producers of food and manage, either independently or jointly, around 60 percent of the land under local maize production. One in five farming households are women-headed, but due to lack of access to inputs and support services, they presently achieve only two-thirds of the production of men-headed households and own half the size of livestock. The average farm size of a female-headed household is 0.6 ha smaller than those of men-headed households.

CAADP was conceived by the African Union in 2003 as an ambitious and comprehensive attempt to help African countries reach higher economic growth through agriculture-led development, with the ultimate goal of eliminating hunger and reducing poverty. Since then, CAADP can be credited with changing the way in which national governments and donors approach agricultural development, while shifting focus back onto African agriculture as a key development pathway. Signatory countries also made important commitments through CAADP to increase spending on agriculture to 10 percent of overall budget and reach an agriculture growth rate of 6 percent per annum.

To date, 23 countries have completed the CAADP roundtable process - a country-led process that defines a strategy for reducing hunger and improving agricultural productivity through policy reform, as well as more and better investment in public resources. The aim is that these country-level processes lead to national compacts and ultimately to investment plans that are jointly owned by governments, donors, civil society organizations, the private sector and regional economic communities.

The strategy that underpins CAADP consists of four main policy pillars: 1) enhancing agricultural production and productivity; 2) ensuring sustainable land and water use; 3) providing improved access to markets; and 4) reducing food insecurity.

The integrated nature of the policy approach is clear. Policies and investments to improve the performance of Africa's agriculture require the use of improved technologies, as well as market development to ensure that producers will respond positively. Increases in

Women may end up being relegated to the category of the 'hungry and malnourished', as opposed to being recognised as key producers in their own right.

production require careful management of natural resources to ensure their future use. And above all, increased production must benefit those most vulnerable to hunger and poverty.

CAADP has already made major contributions to revitalizing African agriculture and one of its major initial successes has been to get commitments from African governments and aid donors to agree to increase public investment in agriculture. The question is whether the ambitious targets and plans can be fully

realized in the coming years, while also ensuring that the needs of the poorest and women farmers are met.

Worryingly, our research into CAADP plans in six countries (Malawi, Nigeria, Ethiopia and Tanzania, Kenya and Ghana) uncovered systematic policy neglect of women farmers and a failure to define robust climate adaptation strategies, as well as urgent gaps in funding. These shortcomings must be resolved quickly if CAADP is to make a real difference to poverty and hunger.⁶

Women and smallholders in CAADP policy guidelines

The CAADP policy approach is about transforming agriculture from subsistence production to farming as a business. This is to be achieved through a combination of agribusiness, efficient input use, market orientation and access, and increasing access to agricultural credit. The outcomes sought are increased productivity, commercialisation and competitiveness. ActionAid broadly accepts these strategies as a path to agriculture-led, inclusive growth. However, there is a risk that commercialisation for its own sake will drive implementation, unless poverty and hunger reduction objectives and the rights of women are clearly prioritised.

A close examination of the CAADP policy framework⁷ reveals that there is currently a lack of analysis of the specific needs of women and smallholders, as well as the best policy mechanisms for meeting their needs. The implementation frameworks for each of the pillars refer to 'smallholders' throughout, without adequate understanding or analysis of the way in which the needs of smallholders differ from larger producers or those of women from men.

To illustrate, in the policy framework for Pillar 1, the need for appropriate, low-cost sustainable land and water management technologies for smallholder use is highlighted without elaboration of the *specific* technological needs of women or the problems of participation and equity for women.

Furthermore, Pillar 2 emphasizes working with organised farmers, which is necessary to meet the volume and quantity needs of modern value chains. Improving market access and promoting competitiveness are emphasized. However, there is very little consideration of how these interventions will affect smallholders, women and youth, either positively or negatively. By the same token, there is also no mention of what models have been particularly effective in reaching women smallholders and unorganised farmers.

In addition, while Pillar 3 explicitly focuses on the "hungry and malnourished, particularly women and children, in order to integrate them into broad agricultural development", it does not recognize women as producers in their own right. If agricultural development necessitates commercialisation, then the way in which this type of growth perceives, involves and impacts women farmers needs to be changed. Otherwise, women may end up being relegated to the category of the 'hungry and malnourished', as opposed to being recognised

as producers who could be successfully targeted by policies designed to increase agricultural productivity.

Lack of policy attention to gender as a cross-cutting issue is also reflected at the structural level. There is no organisation within CAADP with clear responsibility for championing women's needs. A short report produced in 2009 explains that NEPAD, in liaison with the RECs, is given the responsibility for addressing cross-cutting issues including gender.⁸ However, neither NEPAD nor the RECs seem to be taking this responsibility on board.

Women smallholder farmers are often relegated to the most marginal lands and have very little capacity to adapt to climate change.

Like gender, climate change is a cross-cutting issue in CAADP and should, therefore, be integrated throughout its policy framework. Encouragingly, the NEPAD Secretariat has now drafted a "Climate Change Adaptation Framework" (CCA). This initiative aims to foster coordinated climate change policy, research and development related to agriculture and to provide a clear and compelling investment programme for African agriculture that delivers on the twin objectives of meeting current food security needs while building capacity of rural systems and agricultural assets (e.g. soils) to offset or respond to climate change. The CCA promises to maintain a high degree of emphasis on linkages between climate change, sustainable land management, food security and poverty alleviation.

The Framework recognises the implications of climate change for sustainable land and water management (Pillar 1); food security needs; and agricultural research. The CCA calls for CAADP actions to be rigorously monitored for livelihood and climate change impacts. In terms of implementation, it mentions the possibility of linking the framework to national investment plans.

Nevertheless, what appears to be missing are *gender* considerations related to climate change and agricultural development at large. Women smallholder farmers are often relegated to the most marginal lands and have very little capacity to implement effective adaptation practices. Thus, they are particularly vulnerable to climate change and weather-related disasters.

Despite this, the CCA framework is a welcome step and one that will need to be carefully monitored to see how it impacts policy in practice. The framework is particularly important given the fact that, until recently, there has been little or no reference to climate change, apart from Pillar 1 and sporadic mentions in Pillar 4.

Women and smallholders in CAADP country plans

Nigeria, Malawi, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana and Zambia

Unsurprisingly, the gaps in the CAADP policy framework are mirrored at country level in the CAADP-aligned national strategies and investment plans.⁹

In **Nigeria**, for example, the National Food Security Programme 2010 – 2020 makes no explicit reference to the role of women in agriculture and provides hardly any steer on the challenges of semi-subsistence agriculture. The pro-poor element of the Nigerian strategy is seen as increasing the availability and affordability of food, and providing opportunities for both enterprising semi-subsistence farmers and new farmers drawn from currently unemployed and untrained youth. Although this approach is important, it fails to

Malawi is focusing on turning out bumper crops of maize, not increasing productivity and incomes among the poorest and hungriest farmers.

acknowledge the growing proportion of women in the agricultural labour market and the need to eliminate discriminatory employment practices.

Nigeria's Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP), designed to convert the National Food Security Programme into a detailed set of capital cost estimates, does include support to farmers' cooperatives (something that would help smallholders), but much of the proposed

investment is either in strengthening international and inter-state border controls on agricultural trade or in international trade standards compliance. While these measures are important to a more efficient agricultural economy, it is not easy to see how they are pro-poor.

It is also not easy to see how NAIP sees medium size farm enterprises emerging from its growth strategy, nor is it explained what will happen to those families unable to take advantage of farm modernization policies. Given that around 70 percent of Nigerian agriculture is undertaken by families with limited access to land, this needs to be made clear to ensure that poor families are not made more vulnerable by the growth strategy. Moreover, in the identification of farmers targeted for support, there is no analysis of the role of women and the demands upon them in adopting new technologies and market orientation.

The **Malawi Agriculture Sector Wide Approach** is focused on increasing agricultural production by raising crop and livestock productivity. To this end, technology generation and dissemination will be enhanced, with production incentives in the form of subsidies for the adoption of improved (or higher yield) seed technology.

Whilst these interventions may increase productivity and improve efficiency, not all of them will stand up to scrutiny as pro-poor measures. For example, the strategy foresees the adoption of labour saving technologies for promoting sustainable land management, instead of appropriate labour *using* technologies to facilitate employment of the poor. Labour saving technologies should be understood in the context of reducing drudgery and time spent in carrying out farming activities, and not necessarily reducing the supply of labour. Moreover, there is no explicit reference in the strategy to the role of women in agriculture as cultivators, stock-keepers, petty traders, and/or as members of vulnerable households.

The sector plan outlines a clear strategy for reducing food insecurity by increasing maize production, reducing post harvest losses, diversifying food production and managing risks associated with food reserves. However, the accompanying investment plan puts the emphasis on boosting aggregate national food production and overall farm profitability, rather than increasing productivity and incomes among the poorest and hungriest Malawian farmers.

Malawi's plans provoke a number of questions - such as whether the priority accorded to continuing to increase national maize output is justified, given that the country now produces adequate or surplus amounts of maize. Is it possible that more poverty and food security impact and climate resilience benefits could be gained from diversifying food production in food deficit areas and improving the distribution of food among the poorer households?

The lack of an explicit gender and poverty focus is also evident in **Tanzania's** Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) and the accompanying Agriculture and Food Security Sector Investment Plan (TAFSIP). How smallholder farmers will be targeted for support is not clearly indicated. There is no analysis of the role of women (as the main contributors to cultivation) and the demands upon them in adopting new technologies and

market orientation. There are a number of measures that have the potential to positively impact on women farmers - such as the additional expenditure promised to extension services and credit organizations. However, analysis of the different needs of men and women producers is fundamentally necessary for these types of interventions to work.

Kenya's livestock programme focuses on cattle – the almost exclusive preserve of men and the better off in rural society.

Ethiopia's Policy and Investment Framework 2010-2020 (PIF) clearly recognises the role and needs of food-insecure farmers. However, it suggests that social protection programmes (food-for-work and cash transfers) that have become a lifeline for these farmers in recent years can be superseded by subsidies and investments targeted at improving the productivity of rural on-farm and non-farm enterprises. This assumes that improved availability of inputs such as seed, fertilizer and breeding stock (and credit and market outlets) will enable all farmers to intensify and modernize production. This could well be the case for some farmers, but for many the costs and risks may be too high or other factors might limit their ability to adopt new production technologies. The bias introduced by focusing on farmers willing to purchase and adopt new technology at the expense of more risk-averse households may particularly disadvantage women farmers who, risk and cost apart, often have other responsibilities that crowd out cultivation.

By contrast, **Kenya's** Medium Term Investment Plan (MTIP) does recognise that growth does not automatically translate into sustained improvements in food security, that Kenya faces major food security challenges, and that increased food output alone is unlikely to significantly reduce food insecurity. The challenges facing traditional food crop producers - the high level of pre and post harvest losses, low and declining soil fertility and inadequate disaster preparedness - are also described in the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS). But despite the vision being 'a food secure and prosperous nation', and a general desire to reduce food insecurity by 30 percent, there is no discussion of specific food security policies and programmes. For example, the MTIP calls for increased input use and modern farming methods. It also talks of reforming agricultural research and extension. However, there is no exploration of how these investments impact on women and the poor.

As in Ethiopia and Nigeria, the strategy seems to favour better off producers while making inadequate provision for the poorer majority and women. The livestock programme is overwhelmingly focussed on cattle - the almost exclusive preserve of men and the better off in rural society, with women and the poor much more invested in small stock and poultry. Lastly, the absence of a clear policy on food and nutrition has already contributed to a maize scandal, suspension of food sector ministers and permanent secretaries, and subsidised food going to rich people.

Kenya has developed a large aquaculture development programme which has the potential to benefit women and the more marginalised, landless and youth who have limited capital and access to land. However, this programme will only work if women and other marginalised groups are given preferential access to aquaculture support.

In the case of **Ghana**, there has been a welcome acknowledgement of the fact that the existing strategy, Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP I) paid too little attention to low income farming with the result that the main body of Ghana's farmers were largely untouched by any government modernization efforts or new private sector trading activity. In the new strategy, FASDEP II, there is some strategic re-balancing towards low-income farming, especially food crop production, although the strategy is generally much stronger on broad intentions rather than specific measures. Where specific measures are proposed – such as a focus on selected priority crops – this appears to favour the more

Women farmers are not the explicit focus of any of the roughly 5,000 budget lines in Zambia's 250 page budget document.

specialised farming enterprises over the more diversified small farms with irregular surplus production.

In the case of **Zambia**, women farmers are not the explicit focus of any of the roughly 5,000 budget lines in the 250 page budget document. The only mention of gender is various small budget lines concerning HIV & AIDS awareness training, gender mainstreaming and

spending on International Women's Day.

The government has long been committed, on paper, to 'ensuring gender equity in the provision of effective services' to farmers.¹⁰ But this is not realised in practice. Interviews with the senior Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives (MACO) staff confirm that officials have no active plan to target women farmers in their policies, nor do they know how to.¹¹ This does not mean that women do not benefit from some agricultural policies – clearly they do, but probably to a small extent. In September 2010, for example, it was reported that the government had procured 150 hammer mills and Family Drip Irrigation Systems for women's groups.¹² The Farmer Input Support Programme (FISP) does not target women farmers but the World Bank review of the 2007/08 subsidy programme found that 37 percent of beneficiaries were women.¹³ There is a policy that vulnerable groups (which include women, those with disabilities and people living with AIDS) should receive 30 percent of land up for reallocation. However, in 2008, women received only 19 percent of all land titles.¹⁴ MACO seeks to ensure that 30 percent of its workforce is female and MACO officials say that this is achieved in the extension service.¹⁵

Climate change in CAADP country plans

ActionAid also found very little focus on the impact of climate change and no provisions for mitigating its effect on poorer communities in the cases of Nigeria, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zambia, Ghana and Malawi.

In the **Nigerian** case, there is apparently very little on mitigating the impact of climate change. The strategy is to move away from rain-fed agriculture by expanding the area under 'sustainable land management'. However, the only explicit response to climate change is to promote biofuel production and monitoring with a view to instigate unspecified 'mitigating measures'.

In the Nigerian Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP) there are no specific projects concerned with fragile agro-ecological systems or projects that could mitigate the impact of climate change (which would be expected as the focus of CAADP's Pillar 2).

In the case of **Kenya**, there has been a far more explicit policy response to the issue of climate change. There is a national Climate Change Response Strategy which lists modalities for addressing climate change. The ASDS recognises that climate fluctuations have a bearing on the way the environment and natural resources are managed and that the resulting unpredictable weather affects agricultural activities. Local communities are to be encouraged to document knowledge and practices that provided early warning systems and helped mitigate changes within their environments for adaptation and customisation.

In the case of **Ghana**, the programme on environmental sustainability – Sustainable Management of Land and Water – however, provides no analysis of the impact of climate change on agriculture, despite its emphasis upon 'mainstreaming' environmental considerations into planning and incorporating sustainability into extension activities. For example, it does not look at the agro-ecological regions and production systems that are

particularly at risk from a combination of resource depletion and increased variability in seasonal rainfall that could be climate change related.

It is also unclear whether the strategy supports the environmental arguments for new approaches to larger scale commercial agriculture in the savanna regions, in the place of low input traditional farming, or accepts the view that smaller farms practicing rotation and low inputs are more environmentally sustainable.

ActionAid is calling for CAADP policies and investment plans to advance a clear vision for addressing the needs of women and smallholders and to take into account the dramatic impact climate change will have on African agriculture.

Nigeria's only explicit response to climate change is to promote biofuel production and monitoring with a view to instigate unspecified 'mitigating measures'.

Reap what you sow: funding CAADP implementation

Shortfalls in financing threaten to derail the CAADP process through a loss of political will. The goal of raising budget allocations to at least 10 percent of national budgets on agriculture was agreed in 2003, to be met by 2010. Seven years on, most targets are not being met. Many countries have recently increased their agricultural spending, but:

- As of March 2011, only 10 African countries had met the 10 percent target.
- The average allocation across Africa is around 6 percent of government spending, but this varies widely by country: 14 countries spend less than 5 percent while 16 countries spend between 5 and 10 percent.¹⁶
- Of 34 states reporting figures in 2008, almost as many had *reduced* their agriculture spending in recent years (12) as increased it (14), the others reporting no change.¹⁷

African governments' delays in reaching their 10 percent commitment demonstrate an

Box 2: Agriculture spending in Zambia: failing to match pledges with money

In Zambia the government signed the CAADP compact in January 2011, renewing its pledge to reach 10 percent. Yet in his 2011 budget speech three months earlier, the finance minister had once again cut the proportion of the budget allocated to agriculture. Zambia's Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) for 2011-15 sets an 'annual target' for spending on agriculture of 8 percent in 2011 – which has already been missed – rising to 10 percent in 2013, and 12 percent in 2015. The SNDP states that agriculture is the 'priority sector in achieving sustainable economic growth and reducing poverty in Zambia' and concedes that the sector has received 'low investment'. But it remains to be seen whether this recognition will affect actual spending decisions. Failing to spend sufficiently on agriculture is fundamentally a question of lack of political will.

Source: 'Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries' section of the SNDP 'zero draft' provided to the researchers, January 2011, unpaginated.

inexcusable lack of political will. However, lack of donor interest in agriculture (as reflected in a nearly 50 percent decrease in aid to the sector from 1980 to 2006) has also influenced the priorities and incentives of aid-dependent governments. For five out of the six most recent years for which data is available, OECD statistics show that emergency food aid has outstripped donor investment in long-term agricultural productivity. Overcoming years of

Emergency food aid has outstripped donor investment in long-term agricultural productivity in five of the past six years.

chronic neglect of farming will require both donors and government to signal a clear change in priorities through a dramatic shift in spending.

The pace of increase in donor support in recent years has been far too slow to send such a signal. After hitting a low of only 3 percent of all aid in 2006, aid to agriculture has started to climb slowly, and now comprises about 6 percent of sector-specific aid to Africa.¹⁸ However, this still amounts to only about US\$3 billion per year. By contrast, credible estimates suggest that a minimum of US\$6-8 billion, or 10 percent of total aid spending, would be needed from donors to supplement increased government spending.¹⁹

Box 3: Country funding gaps undermine CAADP

Substantial gaps remain between the estimated costs of the country proposals for agricultural reform and the funds available. For example, in Nigeria only 36 percent of the first year's cost estimates are met in the medium term budgetary framework. In Malawi, the total budget for its CAADP aligned investment plan is US\$1.6 billion, of which government and donors together have committed only \$0.6 billion, leaving the plan US\$1 billion short. This raises concerns about the viability of the programme, especially as there are an exceptionally large number of actions being proposed (188 in all) with no clear statement of priorities that would allow consideration of scaling back if necessary.

Kenya, on the other hand, seems to have succeeded in narrowing the gap in that current government, donor and (large projected) private sector commitments are expected to provide close to the Ksh 247 billion (US\$3bn) required to implement the country proposals. This is good news: a fully funded MTIP would reduce poverty by 14 percent to 22 percent, while food consumption in vulnerable areas would also increase by 13 percent and overall benefits would amount to about US\$250 per household per year.

Encouragingly, the endorsement of the CAADP process by the 2009 G8 L'Aquila Food Security Initiative did herald a shift in donor approach towards greater support for country-led plans. The Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP) was launched in 2010 by Spain, Canada and the US, following the commitments made in L'Aquila. The GAFSP holds the potential to be a catalyst for a more effective approach based on country plans. The GAFSP has adopted the Rome Principles into its governance structure, planning, and implementation procedures. All GAFSP funds support country-led agricultural development strategies. In Africa, the fund specifically supports countries that have advanced through the CAADP process.

The fund, with a small secretariat at the World Bank, has received nearly \$1 billion in pledges from 6 donors including the United States, Spain, Korea, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada and Australia. Several additional donors are currently considering further contributions. In June 2010, the GAFSP Steering Committee approved 5 grants totalling US\$224 million for Bangladesh, Haiti, Sierra Leone, Togo and Rwanda. In November 2010, more than \$100 million in grants were approved for Mongolia, Ethiopia, and Niger. The successful country proposals have demonstrated a high level of need, effective agricultural investment plans, and coherent project proposals. What is disappointing is that so little money has been made available to turn a paper endorsement of the country-led CAADP process into a real change in donor funding patterns.

There is clearly movement in the right direction and there is no doubt that the CAADP process has made huge strides in galvanising support for agricultural led growth. However, governments and donors must act quickly to fully fund the CAADP plans once they are agreed, or the political will that has so far been created will be lost and the CAADP process will be trapped in cynicism and stagnation.

Conclusion and Recommendations

ActionAid supports CAADP and its goal of eliminating hunger and reducing poverty through agriculture-led development. We applaud its focus on improving food security and integrating smallholder farmers into development plans. However, its success could be undermined by a persistent failure to identify and prioritise the needs, constraints, and opportunities of women farmers, and smallholders in general.

In order to ensure that CAADP succeeds in its goal of reducing poverty and hunger in rural Africa, CAADP partners must address gaps both in the overall level of resources committed, and in the amount of resources and support being channelled to women farmers and other smallholders who produce the vast majority of Africa's food and comprise the majority of the rural poor. A first step will be strengthening the analysis and policy guidance provided to national CAADP partners to assist them in designing effective policy measures to support women and smallholders.

Comprehensive measures to assist smallholder farmers in adapting to climate change and other ecological shocks must also be integrated into policy formulation at all levels. Currently, the attention to climate change adaptation in CAADP policy guidance and within the CAADP aligned national strategies is wholly inadequate to ensure that smallholders and especially women will be able to withstand global warming.

ActionAid is working closely with the NEPAD Secretariat and the regional farmers' organisations and other non-governmental organisations to ensure greater policy space for smallholder farmers, particularly women smallholders and the most marginalised at the national level. ActionAid and its partners continue to engage with national governments in ensuring they deliver on their promises around reducing hunger and investing in agriculture and food security – particularly for the most marginalised.

In particular, ActionAid calls upon national government, international organisations, regional economic communities, donor organisations, NEPAD and the CAADP Secretariat and non state actors to act upon the following recommendations:

1. Ensure *participation* of women smallholders, so that the needs and concerns of unorganised women farmers are effectively represented and acted upon. Women's organizations should be included in stakeholder reviews at all levels. Moreover, investment programmes should be assessed as to whether they provide clearly articulated, effective and accessible participation mechanisms for stakeholders, particularly women smallholders' organizations, to remain engaged throughout implementation and evaluation at all levels.
2. At the continental level, NEPAD should commission the drafting of a *women's rights analysis* and an *ecological sustainability analysis for each pillar* theme. These analyses would generate recommendations and guidance to inform CAADP-aligned national plans.

3. At the national level, governments, with support of Regional Economic Communities (RECs) where appropriate, should conduct *gendered social and ecological impact assessments* prior to signing off on national agricultural investment plans.
4. All *monitoring and evaluation* tools should include an assessment of how well the poverty reduction and gender inclusion objectives are reflected in investments, considering whether these attributes are clearly defined and demonstrably supported by intended activities, inputs and outputs of projects.
5. The NEPAD *Climate Change Adaptation Framework* (CCA Framework) should incorporate a gender analysis of the intersection between climate change and agriculture into its recommendations before it is adopted.
6. Given that the cross-cutting issues of gender and climate change remain adrift in the CAADP organizational structure, the NEPAD Secretariat must articulate the *roles, responsibilities, and accountability mechanisms* for ensuring that these issues can be integrated throughout the CAADP process. In addition, experts in women's rights and climate should be included in each administrative and technical body at each level (CAADP country team, expert reference group, NPCA, pillar institutions).
7. All CAADP signatory governments must allocate at least *10 percent of their government budgets* to agriculture, as per the CAADP commitment. All governments must set a target date for meeting this commitment as soon as possible.
8. National investment in agriculture must *target women smallholder farmers* recognising both their multiple roles in food production, provision, and procurement but also the unique constraints they face. Governments must give priority to meeting the unmet needs of women farmers with key services, such as extension: public credit and research that builds climate resilience.
9. *No credible CAADP plan should go unimplemented for want of funds.* Donors must improve the effectiveness of their aid to agriculture by coordinating their assistance behind CAADP plans, either through bi-lateral contributions or through multilateral funds, such as GAFSPs.
10. If national plans target women smallholders, and if donors align behind national plans, then the share of agricultural ODA that supports women farmers should increase substantially. To verify this, it is critical that donors enhance the use of tools such as *gender budgeting and collecting of sex-disaggregated data.*

End Notes

¹ FAO. 2011. State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA): Women and Agriculture—Closing the gender gap for development. Rome, Italy.

² Hertel, T, Burke M, Lobell D, 2010, “The Poverty Implications of Climate-Induced Crop Yield Changes by 2030,” GTAP, Stanford University.

³ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007, “Fourth Assessment”.

⁴ World Bank, ‘Agriculture and poverty reduction’, *Agriculture for development policy brief*, 2008, p.1

⁵ MAAIF/CAADP, *Uganda: Long-term funding for agricultural growth, poverty reduction and food and nutrition security*, October 2009, p.1

⁶ This paper does not attempt to offer a comprehensive critique. It omits many components of the CAADP process including, for example, its accountability and participation mechanisms.

⁷ Based on research carried out by Kristin Sampson ‘*Is CAADP the panacea framework for women and other small holder farmers in Africa? A critique*’ for ActionAid International, December 2010.

⁸ CAADP-NEPAD. 2009. *Synthesis on the Process and Outcomes on Alignment of Pillar work and Pillar Institutions Networks and Networking in supporting the CAADP Country Process*.pp.10. Midrand, South Africa.

⁹ ActionAid is indebted to John Howell of the Overseas Development Institute for the research into country plans and proposals that underpins this analysis.

¹⁰ Republic of Zambia, *Fifth National Development Plan, 2006-2010*, December 2006, p.48

¹¹ Interview with MACO officials, Lusaka, January 2011

¹² ‘State buys agro tools for women’s groups’, *Times of Zambia*, 1 September 2010

¹³ World Bank, *Zambia: Impact Assessment of the Fertilizer Support Program*, 9 June 2010, p.33

¹⁴ Republic of Zambia, *Mid-Term Review: Fifth National Development Plan, 2006-2010*, October 2009, p.103

¹⁵ Interview with MACO officials, Lusaka, January 2011; Cathy Farnworth and Monica Munachonga, ‘Gender Approaches in Agricultural Programmes- Zambia Country Report’, *UTV Working Paper 2010*, p.11.

¹⁶ ‘CAADP targets’, www.resakss.org; Shenggen Fan et al, ‘Public spending for agriculture in Africa: trends and composition’, *ReSAKSS working paper No.28*, April 2009, p.5

¹⁷ NEPAD Secretariat, Agriculture Unit, ‘National compliance with 2003 African Union Maputo Declaration to allocate at least 10percent of national budget to agriculture development: 2007 draft survey report’, October 2008, p.11

¹⁸ For calculations see Mark Curtis, ‘The crisis in agricultural aid’, September 2008, www.curtisresearch.org; based on OECD, Creditor Reporting System, accessed 16 May 2008, www.oecd.org

¹⁹ Based on estimates by IFPRI, the MDG Africa Steering Committee and the UN High Level Taskforce on the Global Food Crisis. Fan and Rosengrant, 2008 “Investing in Agriculture to Overcome the World Food Crisis and Reduce Poverty and Hunger” www.ifpri.org/pubs/bp/bp003.pdf.

Acknowledgements: Ruchi Tripathi, Buba Khan, Jo Walker, Kim Trathen, Catherine Gatundu, Henry Malumo and Youjin B. Chung, John Howell, Gem Argwings-Kodhek, Chinyamata Chipeta and Chanyalew Demese.

With Special thanks to Maya Vaughan-Tiwary for compiling this report; to the Overseas Development Institute and Future Agricultures Consortium for coordinating the research in 6 countries and to the participating countries.